

Locating the Franciscans within the Cities of Thirteenth Century Northern Italy
Using the *Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*

Thesis
D
2007
J33

by

Robert C. Jacobs

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of:

MASTER OF ARTS

Joint Masters Program
Department of History
University of Manitoba/University of Winnipeg

©2007

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

MASTER'S THESIS/PRACTICUM FINAL REPORT

Master's Thesis entitled:

**Locating the Franciscans within the Cities of Thirteenth Century Northern Italy
Using the *Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam***

Submitted by

Robert C. Jacobs

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

The Thesis Examining Committee certifies that the thesis and oral examination is:

Approved

Advisor: Roisin Cossar, History Dept., U of Manitoba
 Greg Smith, History Dept., U of Manitoba
 Ben Baader, History Dept., U of Manitoba
 David Watt, English Dept., U of Manitoba
 R. Jarvis Brownlie, Chair, History Dept., U of Manitoba

Date: 23 February 2007

Abstract

In 1210, a young man later to be canonized as St. Francis went to Pope Innocent III and obtained permission to form a new religious order that was radically different from any order that had gone before. In the beginning this order, the Franciscans, disdained the ownership of any material goods, rejected any contact with the developing commercial society of the communes and disapproved of papal privileges. By the last decades of the thirteenth century, the order found its relationships with the community greatly altered. This thesis traces these changes as revealed in the *Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam a Chronicle* written by a young man who joined the Order in 1238. It examines the increasingly close relationship between the Franciscans, the civic administration, the secular church, and the papacy and the mutual benefits that resulted. It investigates the conflict between the local clergy and the order and notes how important the order's close relationship with the papacy was to their ability to triumph in conflicts with local clergy. The thirteenth century saw many spontaneous religious movements that sprang into existence. The Franciscans frequently saw these new movements as competitors and this thesis documents the four methods that the Franciscans developed to deal with them. The close contact with the secular world resulted in significant changes in the Order itself. The assumption by the Order of pastoral service necessitated its acquisition of elaborate buildings. More important and less obvious were changes taking place in the Order itself. There was an increasing regard for social class inside the Order, which eventually led to the near exclusion of lay members from the Order. This thesis describes these changes as they took place in the first seven decades of the Order's existence.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the support of Mr James W. Burns and the University of Manitoba who provided generous financial aid during the completion of this work.

This study would not have been possible without the help of a number of special people. In particular I would like to thank Dr. Roisin Cossar whose supervision, patience and guidance in completing this project were without compare. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Greg Smith, Dr. Ben Baader, Dr David Watt, and Dr. R Jarvis Brownlie who served on my Thesis Examining Committee. Carol Adam, Lisa McKendry and Sandra Ferguson saw to it that all administrative details were completed promptly.

While I was working on this thesis, the staff at the Document Delivery section of the University of Manitoba Library was extremely helpful and never once failed to find the frequently obscure papers that I requested.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends who provided encouragement as I completed this thesis. In particular, I would like to thank my parents. My mother always knew I was capable of doing almost anything even when I was not as sure. My father wondered why I put myself to so much work but was beginning to see the personal satisfaction it brought me. They did not live to see the end of the process, but this is for them.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....	1
Content of This Thesis.....	2
Content of This Chapter.....	3
THE FORM OF THE TEXT.....	4
Salimbene's <i>Chronicle</i>	8
Medieval Biographies.....	11
THE CONTENT OF THE TEXT.....	15
The Franciscan Problem.....	15
Clericalization of the Franciscans.....	19
THE CONTENT OF THE TEXT.....	21
The Communes of Northern Italy.....	22
USING THE TEXT.....	30
Various Historians and Their Use of Salimbene.....	30
Problems in Using Salimbene.....	38
2. SALIMBENE THE MAN.....	43
Introduction: Salimbene and Family Relations.....	43
Salimbene and the Powerful of Society.....	47
Salimbene's Attitude toward Lay Brothers in the Order.....	50
Salimbene and Joachim of Fiore.....	55

Joachim of Fiore	55
Joachim and the Mendicants	57
Salimbene's Attitude to Joachim	58
Problems in Paris	63
Salimbene's Doubts about Joachim	64
Conclusion	65
3. THE FRANCISCANS AND THIRTEENTH CENTURY ITALIAN SOCIETY	67
The Early Franciscans	70
Familial and Other Relationships	71
Marriage Relationships	72
Movement into the Order and from the Order into Church Government	75
Individuals Who Acted as if They had Assumed a New Station in Society	77
King Louis of France	77
Papal Legates	78
Civic Role Confusion	81
The Flagellant Movement	82
The Great Halleluiah	82
Early Preachers during the Great Halleluiah	85
Brother John of Vicenza	90
Post Mortem for the Great Halleluiah	92
Benefits Flowing as the Result of the Sharing of Power	95
The Franciscans and the Papacy	101
Problems between the Papacy and the Mendicants	103

Papal Privileges for the Franciscans	105
Franciscans' Service to the Pope.....	106
4. THE FRANCISCANS AND DISPUTES WITH THE SECULAR PRIESTHOOD	110
The Franciscans and the Secular Clergy	111
Problems in Paris	112
John of Parma's Speech in Paris	114
Further Disputes in Paris	116
The Franciscans and the Parish Clergy	117
Conflict at the Synod of 1260	118
Salimbene's First Defence of the Franciscans	120
Salimbene's Second Defence of the Franciscans	127
Conclusion	128
5. SALIMBENE, THE FRANCISCANS AND NEW RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS	131
The Great Halleluiah	134
The Flagellant Movement	135
The Godenti	143
The Order of the Sack	145
The "False Prophet" Albert	149
The Apostles of Gerard Segarello	151
The Ideal Religious Order	158
Conclusion	161
6. EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL CHANGES IN THE ORDER	163

The Franciscans' Changes to the Physical Map of the City	161
Objections to the Franciscans' Building Program	167
Internal Changes in the Franciscan Order	169
Increase in the Granting of Sepulture in Franciscan Graveyards	171
Changes in the Internal Social Structure of the Order	174
Conclusion	178
7. CONCLUSION.	179
BIBLIOGRAPHY	184

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In 1283 a Franciscan Brother, Salimbene de Adam de Parma, began to write a chronicle of his life.¹ Born October 9, 1221, at the age of seventeen against the wishes of his father he had entered the Franciscan Order, only twenty-eight years after the formation of the Franciscans (also known as the Friars Minor) and only twelve years after the death of St Francis. He spent a large part of the rest of his life travelling through France and Italy living in many different houses, both those of the brotherhood and those of the wealthy. The Order, at the time that he entered it, was not fully formed and was still in the phase of development that some at the time considered a bizarre experiment. By the time Salimbene was engaged in writing his *Chronicle* (1283-1288) the Order was close to being fully formed. It had found its place in the world and in the Church. Since Salimbene's work is contemporaneous with that period, it is one of the few documents outside those of the official Church that provides a glimpse into the early formative years of the Franciscans. At the same time the governmental structure of the cities of Northern Italy was also undergoing a significant change. These changes, while similar, were not identical from city to city. Because of his widespread travels, Salimbene's *Chronicle* is

¹ The only existing copy of Salimbene's *Chronicle* was first found in the eighteenth century and was moved into the Vatican library where it currently rests. While the thirteenth century historian Albert Milioli of Reggio seems to have been aware of Salimbene's *Chronicle* and made use of it in his *Liber de temporibus* Salimbene's work appears to have been little known and read in the Middle Ages. The single manuscript that is in the Vatican library is a holograph, written, illuminated and corrected by the hand of Salimbene himself. Joseph Baird, Introduction to *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, by Salimbene de Adam, trans. Joseph Baird, Giuseppe Baglivi, and John Robert Kane, with an Introduction and Notes by Joseph L. Baird, (Binghampton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1986), xxvi-xxvii. Edited versions in Latin are available with the most current version that of Scalia produced in 1966. Salimbene da Parma, *Cronica Fratris Salimbene de Adam*, ed. Guiseppe Scalia (Bari: G Laterza, 1966). All references in English to Salimbene's *Chronicle* are from the Baird translation.

also one of the few documents from the time to describe changes taking place in society from the point of view of one individual over the span of many cities. It is, therefore, a valuable tool to explore the changes in civic government and the resulting relationship between the rapidly changing governments and the developing Franciscan Order.

Content of This Thesis

In this thesis I use the *Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam* to locate the Franciscans within the governmental and social structure of the cities of Northern Italy over the years 1230 to 1285. In contrast to other studies, I use Salimbene's *Chronicle* as the major primary source. While I use other primary sources occasionally, and use secondary sources frequently, the most important source remains Salimbene.

I will first show that the governmental structure of the cities was complicated and resulted in an ambiguity of position that allowed the Franciscans to assume positions in society that they would not normally have been allowed to fill. As a result, the Order allied itself more and more with the rich, powerful, and famous by making itself useful to both the Church and secular government. Increasingly there was an exchange of personnel between the Order and senior positions in the Church. Second, I will show that, in allying themselves with senior positions in Church and secular government, the Franciscans more and more began to alienate themselves from the local clergy and, indeed, some of the bishops because they were seen to be interfering with the income of the secular clergy. Spirituality in the Northern Italian cities was not limited to the orthodox religious structure. While the fourth Lateran Council of 1215 had forbidden the creation of new religious orders with new rules, this did not stop the spontaneous development of new forms of spirituality in the community. As the Franciscans became

increasingly associated with the orthodox religious structure of the society, they found themselves frequently at odds with some of these new religious movements. Third, I will show that just as the secular clergy had seen the Franciscans as posing a risk to their position in society and their source of financial support, so the Franciscans perceived some of these new orders in the same way and developed a strategy to engage these religious movements. In two cases, they were able to make use of the new orders to further their own ends and that, in itself, said much about how the Franciscans had changed from a small band of revolutionaries to an important part of the orthodox religious structure. The increasing interaction between the Franciscans and the secular world led to changes in the Order. The most obvious change was that the Order was increasingly making use of large and opulent buildings. The other change was less obvious but more significant. There was an increasing awareness of social structure within the Order and the Order more and more saw the lay Brother as unimportant. chapter 6 in this thesis will document these changes.

Content of this Chapter

Since Salimbene's work is more complicated than a simple chronicle and contains all three elements of medieval historiographical representation: annals, chronicles and histories, to better understand his work I will provide some historical background on the development of the chronicle and an assessment of the existing historiography.

Salimbene's work contains a large element of biographical and autobiographical components as well, permitting a discussion of its place among medieval biographies.

Much of Salimbene's document concerns developments within the Franciscan Order. For that reason I will present a short historiography of the Franciscans and describe how the

developments in that Order which took place in the thirteenth century remain the subject of historical disputes today. The changes in the Order took place within the context of a rapidly changing secular governmental structure, and Salimbene was a witness to many of these changes. Therefore, I will furnish a brief historiography of the communal structure of the cities of thirteenth century Northern Italy. Finally I will examine the way other historians have used Salimbene's work and examine some of the problems in using Salimbene to analyse thirteenth century historical developments in Italy.

THE FORM OF THE TEXT

Salimbene's text is called a chronicle but in some ways it more closely resembles a modern historian's work because rather than follow a strictly chronological order it will occasionally trace an idea from beginning to end. However, at root, it remains a chronicle with all the difficulty of interpretation that that form of historical record presents.

It is the contention of many modern historians that there are three kinds of medieval historiographical representation: annals, chronicles and 'history proper.'² However, the distinction between the three forms of historical representation remains subject to significant dispute and this dispute goes to the root of historical investigation. According to Nancy Partner, "History is meaning imposed on time by means of language: history imposes syntax on time."³ What is in dispute, then, is the degree of narrative present in the three forms and whether what narrative is present does indeed impose syntax on time.

² Hayden White, "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality," in *The Content of the Form*, (Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 4.

³ Nancy Partner, "Making Up Lost Time: Writing on the Writing of History," *Speculum*, 61:1 (Jan, 1986), 97.

According to Denys Hay annals are the most primitive form of historical record.⁴ In their earliest form they consisted of a series of events arranged in lists showing the annual changes in magistrates or they were computed from the years of a king's reign. It was assumed that the reader knew or could find out the temporal reference. The medieval annal, while taking its pattern from the earlier form, gained an advantage from Christianity as it provided a fixed point in time around which all historical events could be arranged in temporal sequence. This point was Easter but since it was a moveable feast its location in the year provided a source for debate between various factions of the Church.⁵ As a result many tables setting out a series of the annual dates of Easter were created.

These tables not only contained the date of Easter but other extraneous data which was included because of the sanctity of the day. Lists like this invited the inclusion of historical items and formed the basis for the early annals. The Easter tables were frequently lent or carried from one centre to another and in a similar fashion the annals were copied and gradually spread through Western Europe. Consequently there came into being a great deal of chronological data, more or less exactly dated, which could be extended backwards or forwards by writers anxious to write more comprehensive history.⁶

However, each annual record was confined to a single physical line on the page. The small amount of blank space in each line limited the length and extent of the entries if the annalist did not want to confuse things by having his entry continue on to the next

⁴ Denys Hay, *Annalists and Historians: Western Historiography from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century*, (London: Methuen and Company Ltd., 1977), 38.

⁵ Hay, *Annalists*, 39.

⁶ Hay, *Annalists*, 42.

line. Hayden White, in his examination of medieval historiography, analysed the *Annals of Saint Gall* for the years 709-734 and pointed out some of the results that stemmed from this limited space. The events the compiler chose to include were extreme events and the implicit criterion for their acceptance was their extreme nature. Basic needs and the possibility of their not being provided were of great significance to the annal's compiler.⁷ Many years have no events attached to them, though of course this does not mean that nothing took place during that year. As Nancy Partner points out, even the supposedly objective, unknown monk of St Gall found it necessary to make a choice on the events that he would include in his record. Therefore, even the annal, which earlier nineteenth and twentieth century historians had considered a supposedly objective form of historical record, remains a highly subjective document because of the personal choice behind the events included by the compiler.⁸

According to White the vertical ordering of the events on the right hand column of the annal leads to the conclusion that the unknown compiler considered all events to be events of the same kind; that is they are all "metonymies of the general condition of scarcity or 'overfullness' of the reality" that the annalist is recording. The sequence of dates had an inherent organisational structure to it. What the annalist lacked to make a narrative out of his list of events was the capability to sense a similar relationship between events on the right hand side of his list. He lacked the capability or will of substituting meanings for one another in a chain of 'semantic metonymies' which would transform his list of events into a discourse and would grant it a form of narrativity.⁹ In

⁷ White, "Value," 7.

⁸ Nancy Partner, "Hayden White: The Form of the Content," *History and Theory*, 37:2 (May 1998), 166.

⁹ White, "Value," 15.

other words, what was required, according to Sarah Foot, was a capability not only to record one thing *after* another but to record one thing *because* of another.¹⁰ Foot differs from White in arguing that annals, while limited by their form, have certain narrative characteristics including chronological organization, a central subject and an elementary plot. Just because the plot is not clear to the modern reader does not mean that it was not clear to the compiler who made the record or his contemporaries for whom the text was written.¹¹ She proposes that the adoption of the paratactic syntax is an important part in Old English literary style and does not denote literary naiveté. It may even make handling contemporaneous developments easier without recourse to digression or recapitulation. The counted years themselves become part of the story. By making them so, the compilers have contrived to “colonize a concrete temporal space locating themselves and the subjects of their texts into the larger story that is time itself.” Foot says that annals read in the way she would prefer, do indeed, using Partner’s terminology, “impose syntax on time” and should be properly called a form of narration.¹²

The chronicle differs from an annal in that it is a more expansive account of events; however, it usually retains a strictly chronological framework. Like the annal, its organizational element is usually the year. According to White the chronicle is a “higher” form of historical representation and represents a superior form of historical representation to the annal. Its superiority consists of its greater comprehensiveness, its organization of materials by topics and reigns, its greater narrative coherence, and the presence of a central subject. However, to late nineteenth and early twentieth century

¹⁰ Sarah Foot, “Finding the meaning of form: narrative annals and chronicles,” in *Writing Medieval History*, ed. Nancy Partner, (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), 90.

¹¹ Foot, “Finding,” 93-94.

¹² Foot, “Finding,” 94-96, quote at 96.

historians the chronicle was seen to lack a true historicity because chronology remains as the organizing principle of the discourse and chronicles, like annals, but unlike histories, simply terminate. The chronicle promises closure but typically does not provide it.¹³

In examining the *History of France*, a chronicle written ca. 998 by one Richerus of Rheims, White notes that although it has all the characteristics of a narrative it fails as a work of history because it was written for the exclusive purpose of justifying the author's superior's reign over the see of Rheims. What was missing was a moral principle that might have judged the resolution of affairs as either just or unjust.¹⁴ White insists that to qualify as a history there must be at least two versions of narration of its occurrence possible. Without two versions of events being imaginable there is no reason for the historian to take upon himself the authority to describe the 'true' account of what really happened. The authority of the historical account is the authority of reality itself. The historical account endows this reality with form and therefore makes it desirable because it imposes upon it the processes of the formal coherency that only narratives possess.¹⁵

Salimbene's *Chronicle*

Salimbene's work differs from most other chronicles because it contains all three forms of historiographical representation: the annal, the chronicle and "history" proper. Its basic structure is denominated by years but he has moved far away from the simple Easter table or early annal. He has adopted the form of the chronicle since there are often many entries for each year and each entry is usually more comprehensive than the simple entries in annals. However, in a way that is typical of annals, he gave events of seemingly minor importance as much significance as major events. For example, minor battles that

¹³ White, "Value," 16.

¹⁴ White, "Value," 19-20.

¹⁵ White, "Value," 20.

took place in 1213 are given as much space in the *Chronicle* as the beginning of the Children's Crusade or a famine in which "mothers even ate their own children."¹⁶ His mention that in 1285 Easter fell on the Day of Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary is another reminder of the origin of annals in Easter tables although in this case it is only one minor entry buried in a sea of other events.¹⁷

While Salimbene's work is called a chronicle and retains years as an organizational element, it does not strictly conform to the medieval ideal of the chronicle because it does not always follow a strict chronological timeline as he narrates events. Rather, in a manner more resembling a modern historian, Salimbene occasionally followed a theme outside the chronological order of events. In that sense his work can be seen to be a work of history in that he was attempting a narrative. However, even as he made these excursions, he apologised for his digressions from what he considered strictly correct format, so he essentially remained bound by the medieval convention.¹⁸ He provided three reasons for the digressions. First, they came to his mind when in good conscience he could not avoid them. Second, the digressions allowed him to say many good and useful things. Finally it did not matter because he never left out any facts. In the end, however, his work, in a similar fashion to other chronicles, does not always provide closure. It does not adopt one theme, develop it and follow it to a conclusion.

His excursions from a strictly chronological format begin early in the work. The only event mentioned in the entry for 1216 that actually took place in that year was the death of Innocent III. The rest of the entry is devoted to events in the life of Innocent. In the first paragraph Salimbene gave a synopsis of Innocent's conflict with Frederick II. He

¹⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 4.

¹⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 572.

¹⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 176.

then devoted almost as much effort in describing Innocent's dealing with a court jester who exchanges witty sayings with the pope and a magician who conjured up images of the Archbishop of Bismantova.¹⁹ It was in the entry for 1216 that Salimbene first mentions Joachim of Fiore, who was an important influence in his life. The entry for 1221 noted the death of St. Dominic and in much greater detail his own birth and baptism.²⁰ The first entry against the year 1229 is the description of the Battle of San Cesario, in which Salimbene's great uncle was slain. At this point Salimbene digressed from the chronological order to provide a description of his family's genealogy, his entry into the Franciscans, his argument with his father over his joining the Order, visions of the Holy Family which overcame his doubts about his chosen life path and his early years in the Order.²¹ He continued with this digression, describing events in his early years in the Order up to and including the rebellion of Parma against the emperor in 1247 before returning to events in the year 1229.²² Such a prominent deviation from strictly chronological organisation is an indication of how important family, both his own and that of others, was to Salimbene. The importance of family to Salimbene was closely allied to his feeling of loyalty to those who were well born and to his rejection of the importance of those who were not fully literate. This feature of his character will be examined in more detail in chapter 2.

¹⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 5-8. Salimbene appears to have missed the point of the witty exchange. J.L. Baird and Guiseppe Baglivi, "Salimbene and *Il Bel Motto*," *American Benedictine Review* 28 (1977), 201-209.

²⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 8.

²¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 33.

²² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 11-36.

Medieval Biographies

Salimbene's work, in contrast to many chronicles, is a strongly personal document. While other chroniclers state that they were present when events took place, Salimbene inserted himself into the very events as they were taking place. Whether it was a meal with the King of France or a meeting between the Minister General and the *podestà* of Parma, Salimbene either took part in events or was at least more involved in them than as a mere observer. To understand his work fully it is therefore necessary to briefly examine medieval biographies and autobiographies.

Early medieval writers did not produce biographies in the sense that they were attempting to explain what made their subject unique. Rather they produced them in a manner patterned after saints' *vitae* according to set patterns or models.²³ These patterns sought on a literal level to relate particular events of a saint's life. On an allegorical level, they attempt to show how the life path followed by the saint was the same as that followed by Christ. The saint is born to the accompaniment of heavenly signs. After a period of stylized childhood when the child is seen to be different from other children and may or may not have rejected God comes a conversion to the ecclesiastical life. This is followed by triumphs over devils, miracles performed and eventually death, which, like the saint's birth, is accompanied by miraculous signs. Whatever the variations, these *vitae* share two characteristics. First there is no doubt about the core virtue of the hero and there is no doubt about the eventual outcome of events. Secondly, the life of the

²³ Jay Rubenstein, "Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages," in *Writing Medieval History*, ed. Nancy Partner, (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), 22.

antagonist is seen as that of a pilgrimage. Like Augustine he is seen in a constant motion forward from the City of Man to the City of God.²⁴

Salimbene, by inserting himself into his work in such an unmistakable way, also makes the work into a form of autobiography. Autobiography is a different type of literature from biography. The medieval model for autobiography is St Augustine's *Confessions* written in the fourth century. That text does not take a linear path from beginning to end. To borrow a phrase from Peter Brown, it is a story of "the evolution of the heart."²⁵ Augustine's purpose was to describe his soul's motion toward God and it most assuredly was not a straightforward and continuous motion but rather was full of dead ends and pitfalls. For example, he was forced to battle with carnal desires through his life. In contrast, in most Saints' *vitae* the antagonist was able to overcome carnal desires with a single extreme act of asceticism and the subject's life came to a worthy end.

This is what makes it difficult to write autobiographies using the traditional medieval concepts of bibliographic structure because, in the case of an autobiography, the author is not dead. Therefore, the story of his life is not complete because completion only comes with death and the achievement of the subject's soul's pilgrimage to God. Augustine overcame this difficulty by making an inward turn in Book X to examine his soul with greater intensity. This sophistication was beyond lesser writers and as a result before the twelfth century, instead of complete autobiographies, one finds works with "autobiographical moments."²⁶

²⁴ Rubenstein, "Biography," 25-26.

²⁵ Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, (London: 1967), 28 quoted in Rubenstein, "Biography," 26.

²⁶ Rubenstein, "Biography," 26.

One of the first truly modern autobiographies is the memoir-letter of Peter Abelard. Abelard had compelling reasons for telling his life story—namely to defend himself against several prominent critics and enemies. In addition he wanted to leave a record of his relationship with Heloise that best suited his memories and best explained his own conduct. In addition, his work was richer because he had engaged in abstract speculation about the shape of human consciousness. He was a thinker who theorized about the self and it was these speculations which gave him the tools to write about his own life. Twelfth century writers may not have discovered the individual but they discovered something as important; the tools for thinking about and writing about the individual.²⁷

Interpretation of medieval biographies and autobiographies remains difficult because of what Rubenstein calls the “apparent clutter of the medieval authorial mindset.”²⁸ This clutter was the result of the kind of academic training that medieval writers experienced which emphasized the study of the Bible. Rubenstein argues that to the medieval mind, Biblical writings functioned on four levels—the literal, allegoric (how the words comment on the development of the Church), tropologic (advice on how to live a moral life), and anagogic (the prophesies of the last days).²⁹

Analysis of medieval autobiographies requires that a pair of precepts be kept in mind. First, all medieval biography is to some extent autobiographical.³⁰ This, in turn, shapes the authorial voice in three ways. Biographers feel the need to insert themselves into the text, either to tell a story about themselves or to assert a connection to the

²⁷ Rubenstein, “Biography,” 30-31.

²⁸ Rubenstein, “Biography,” 24.

²⁹ Rubenstein, “Biography,” 24-25.

³⁰ Rubenstein, “Biography,” 34.

subject. Second, biographers have a particular political agenda which must be considered when interpreting his description of events. Finally, biographers have preconceptions on the correct way a life is to be led, which grow out of both theoretical considerations and out of their own experiences. The life presented is designed to present these ideals.³¹

The second precept is the inverse of the first. All autobiographies contain an element of biography. When biographers write about a life they do so inside a theoretical conception of society. A life gains meaning, not just from the actions, but from the ways in which it conforms to or illustrates this theory. Autobiographers work within the same intellectual structure. When they seek to define themselves they do so within generalized constructs which they have fashioned inside their own intellectual worlds.³² In this way they are no different than other historians who, according to Partner, must produce a form of writing which has a central purpose in affirming our consciousness of a shared experience over generations. The writer must persuade the reader, using constructs that differ only marginally from those of novelists, not only of the possible reality of these constructs but of their guaranteed relationship to things outside the text.³³ In particular the constructs of the character of the historical subjects must remain consistent with the reader's (and the author's) concepts of the workings of the society being portrayed.³⁴ In this respect, Salimbene was no different from the modern historian. He attempted to make his *Chronicle* consistent with his and his reader's construct of the world.

³¹ Rubenstein, "Biography," 34.

³² Rubenstein, "Biography," 34-35.

³³ Partner, "Writing," 97.

³⁴ Partner, "Writing," 100.

THE CONTENT OF THE TEXT

The Franciscan Problem

Salimbene was a young man of seventeen when he joined the Franciscans. Most of the events noted in his *Chronicle* took place after he had joined the Order and events concerning the Order assumed a great importance in the *Chronicle*. The Order itself was changing and Salimbene, with his eye for detail and his ability to capture the essence of individual personalities, provides the reader with a vivid description of these changes.

One of the last groups accepted by the Church before the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 forbade the acceptance of any new religious groups was the Franciscans. In 1210 the man later to be canonized as St Francis and eleven of his followers approached Innocent III and asked for permission to lead a religious life following a simple Rule.³⁵

The Franciscan Order flourished over the next century but with growth came some internal problems. A controversy over the type of life the Franciscans were to live and the Rule they were to follow escalated over the next century. Two parties developed inside the Order. One party who were called "spirituals" wished to follow a simple life divorced from society. Another group in the Order (sometimes called "conventuals") wished to take a greater role in society and were willing to accept the compromises with the early Rule that this required. This controversy became so violent that in 1317 a group of spirituals were executed at Avignon. As David Burr says, since both the victim and inquisitor were Franciscans, "it was very much a family affair."³⁶ Why an Order that started in such a promising manner should have reached such an impasse is the question that has troubled and continues to trouble Franciscan scholars.

³⁵ The exact wording has not survived.

³⁶ David Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century after St Francis*, (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 1.

The Franciscans were only one of a large number of religious movements that began in the last half of the twelfth century. Caroline Walker Bynum has said in characterizing the twelfth century: "No period was ever busier creating structures for its piety than the twelfth century."³⁷ Earlier twentieth century historians had classified these movements as either heretical or orthodox. In a series of papers produced over the years from 1935 to 1961 Herbert Grundman disputed this form of synthesis.³⁸ In contrast to earlier historians, he comprehended those elements in the many movements which were common to all—a desire to imitate the poverty of the early Christians and the desire to preach. He contended that it was the genius of Innocent III to overrule the previous repressive policy of the Church and make use of the basically sound groups as weapons against obvious (to the Church) heretics such as the Cathars. Later historians such as James Powell have refined Grundman's analysis but they remain firmly embedded in the "Big Man" theory of history in concentrating on the clashes between the mighty figures of the past and grounding the study of Franciscan history in the Church.³⁹

Up until recently there have been two contrasting ideas about what went wrong or what was done right in the early years of the Order. Both of these ideas were embedded in Grundman's approach that evaluated the Order as a child of the Church.⁴⁰ One group contended that the power of the Church bent the basic Franciscan intent and corrupted the

³⁷ Caroline Walker Bynum, "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?," in *Jesus as Mother Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 109.

³⁸ Herbert Grundman *Religiose Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, (Berlin, 1935. Hildersheim 1961). Later collected and translated in Herbert Grundman, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages*, tr. Steven Rowan, Intro by Robert E Lerner, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995).

³⁹ It was Powell's contention that it was Innocent III's successor Honorius III who was the real author of the enlightened approach to popular movements in the Church. James M. Powell, "The Papacy and Early Franciscans," *Franciscan Studies*, 36(1976), 248-262.

⁴⁰ David Flood, "The Grundmann Approach to Early Franciscan History," *Franziskanische Studien*, 59:4(1977), 312.

Franciscan idea. The other side held that, under Francis, the Order began and developed as an institution within the Church and integrated itself naturally into the larger life of the Church as led by Innocent III, Honorius III, and Gregory IX.⁴¹

In 1977 David Flood argued that the study of Franciscan history required a new approach. In particular he rejected the Grundmann methodology that grounds the history of the Franciscans in Church phenomena. Instead he insisted that the roots for Francis's movement lay in Assisi and particularly in its development as a commune. In 1978 Flood went on to argue that the fundamental change that took place in the Franciscan Order from 1220 to 1240 was the result of the increasing number of clerics in the Order. He calls this change the "domestication" of the Franciscan Movement.⁴²

Flood insists that, in 1220, a man by becoming a cleric had learned a role in society. He had acquired understanding and attitudes which allowed him to serve society and conditioned him to do so. He had formal learning and learning does not exist apart from a socio-cultural context. As soon as he used his learning to serve his fellow man he was wedding himself to the social constructs of the time. However Francis had turned away from the world. Francis demanded that a recruit completely disassociate himself from society and put on a new mind. The clerics, when joining the Order, had to leave their learning. Flood says that when they "dragged their learning with them over the line separating world and Order" they weakened the distinction so critical to the Order's

⁴¹ Flood, "Grundmann," 312

⁴² Flood disagrees with both P. Sabatier and K. Esser on the reasons for the changes in the Order. He cannot accept that the Order was corrupted by the power of the Church or that the Order naturally integrated itself into the larger life of the orthodox religious community. First there is no question that the movement was a Church institution. After all, Francis went to Innocent III to get approval in 1210. On the other hand the number of bishops in the Order (47 from 1226 to 1261) speaks to Flood of a more than natural institutional development particularly for an Order that in the beginning had forsworn Papal privileges. David Flood, "The Domestication of the Franciscan Movement," *Franziskanische Studien*, 60:4 (1978), 311-327.

dynamics.⁴³ They joined with the best of intentions. They did not understand however that "they had to shuck a pastoral mind for a deviant one."⁴⁴

This change was already beginning before the death of Francis. In a letter to the Order written in the early 1220's Francis handled several questions raised by the presence of priests in the Order. First he stated that they should not celebrate Mass for profit or gain.⁴⁵ Flood points out that this does not mean that he forbade them to sell Masses or obtain prebends as that would have been impossible at the time. Rather he wanted to prevent any clerical brother from profiting socially by his position as a priest. Francis went on to order that when there were several priests in any chapter only one Mass was to be celebrated. He wanted to prevent clerics from thinking of themselves as clerics to the detriment of the brotherhood. Francis composed a series of admonitions to correct and define the Franciscan mind. In admonition XIX he addressed the problem of social prestige. A man is what he is before God and no more. "Woe to the religious who is placed in a high position and does not want to come down by his own will."⁴⁶ Francis discussed learning in Admonition VII. He saw learning that was used to obtain wealth and esteem as a danger to the Order and to the soul of the man involved. Rather Francis extolled learning used to worship God from whom all blessings flow.⁴⁷ Flood says that if learning was not becoming a problem in the Order Francis would not have mentioned it.⁴⁸

⁴³ Flood, "Domestication,"

⁴⁴ Flood, "Domestication," 321.

⁴⁵ Francis of Assisi, "A Letter to the Entire Order (122-26)," in *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume 1 The Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong, O.F.M. Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellman, O.F. M. Conv. and William J. Short, O.F.M. (New York: New City Press, 1999), 117-118.

⁴⁶ Francis of Assisi, "The Admonitions" in *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume 1 The Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong O.F.M. Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellman O.F. M. Conv., and William J. Short, O.F.M. (New York: New City Press, 1999), 135.

⁴⁷ Francis of Assisi, "Admonitions," 132.

⁴⁸ Flood, "Domestication," 322.

According to Flood the net result of the capture of the Franciscan Order by the clerical ethos was a change in the Franciscan definition of poverty and of the Friars' tasks. The old definition of poverty was "a brief of disassociation from a social world riddled by error and evil." The new definition saw poverty as "an ascetical authentication of the Friars' pastoral services."⁴⁹ In a similar way, the old definition of the Friars' vocation saw it as "sharing regeneration with others." Now the Order saw the Friars' tasks as "subordinate to the Church's pastoral mission."⁵⁰ This domestication or clericalization of the Order led to many changes in the Order, both external and internal, which will be discussed in chapter 6.

Clericalization of the Franciscans

Laurentino Landini addressed the same question of clericalization and came to the conclusion that no other path for the Order was possible if it was to survive.⁵¹ During the eleventh and twelfth century the Church had undergone a significant reformation in which it had attempted to improve the quality of the clergy and abolish simony. This attempt at reformation resulted in an increased resentment by some segments of the Church with lay involvement in the appointment of bishops. This resentment grew at the same time that the Church was to beginning to understand that it was increasingly responsible for the souls of humanity and was beginning to rethink its concept of the structure of society. Rather than the tripartite society of men of prayer, men of work and men of war the Church increasingly saw two kinds of Christians: laity and clergy.⁵² How

⁴⁹ Flood, "Domestication," 325.

⁵⁰ Flood, "Domestication," 325.

⁵¹ Laurentino Landini O.F.M., *The Cause of the Clericalization of the Order of Friars Minor 1209-1260 In Light of Early Franciscan Sources*, (Chicago: Dissertatio ad Lauream in Facultate Historiae Ecclesiasticae Pontificae Universitatis Gregoriana, 1969).

⁵² Edward Peters, *Europe in the Middle Ages*, (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1997), 220.

then, asked Landini, could an Order be maintained in the Church with equality of status granted to both lay and clerical brothers when Church councils had forbidden the laity to exercise jurisdiction over clerics? The answer of course was that equality of status could not be maintained and the importance of lay brothers in the Order decreased.⁵³

In the twelfth century the Church faced another problem as a new form of heresy became visible in Europe. The new heretics in the beginning had many names and many leaders but had one thing in common. In contrast to eleventh century heretics who existed secretly and expanded through quiet missionary work, the new heretics were spread by open and aggressive preaching. They demanded that the Church hear them and accept the radical reforms demanded.⁵⁴ Lay participation in these radical groups was common and some of the laity went so far as to usurp clerical functions.⁵⁵ According to Landini the Church's fear of a movement which it did not understand, of lay involvement in it and the necessity to preach against it led to the eventual exclusion of lay brothers.⁵⁶ This change was beginning early in the Franciscan Order's history. As early as 1229, Brother Haymo the Regional General of England forbade lay Friars to become superiors in convents.⁵⁷

Finally Landini raises the practical problem of the economic support for the Order. Without some form of clericalization there were only two means of support available to the Order – work outside the convent and begging. However, in an attempt to stabilize the Order, the Church increasingly forbade the Order to work outside the convent. As hostility to the Mendicants from the secular clergy grew, the Church was

⁵³ Landini, *Cause*, 45.

⁵⁴ Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002), 43-44.

⁵⁵ Lambert, *Medieval*, 45.

⁵⁶ Landini, *Cause*, 69-70, 110.

⁵⁷ Landini, *Cause*, 88.

forced to emphasize their utility to the Church in order to protect them. An Order that spent its time begging could hardly be very useful and so other forms of obtaining economic support had to be arranged. Since begging was the one occupation in which both lay and clerical brothers were equally qualified, the importance of lay brothers diminished rapidly once begging was no longer considered an important part of the Franciscan's calling.⁵⁸

Landini concludes that "the choice which confronted the Friars Minor was either to clericalize their Order or perish as a distinct way of life in the Church."⁵⁹ The Church either willingly or by accident cleared the way by increasingly granting concessions to the Order. Finally he says "at the core of both the external and internal forces responsible for the Minor's clericalization was the example and the law of the clericalized Church of the thirteenth century which did not possess a developed theology with respect to the place and role of the layman in the Church."⁶⁰

This thesis will show that the clericalization of the Order, already well under way in the early years of Salimbene's *Chronicle*, had become a dominant characteristic of the Order in the final years of his *Chronicle* and even so worldly a Friar as Salimbene had some doubts about the road the Order was taking.

THE CONTEXT OF THE TEXT

Even as Europe was experimenting with new religious groups so Northern Italy was experimenting with a new form of civic government. Self-governing communes developed in the cities after the middle of the first century of the new millennium and lasted through the thirteenth century. As a result the name "Communal Italy" has been

⁵⁸ Landini, *Cause*, 104-106.

⁵⁹ Landini, *Cause*, 143.

⁶⁰ Landini, *Cause*, 143.

given by historians to twelfth- and thirteenth-century Northern Italy.⁶¹ Salimbene's work, since it extends over some of the formative years of the development of the Italian communes, is a valuable resource in the examination of the relationship between the communes and the Franciscans.

The Communes of Northern Italy

Communes were able to develop because of loss of central government authority and the development of provincialism. The German Salian emperors who had been the nominal rulers of the *regnum italicum* since 1024 were not present frequently enough during the later years of the eleventh century to enforce their authority resulting in a series of city revolts. These disturbances, combined with the increasing conflict between the Emperor and the papacy over ecclesiastical investitures, meant that the emperors were infrequent visitors to Italy.⁶² The daily administration in the eleventh century, therefore, was left in the hands of local representatives of the Emperor, the majority of whom were bishops. Bishops had intermittently attained this place in society over the previous two centuries whenever the central power was too weak. Bishops were ideal for this office because Northern Italy was easily administered from cities and bishops held a position in city life on account of their social position, and because of their large land holdings. They were also usually literate and good administrators.⁶³ In addition, their "theoretical celibacy" made it less likely that they would promote family interests.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Edward Coleman, "Cities and Communes," in *Italy in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. David Abulafia, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 27; J. K. Hyde, *Society and Politics in Medieval Italy The Evolution of the Civil Life 1000-1350*, (London: MacMillan, 1973), 38.

⁶² Coleman, "Cities," 29.

⁶³ Coleman, "Cities," 29-30.

⁶⁴ Hyde, *Society*, 43. However Coleman points out that the relationship between the bishop and his vassals sometimes bordered on the "familial". Coleman, "Cities," 30.

The bishops, however, could not govern without help or intervention from the citizens and the nobility. Historical custom had given the citizens the right to pass comments on the administration of Church property. In addition, the bishops needed military support from citizens to defend the walls of the cities and knights to form a cavalry necessary to their armies. To accomplish this purpose, at times the bishops were forced to buy military service by enfeoffing suitable men with Church land. This in turn created a body of episcopal knights which could sometimes act as a committee to provide feedback on local issues. In some domains, if the bishop was unusually powerful he could achieve a dominating position and rule with little interference. In other regions the power of the bishop was virtually superseded by the locally powerful families. There was therefore no single system of government in the cities of Northern Italy but a variety of different arrangements, sometimes verging on anarchy.⁶⁵

From 1050 onwards, what Edward Coleman calls this episcopal lordship crumbled and was replaced by the communes. J. K. Hyde feels that their emergence came about as a result of a series of upheavals which disrupted civic government during the last half of the eleventh century. In particular, a series of conflicts between the papacy and the emperors known as the Investiture Conflict combined with ecclesiastical reform and culminating with Pope Urban II's call to crusade in 1095 kept the Northern cities in turmoil. According to Hyde the communes were born out of that general turmoil.⁶⁶

Coleman has a different view of the immediate background to the emergence of the communes and posits two causes for their development. The first cause was the decline and eventual disappearance of a centralized monarchy which undermined the

⁶⁵ Hyde, *Society*, 45.

⁶⁶ Hyde, *Society*, 49.

bishops' position as the Emperor's representative. But second and more important was the call for Church reform, which made the powers wielded by the bishops seem incompatible with religious responsibilities. The void left by the removal of the bishops in civic administration was filled by the first communes.⁶⁷

Both Hyde and Coleman place the origin of the commune in the political and economic structure of the Northern Italian cities. In their discussion of the development of the communes the Church is barely mentioned. Augustine Thompson disagrees. In his *Cities of God* he sees the origin of the commune in the formation of voluntary associations, in particular the "religious association" which grew up in the "penance culture" populated by *conversi*—those individuals, frequently married, who took up a life of moderate asceticism but refrained from joining an enclosed Order. What was important about the meetings in the civic square in front of the cathedral was not the square but the cathedral that soared above it. Thompson does not see the Church as one isolated division in the socio-political structure of the cities. Instead he sees the ecclesiastical and civic institutions as a single communal institution. According to Thompson this became even more important in the last years of the commune when the communal lay governments associated themselves with patron saints and adopted wholesale religious language, rituals and forms. Bishop and commune, clergy and laity may have been in conflict at times but "inhabited the same space and shared the same culture".⁶⁸

By 1150 communes had been established in all the major urban areas in Lombardy and Tuscany. According to Coleman, most developed at the same rate and

⁶⁷ Coleman, "Cities," 30-31.

⁶⁸ Augustine Thompson, *Cities of God*, (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005), 6.

developed similar institutions. All set up assemblies of citizens to discuss matters of common concern. They all elected consuls who acted to maintain internal law and order and took charge of external affairs. With their increasing economic and political strength they tried to exert control on the external lands surrounding the city called the *contado*. Finally all began to develop a body of legal material which later developed into the city statutes. According to Coleman, this similarity cannot be coincidental. Most cities had similar problems and the solutions to their problems would therefore be similar.⁶⁹ However this commonality may be mainly a creation of historians' desire for synthesis. Even a superficial reading of Salimbene leads to a conclusion that the civil government of Italian cities at this time was closer to anarchy than is normally pictured in historical writing.

An indication of the failure of the communes to maintain law and order in the cities was the development of the office of *podestà*. The *podestà* was a single supreme official of the commune that was made responsible for justice, finance, and defence of the commune. The *podestà* were not really rulers but were appointed administrators. They were appointed by the commune and remained in position for only a short time. They were an attempt to minimize the power and disrupting influence of the urban elites as it was hoped that by investing power into the hands of one, supposedly neutral, individual civility could be maintained in the city. To assure neutrality the individual chosen was never a citizen of the city.⁷⁰ By the end of the thirteenth century the number of legally trained *podestà* increased. A significant minority were doctors of law of Bologna or Padua while some were men of mediocre or obscure background. If a man could acquire

⁶⁹ Coleman, "Cities," 35.

⁷⁰ Acting as a *podestà* became a tradition in some families and some individuals made a lifetime career of being *podestà* in one city after another. Coleman, "Cities," 41.

the necessary education the career of judge and *podestà* could provide a unique road for personal advancement.⁷¹

Another development in the cities of Northern Italy that had a great influence on the history of the communes was the evolution of guilds. Before the middle of the twelfth century the evidence for guilds is very scarce. However, by the middle of the twelfth century a range of guilds had developed which combined social and religious functions with the regulation of skilled crafts, commerce and shopkeeping. As they attempted to regulate their members it was inevitable that they would come into conflict with the communes who were acting as a surrogate for the Emperor. As a reaction to this conflict the guilds began to act collectively to protect their interests and in this way formed a new political group which attempted to distribute political power throughout the community. As they did so, they took over the old name of *popolo* and by 1250, according to Hyde, had secured a dominant position in the constitution of the major communes.⁷²

To some historians the emergence of the *popolo* was the crowning achievement of the Italian communes. Thompson refers to the "corporations known as the *popolo* (people) in the golden age of communal democracy."⁷³ Hyde speaks of the "old name of *popolo* with its powerful democratic overtones." He says that the rise of the *popolo* is an index of the vitality of both the rural and urban economy.⁷⁴ Finally he says "the triumph of the *popolo*... marked everywhere a revolution of the first magnitude in the life of the

⁷¹ Hyde, *Society*, 103.

⁷² Hyde, *Society*, 79-80.

⁷³ Thompson, *City*, 6.

⁷⁴ Hyde, *Society*, 80.

Italian cities—the only successful ‘democratic’ revolution in the history of the communes”⁷⁵

Coleman is less sanguine about the worth of the *popolo*. He points out that in many cities the rise of the *popolo*, unlike the movement from episcopal lordship to commune, was accompanied by much violence. The *popolo* sought changes on three fronts. It sought to break the stranglehold of the old families over office holding. It sought a revision in the tax system from a tax based on goods to direct property based taxation. Thirdly it tried to re-establish law and order. The *popolo* attempted to curtail blood feuds and the carrying of weapons, demanded financial pledges for good behaviour and forbade the wearing of badges or livery which demonstrated family or party loyalty.⁷⁶

The *popolo*'s program has been described as anti-magnate and therefore class based, leading some historians to go so far as to brand the *popolo*'s struggles as an early example of class struggle. Hyde says it is difficult to reconcile this with the leading role taken by noblemen as captains of the *popolo*. In addition, many noblemen entered into an alliance with it by marriage to avoid the anti-magnate policies of the *popolo*. This in turn tended to blur class lines. According to Hyde, while the *popolo* was marginally successful in some cities, in most cities it became ensnarled in the struggles of the nobility losing its distinctiveness and contributing to the general anarchy. In this way it contributed to the opportunities for powerful individuals, the *signori*, to seize power and supplant the commune.⁷⁷

Historians' viewpoints of the commune tend to mirror their viewpoint of the *popolo*. Thompson does not continue his study beyond the end of the commune but his

⁷⁵ Hyde, *Society*, 115.

⁷⁶ Hyde, *Society*, 53-54.

⁷⁷ Hyde, *Society*, 54.

reference to a "golden age of communal democracy" states his position clearly. Some historians are even more glowing in their treatment of the communes. Mario Ascheri in an examination of the place of communes in the history of Italy says that the communes were the precursors of the "majoritarian" principle. In order to delimit the activities of various government branches they introduced checks and balances. They pioneered measures to depoliticize judges and the administration of justice, to moderate the excesses of their officials and "they involved the enfranchised citizenry to a degree never previously conceived and in all likelihood never since."⁷⁸ In some cases an understanding of a historian's view of the commune can be gained by examining his viewpoint of the oligarchies which followed them (*signori*). Hyde refers to the establishment of "despotic" control over Verona, Vicenza and Padua by Ezzelino da Romano after he had supplanted the commune.⁷⁹ Hyde insists that the establishment of control over the Northern Italian cities by the *signori* resulted in an obvious decline in public spirit. *signori* treated their city states as if they were private property "eroding the distinction between public and private law in a manner scarcely equalled in the Dark Ages."⁸⁰ Coleman on the other hand is less negative toward the development of the *signori*. Some writers contemporary with the supplanting of the commune condemned the new *signori* as having "fullest dominion [over Ferrara] . . . so that he may do anything, just or unjust, by the power of his will."⁸¹ Others, such as Bonvesin della Riva, were positively enthusiastic about the

⁷⁸ Mario Ascheri, "The Italian City-state and its Inheritance," in *The Medieval World*, ed. Peter Linehan and Janet L. Nelson. (London and New York:Routledge, 2001), 464.

⁷⁹ Hyde, *Society*, 122.

⁸⁰ Hyde, *Society*, 178.

⁸¹ Ricobaldo de Ferrar, *Chronica parva Ferrarienses*, RIS VIII(1726) coll. 487-8. quoted in Coleman, "Cities," 56.

new governmental structure.⁸² Few voices were raised in favour of the commune. Even Dante, who had been a full citizen of Florence, did not come to the defence of the commune's ideals of shared and temporary authority. As Hyde says he showed no real appreciation of the political regime under which he had lived. As a wandering exile, he would appreciate the protection of a *signori* who had more patronage to endow than could the private citizens of a republic.⁸³ "Strong men who could deliver strong rule in a crisis had their appeal."⁸⁴

It must be noted that not all cities followed the same timetable in their governmental development. While historians have a desire to synthesise developments into overarching structures historical events are usually not that cooperative. For example, in Florence, in the last decades of the thirteenth century there were three competing principal magistracies which met in three fortress-like towers in the centre of the city. Not only did the *popolo* and *podestà* coexist but the citizens of Florence had seen fit to create yet another level of government—the priors.⁸⁵

Similarly, the complexity of the governmental structure in the Northern Italian cities is evident in Salimbene's work. Far from losing all their secular power, bishops had maintained extensive power and were not afraid to use it.⁸⁶ Ezzelino da Romano had overthrown the communes in Verona, Vicenza and Padua (at least partly with the blessing of the Emperor) and he was in the process of establishing a hereditary *signori*

⁸² Bonvesin della Riva, *De magnalibus Mediolani/Le Meraviglie di Milano*, ed. M. Corti (Milan 1974). Quoted in Hyde, 56.

⁸³ Hyde, *Society*, 150.

⁸⁴ Hyde, *Society*, 56.

⁸⁵ George W. Dameron, *Florence and Its Church in the Age of Dante*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 14. While the priors were unique to Florence their presence indicates the difficulty in synthesizing one common timetable for all cities.

⁸⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 400-401.

even as *podestàs* acted as senior civil servants for the communes in other cities.⁸⁷

Salimbene provided us with examples of the tyrants being overthrown by an army led by a Papal legate,⁸⁸ Parma being conquered by the Emperor's party⁸⁹ and later the same city being conquered by a party favouring the Church.⁹⁰ In later years, he provided an example of the Captain of the People (the elected representative of the *popolo*) gaining significant power in some cities.⁹¹ Through it all, the Franciscans were able to find a place for themselves by providing services of one kind or another to all parties. As a result their influence within the power structure of Northern Italy continued to increase through the thirteenth century.

USING THE TEXT

Various Historians and Their Use of Salimbene

Many historians have found difficulty in making use of Salimbene's *Chronicle*. Those historians who have used Salimbene as a historical source appear to be divided into three groups. The first finds Salimbene objectionable for doctrinal reasons. For some, his obvious Catholicism is a reason for rejection. Others in the first group react to the complexities of his life and his seemingly rich life-style with a subtle sentiment of distaste and a desire to reject the worth of the whole work. While they may willingly mine the work for nuggets to support their theses there is an underlying feeling of guilt that they were forced to use such an unworthy work. A second group use his work unquestioningly and accept what he says at face value, while a third group use it carefully but with greater appreciation for its place as a thirteenth century text.

⁸⁷ Hyde, *Society*, 122.

⁸⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 157.

⁸⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 29

⁹⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 373.

⁹¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 515.

Ephraim Emerton, a man with strong Protestant principles, produced one of the first commentaries on the *Chronicle* after its first appearance in an acceptable edited form by in 1915.⁹² Emerton's Protestantism shines through in his analysis of Salimbene even as he expresses wonder at the revelations of the *Chronicle*. He dismisses monastic reform as a "fruitless protest against worldly activities."⁹³ He ends by stating that Salimbene was a "stammering apology" for the papacy.⁹⁴ In spite of his strong Protestant principles, he finds much of interest in Salimbene's chronicle and was the first to appreciate the engaging brother's ability to bring to life individuals (both high and low) with small but revealing anecdotes.

Far from being dismissive of Salimbene for his Catholicism, Rosalind B. Brooke, in her history of early Franciscan government, is dismissive of much in his *Chronicle* because he did not lead a life of a true Franciscan.⁹⁵ One suspects that what she is saying is that Salimbene was not Francis. She is particularly hard on Salimbene in her analysis of the section of the *Chronicle* that has come to be known as the "*Liber de Prelato*" in which Salimbene condemns Elias, the second Minister General of the Franciscans, and explains why it was necessary for him to be dismissed as Minister General. She accused Salimbene of ingratitude because Elias protected him from his father and therefore facilitated his entry into the Friars. As she says, "he could scarcely have been treated more kindly."⁹⁶ This is an unusual attitude for an historian to take since she could not

⁹² Ephraim Emerton, "Fra Salimbene and the Franciscan Ideal," *Harvard Theological Review*, 13(1915) 480-503.

⁹³ Emerton, "Fra," 483.

⁹⁴ Emerton, "Fra," 503.

⁹⁵ Rosalind B. Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government: Elias to Bonaventure*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), 55.

⁹⁶ Brooke, *Early*, 54.

expect Salimbene to ignore the errors of Elias in gratitude for one favour.⁹⁷ If Salimbene is to be believed, Elias committed many such misdeeds. Indeed Brooke admits that much of what Salimbene has to say is corroborated by other sources. To her, the danger in accepting Salimbene's testimony lays less in "actual invention" than in the "bias of the whole presentation."⁹⁸ Here she is on firmer ground. In fact, it was not beyond Salimbene to incorporate information of sometimes doubtful accuracy in his arguments. When he felt strongly about something he looked far and wide for support for his view. However, he avoided a complete disregard for the truth. For example, rather than condemning Elias for dabbling in alchemy he only mentioned that it was a possibility.⁹⁹ While Brooke admits that Salimbene's facts "when divested of his interpretation and biased presentation have generally *some* truth," his opinion of how the Order should progress "was not worthy of serious attention."¹⁰⁰

M. D. Lambert, in his examination of Franciscan poverty, is another historian who makes frequent, albeit reluctant, use of Salimbene. Strangely, it is not until after using Salimbene as a reference many times that, in a footnote, he almost apologises for using Salimbene as a source because of his supposed inaccuracy.¹⁰¹ In his footnote he points out there was an error in Salimbene's *Chronicle* when he described the vicar of Creccenzio da Jesi at the Council of Lyons as John of Parma. He points out that the latest research shows that Bonaventure of Iseo was Creccenzio's vicar. What makes the footnote and its location even stranger is that Salimbene's error (and indeed the footnote) has nothing to do with the point in question in the body of the work. In spite of this

⁹⁷ Brooke, *Early*, 47.

⁹⁸ Brooke, *Early*, 51.

⁹⁹ Brooke, *Early*, 235.

¹⁰⁰ Brooke, *Early*, 55.

¹⁰¹ M. D. Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), 105 and note 4.

prejudice, Lambert is forced to use Salimbene as a reference for the period of Franciscan history until Bonaventure becomes Minister General because there are simply no other sources available.

Duane Lapansky provides a final example of an historian who rejects Salimbene for doctrinal reasons. In his examination of the concept of "Evangelical Perfection" and its development in the first decades of the life of the Franciscan Order Salimbene is dismissed as a "refined aristocrat and a courtly 'gentleman.'"¹⁰² He is taken as an example of all that went *wrong* in the later years of the Franciscan movement. Lapansky sees Salimbene's attachment to the wealthy and his criticism of "rustics" as corrupting his whole opus. He says that "in Salimbene the Order of Friars Minor has cut itself off from its historical roots."¹⁰³ Nowhere does Lapansky attempt to see beyond his own superficial rejection of Salimbene's dreadful lifestyle and examine the society that Salimbene inhabited.

In contrast, John Moorman, in his history of the Franciscans, uses Salimbene with no reluctance whatever.¹⁰⁴ This is somewhat surprising because, as Rob Foot points out, throughout his history he seems to be proud of the advances of the Franciscans even as he sometimes regrets the alterations in the structure of the Order that change and progress required.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, as does Emerton, Mooreman revels in the anecdotes in Salimbene's work. They provide a vivid account of life in the thirteenth century and the individuals

¹⁰² Duane V. Lapansky, *Evangelical Perfection*, (New York: The Franciscan Institute, 1977), 284.

¹⁰³ Lapansky, *Evangelical*, 285.

¹⁰⁴ John Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order from its origins to the Year 1517*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

¹⁰⁵ Rob Foot did research on the early years of the Franciscan Order and came to the conclusion that even the so-called Spiritual Franciscans had lost track of Francis's aims. They became fixated on minor aspects of the Rule (such as the length of the habit) and forgot the reason for the existence of the Order—the service of the poor. Rob Foot, "The Poverty of Francis of Assisi: Historical Actions and Mythologized Meanings," in *No Gods Except Me: Orthodoxy and Religious Practice in Europe 1200-1600*, ed. Charles Zika (Melbourne: University of Melbourne, 1991), note 17.

that provided such variety¹⁰⁶ With few exceptions he accepts Salimbene's statements with little argument even when perhaps he should have expressed some scepticism. For example he, without demur, accepted Salimbene's description and condemnation of Elias' actions when perhaps they might have borne some close scrutiny.¹⁰⁷ On the other hand, Salimbene's love for John of Parma could also have been examined a little more closely as¹⁰⁸ here are indications that John was not the rigorist that previous historians had painted.¹⁰⁹

David Burr has also made almost unquestioning use of Salimbene in his examination of the Spiritual Franciscans. His examination of the Franciscans before 1274, in particular, depends greatly on Salimbene. Of particular importance to his thesis is the contention that before 1274 the "Spirituals" had not become important in the Order in contrast to the contention of Angelo Clareno (a later "Spiritual" writer) who insisted that John of Parma was forced to resign because of his insistence on the strict following of the Rule. Burr depends almost entirely on the writings of Salimbene to counter this contention. He admits that some might question the use of Salimbene since he has "never been accused of showing any great interest in emulating the rigors of primitive Franciscanism." Burr continues that when historians look for "ardent reformers" in the thirteenth century they "do not linger long over Salimbene."¹¹⁰ However, he insists that Salimbene was aware of most events that took place in Italy at the time, and it is unlikely that he would have missed something as important as a developing schism in the Order.

¹⁰⁶ Moorman, *History*, 293-294.

¹⁰⁷ Moorman, *History*, 101-104.

¹⁰⁸ Moorman, *History*, 112-114.

¹⁰⁹ John originated the idea of writing Letters of Authority to individuals who had been especially supportive of the Order. Salimbene make a point of saying that John thoroughly investigated each individual before writing the letter. He seems to be anticipating questions about the morality of the letters. Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 298.

¹¹⁰ Burr, *Spiritual*, 32.

Salimbene probably died before the split in the Order became obvious. He contended and Burr agrees that John of Parma's departure from the position of Minister General was due to his strong belief in Joachism.

One of the most imaginative uses of Salimbene's opus is found in Robert Brentano's landmark comparison of the English and Italian Churches.¹¹¹ Until his work was published, historians had examined the two Churches individually. His comparative study was able to illuminate clearly the differences between the two Churches in a way that no pair of individual studies could do. Brentano is a historian of the third type who uses Salimbene fully but carefully. In his chapter on the written Church, he compares Matthew Paris and Salimbene as historians and as representatives of their comparative Churches, pointing out that Salimbene and Paris were both thirteenth century historians were more interested in "man as an intricately political and social animal" than were twelfth century historians.¹¹² They were more interested in details of observation than "musing slowly on the vanity of earthly values."¹¹³ Both Paris and Salimbene were prejudiced, gossipy and interested in scandal and action but one of the main differences between the two men mirrored the differences between the two Orders to which they belonged. Paris, a Benedictine, was confined to his convent and had to have information brought to him while Salimbene, a Franciscan, was able to move freely about society and chase after his tidbits of information. Paris was more an introvert than Salimbene. We are told virtually nothing of Paris' family while Salimbene devoted pages to a description of his family. Paris was uncomfortable with change. When Robert Grosseteste was made

¹¹¹ Robert Brentano, *Two Churches England and Italy in the Thirteenth Century*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988)

¹¹² Brentano, *Two*, 327.

¹¹³ Brentano, *Two*, 328.

bishop and threatened to upset the relationship between the secular Church and the monasteries Matthew Paris was unhappy.¹¹⁴ He did not understand the new type of bishop that Grosseteste represented. "Heavy with his possessions he fears movement and change."¹¹⁵ Salimbene on the other hand "is in a Franciscan way possession-less; his security is in freedom and movement."¹¹⁶ The difference between the two men was both personal and reflected the difference between the two societies. One was agrarian in which wealth was slowly gained and just as slowly lost. The other was more commercial where great fortunes and one's position in society could be won and lost quickly.

Brentano made no value judgements in using the writings of Paris and Salimbene as a window into their respective societies. As Baird says in his introduction to his translation of Salimbene, to observe Salimbene with respect to the standards of a "true Friar Minor" gives the wrong impression. What is important is that a Friar of the thirteenth century sat down and "with rather startling openness and candour recorded his thoughts for us."¹¹⁷

Augustine Thompson employed Salimbene as an important source in his work *Cities of God* in two ways. In the first, he uses a brief reference to Salimbene to firm up an argument made with a series of references. More importantly, in the second, the reference to Salimbene frequently anchors an argument which is merely supplemented by other references.

¹¹⁴ Robert Grosseteste was the Bishop of Lincoln from 1235 to 1252. In the past Bishops had been chosen from the members of religious orders. Grosseteste, in contrast, had been a scholar, the first Chancellor at Oxford, and the first teacher for the Franciscans at Oxford.

¹¹⁵ Brentano, *Two*, 342.

¹¹⁶ Brentano, *Two*, 342.

¹¹⁷ Baird, "Introduction," xv.

In common with other gifted historians, Thompson is able to extract useful information from sources that is not related to the subject being discussed in the source. When Salimbene is describing the evil deeds of certain secular priests Thompson notes that the priest took the woman behind the altar for confession.¹¹⁸ This supported his contention that confession took place in public surroundings rather than in a dark box. One of Salimbene's more fascinating stories concerns a man who went insane and began to stockpile food to excess. The grain of information that Thompson gained from the story had nothing to do with the obvious theme of insanity but rather that the man taught children to read Latin and gave chant lessons to laypeople. Because Salimbene saw nothing amiss with this it was clear that there was enough demand for literacy from the populace to support the man as a teacher and this, in turn, supported Thompson's contention that literacy was common amongst the populace of the commune.¹¹⁹

While Thompson appears to accept Salimbene's views without question he occasionally provides a clue that he is conversant with some of the eccentricities of Salimbene's character. In discussing Salimbene's comments that the populace preferred the Franciscans' manner of celebrating mass, Thompson notes that this may have reflected Salimbene's ego rather than reality.¹²⁰ When Salimbene reported that the bells of morning mass at Sant'Onorato near the Franciscan convent annoyed the Friars Thompson opined that "perhaps the noise bothered the Friars less than the order in which the bells rang."¹²¹

¹¹⁸ Thompson, *Cities*, 286.

¹¹⁹ Thompson, *Cities*, 241.

¹²⁰ Thompson, *Cities*, 259.

¹²¹ Thompson, *Cities*, 176.

While Thompson made good use of Salimbene, some topics covered in the book would have been illuminated further by a reference to Salimbene. Thompson mentions the importance of the lay religious movements like the flagellants.¹²² Surprisingly Salimbene is not used as a reference here even though Salimbene himself led a procession of flagellants through Parma and Reggio.¹²³ Even more surprising is that there is no mention in Thompson's work of the great Halleluiah movement of 1233 considering that Thompson wrote one of the standard reference works on it and considering that it was certainly an example of the merging of civic pride and piety.

Another problem remains with Thompson's use of Salimbene. Thompson's work is comprehensive, both geographically and temporally, covering many cities and one hundred and fifty years and Salimbene is used as a source throughout. In using one reference in this way the author has made an inherent assumption that there was little variation through time and from city to city. Salimbene's work itself would argue against this assumption.

Problems in Using Salimbene

This is not to say that the use of Salimbene's *Chronicle* is not without difficulty. While Salimbene insists that "elegance of style was far less important to me than the truth of history"¹²⁴ as Nancy Partner points out, "truth" to the medieval chronicler meant different things than it does to a modern historian. Twelfth-century historians were not beyond adding routine fictions to their works to make them more authentic to their readers. "Anecdotes with exemplum-like moral weight, direct speech, interior states, all such fictionally dramatized information is cloaked by the conventional assurance that the

¹²² Thompson, *Cities*, 89, 107, 92, 93, 294-295.

¹²³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 474.

¹²⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 177.

historian had heard it from a man, who heard it from a man, who really knew what he was talking about."¹²⁵ In contrast the modern historian is limited to the "true but inadequate facts justified by evidence."¹²⁶ In addition as James Franklin said one has to allow for the "higher medieval a priori likelihood of a miracle" which he excuses as more a matter of philosophy than a matter of rationality because it is dependant on the belief in the absolute power of God.¹²⁷ This does not mean medieval historians were beyond telling the likely from the unlikely. Jacobus de Voragine, even as he relates uncritically the death of eleven thousand virgins in his *Golden Legend*, remarks that the claimed date of A.D. 238 could not be correct as Sicily and Constantinople were not kingdoms and his source said that the queens perished with the virgins.¹²⁸ In a similar judgement William of Newbrough criticized Geoffrey of Monmouth's "history" of Arthur because it stated that there were three archbishops present at Arthur's coronation which could not be possible as there were no archbishops in Britain at that time.¹²⁹ In addition, William noted that Geoffrey's confidence in Merlin's prophecies on the grounds of his father being an incubus is misplaced, because it is well known that demons cannot see the future but can only conjecture it.

Salimbene certainly followed in the twelfth century tradition. Because he uses the expression "as I saw with my own eyes" or "as I was told by" we sometimes forget that he was not beyond inventing events if they improved the realism of the story. When he was twelve years old an event later known as "The Great Halleluia" took place in

¹²⁵ Nancy Partner, "Medieval Histories and Modern Realism: Yet another Origin of the Novel," *Modern Language Notes* 114:4 (1999), 858.

¹²⁶ Partner, "Medieval," 860-861.

¹²⁷ James Franklin, *The Science of Conjecture*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 2002), 181.

¹²⁸ G. Ryan and H. Ripperberger trans, *The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine*, (New York, 1941), 630. quoted in Franklin, 182.

¹²⁹ William of Newburgh, *History of English Affairs* 1 ch. 27, ed. and trans. P Walsh and M Kennedy, (Warminster, 1988), 115. quoted in Franklin, 183.

Northern Italy. He describes the great preachers conspiring together in order to make their preaching and crowd motivation even more successful.¹³⁰ It is unlikely that he was privy to their discussions (if they took place) and, indeed it would be a precocious twelve year old that would have understood what they were doing. It seems likely that the event was invented or that he was told about it later when, as a young Franciscan, he was made a companion of one of the preachers, Brother Gerard of Modena.

Salimbene was also something of a mystic and had numerous visions of one kind or another. The evening after he had defied his father, the Holy Mother and the infant Jesus appeared to him. As a means of consoling him for what he had lost, she put the child in his arms and he was greatly comforted.¹³¹ A few days later when doubts again assailed him, he had a vision of the Holy Family begging for food as if they were Franciscans. In this case he had a long discussion on theology with Christ.¹³² A year later while living in Pisa he had a vision of a beautiful garden filled with young boys and girls carrying harps and with strange beasts from beyond the seas.¹³³ These visions are sometimes difficult to separate from more "regular" events noted in the *Chronicle*. In a similar way, miraculous events were a part of everyday life to Salimbene whether it was the appearance of the Archbishop of Bismontova to Innocent III¹³⁴ or devils carrying off a certain "fickle and lightheaded lay brother."¹³⁵

Another problem in using Salimbene is that he began to write in 1283 and finished the section of the *Chronicle* that we have available to us in 1287. In other words,

¹³⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 47-48, 54.

¹³¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 15.

¹³² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 20-28.

¹³³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 18.

¹³⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 6-7.

¹³⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 18.

he is writing about events that happened well in the past. Most chroniclers tended to write their works much nearer in time to the events in question. Because he wrote his history so late in life and so many years after many of the events had taken place his attitude toward, and impression of events are more likely to be the reflections and reminiscences of a man of sixty rather than the observations of a man who was present to observe the events described. In a similar manner, the society and its mores that he mirrors in his writing are possibly more reflective of Italian society of the 1280's than the society in which the events took place. His *Chronicle*, therefore, may be more of a snapshot than a moving picture. This would make it less useful as a tool to follow changes in attitude and societal mores. However, there is at least a hint that Salimbene was writing from notes. When he discussed the Order's attitude toward the burying of non-Franciscans in Franciscan graveyards, his attitude changed from one of disapproval to approval.¹³⁶ Given the page separation in the *Chronicle*, the two passages were written two years apart. It seems unlikely that his attitude would have changed so rapidly especially so late in life. It seems likely that his writing, at least in this case, reflected his opinions as the events were taking place.

One last problem remains in using Salimbene. During his lifetime confraternities were becoming one of the most popular forms of lay spirituality. Salimbene was strangely silent about them. He mentioned only three orders that resemble confraternities but only knights were eligible to enter these orders. He also noted the formation of one order, the Order of Motorano, by Bernard Vizio but gave no particulars about it.¹³⁷ Even as he wrote about the flagellant movement he refrained from mentioning the

¹³⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 108-109, 429.

¹³⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 619.

confraternities associated with it.¹³⁸ Given his feelings toward lay brothers, it is possible that he dismissed lay confraternities as of no importance and decided that it was not worth the effort to write about them. However, that did not stop him from writing about other events or people that he would later describe as unimportant.

¹³⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 474-476.

CHAPTER TWO SALIMBENE THE MAN

Introduction: Salimbene and Family Relations

As noted in chapter 1, in contrast to most chronicles Salimbene's *Chronicle* contains much biographical and autobiographical content. Because of this personal element in his work it is necessary to try to understand the man himself. He was born into a relatively wealthy family which was well acquainted with the wealthy and powerful in Parma. As a result, his family was important to him; it located him in society. Since he grew up surrounded by the rich and powerful it is understandable why he felt so favourably disposed toward those of superior social status. After he gave up his hereditary family for his new spiritual family, the Franciscans, he had doubts about the path taken. The prophetic writings of Joachim of Fiore allowed him to overcome some of these doubts. They led him to the conclusion that his new spiritual family was, in a similar fashion to his old one, a select group. An examination of his attitudes toward his family, toward the rich and famous, and toward Joachim leads to the conclusion that his *Chronicle* provided a justification for his joining the Franciscans and was, in addition, a prescription for the correct way to live one's life.

It was noted in chapter 1 that the first excursion from a strictly chronological organisation in Salimbene's *Chronicle* comes when he begins to describe his family. In the genealogy that Salimbene provides, the first relative introduced is his father's cousin Lord Bernard Oliver de Adam of Parma, a "famous judge of great prowess of arms," who was killed in the Battle of San Cesario in 1229.¹ This description set a pattern for his

¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 11.

description for all his family members. All were either superior in their own right, were connected with worthy individuals, or both.

His ancestors had been established in Parma for many generations and Salimbene was proud of his ancestry. His uncle was a "worthy, courtly, and generous man." His brother was married to the "noble lady Adelasia" who died "laudably in the Convent of the Order of St Clare in Parma."² His grandmother, Ermengard, was a wise woman who lived to be one hundred years old. He had three sisters who were beautiful ladies who married into noble families.³ His brothers-in-law were related to Countess Matilda.⁴ While Salimbene's mother was "a humble lady who was devoted to God" he points out that his half brother's mother was the Lady Ghisla de Marsili who came from an "ancient, noble and powerful family" from Parma, and he points out, with some pride, that he too was related to this noble family on his mother's side.⁵ Even though he had quarreled with his father, he was proud of him. When his father had sailed to the Holy Land on crusade, he had been clever enough to avoid the use of divination. Even objects associated with his family were significant. He notes that the Elm tree that grew in front of their gate was famous.⁶

He said that he provided the family's genealogy for five reasons. First, he did it at the request of his niece, Sister Agnes, a member of the Order of St Clare in the convent at Parma. She asked him to provide an account of the relatives on her father's side, about which she knew nothing, so that she could become as knowledgeable about her father's

² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 12.

³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 30.

⁴ Joseph L. Baird, "Notes" 662, n42. Matilda (1045-1115) The Countess of Tuscany was the powerful ally of the Church in the Investiture Contest with Emperor Henry IV.

⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 30-31.

⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 12.

ancestry as she was about that of her mother. Secondly, it was provided so that Sister Agnes might know for whom she ought to pray. The third reason was that he was following the example of the ancients who kept records of their genealogies so that they could prove that they were worthy of certain hereditary posts. Fourthly, (and perhaps the most important, given his tendency to provide *exempla*) the listing of the genealogy allowed him to say many good and useful things. Finally, the last reason was to demonstrate the truth of the Apostle James who in the fourth chapter of his epistle said: "For what is your life? It is a vapour which appeareth for a little while and afterwards shall vanish away." Salimbene illustrated his point by noting that as he was writing his chronicle most of the people that he saw during his lifetime and who were mentioned in his chronicle were dead.⁷ These reasons provide a clue to Salimbene's reasons for writing the *Chronicle*. If he wrote it for Sister Agnes, alone, there would be no reason to include the large number of *exempla*, which would be of little use to a middle-aged nun. If, on the other hand, the document was intended to be public why was the genealogy included when a simple letter to Agnes would have been sufficient. The genealogy was included because he was proud of his family and was proud of the family's connection to the rich and powerful. In addition, the many *exempla* in the *Chronicle* were not an accident. They were an important part of the work and by providing them, he was providing a manual on the correct way to lead one's life.

Other families were also important to Salimbene. Whenever Salimbene introduced a new person in his *Chronicle* an indication of familial relationships was frequently included. In describing the death of Lord Zangaro de San Vitale of Parma we learn that his kinsman, Lord Guarino, also died in the same battle. In addition, Salimbene

⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 33.

told us that Lord Guarino was married to the sister of Pope Innocent IV and had six sons and one daughter. Next, he provided a cursory description of the children's lives and incidentally pointed out that Salimbene's father's daughter had married Lord Azzone, who was a relative of Lord Guarino.⁸

His father objected to Salimbene's joining the Order and leaving him without an heir. In an attempt to stop Salimbene from joining the Franciscans his father obtained a letter from the Emperor to Brother Elias, the Minister General at the time, enjoining him to return Salimbene to him. Elias gave Salimbene a free choice with respect to his future and in a scene that is reminiscent of Francis's denunciation of the material life, he chose the spiritual family over the biological one.⁹ The actual words that Salimbene claims to have used in his debate with his father are significant. They are almost the same words that Christ used to refute Satan's last temptation in the wilderness. In doing so, he was following the standard medieval biographical format where the main protagonist, in one climactic event, sets his life on a new track by modelling his life on a major Biblical figure. That Salimbene would choose Christ says something about his vanity.

However, in spite of his facade of confidence he had some doubts. A vision of the Virgin the morning after his dispute with his father removed some of his fears and doubts.¹⁰ The doubts, nevertheless, returned a few days later when a man from Parma rebuked Salimbene for assuming a life of begging when he could have been living a life of plenitude. Another vision of the Holy Family, begging as Friars, again provided self-assurance.¹¹ Years later, while writing his *Chronicle*, he noted that a cardinal was from

⁸ Salimbene, Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 37.

⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 13-14.

¹⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 15.

¹¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 19.

Gainaco, a town where "I, myself, Brother Salimbene, once owned much property."¹² In another place in the *Chronicle* he said "this Gainaco was once my village for I once owned much property there."¹³ He wrote these passages some thirty years after he had joined the Order and took an oath of poverty. That he included them indicates that a wistful regret about his renunciation of the material world remained. While he had joined the Franciscans and taken an oath of poverty, he still valued money and power.

Salimbene and the Powerful of Society

Just as Salimbene attempted to attach his family's reputation to the lustre of the well born of the community or the leaders of the church he attempted to do the same with his own reputation as an adult. He began early in the *Chronicle* with a description of his baptism. There are two events noted for the year of 1221. The Blessed Dominic, the founder of the Dominicans died and Salimbene was born on the feast of Saints Dionysius and Doninus. His godfather was Lord Balion of Sidon, "a great baron of France—who had just returned from the Holy Land to join the Emperor Frederick II"¹⁴ For some reason he found it necessary to provide two sources for that information which one would think was common knowledge. From then on, his *Chronicle* is full of statements that a certain famous, important, or good man was "a good friend of mine" or "was my friend."¹⁵ He also noted that Brother Bernard of Quintavalle, the first Friar accepted by Francis, was his "very close friend," that he "lived an entire winter in the convent at Sienna" with Bernard and that Bernard told Salimbene "and the other young men many great things

¹² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 519.

¹³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 529.

¹⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 8.

¹⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 476, 318.

about St Francis and I[Salimbene] heard and learned from him much that was good.”¹⁶

He often makes note that a certain well-born woman was his “spiritual daughter and close friend.”¹⁷ He recounted his visit to the Pope to inform him of the fate of Parma with pride. He noted that the Pope had him brought to his private chambers and “talked to me in a most friendly manner.”¹⁸ He was also proud that the Pope had absolved him from all his sins and ordained him in the office of preaching.¹⁹

Perhaps the most interesting relationship that Salimbene had with the noble and wellborn was with Lord Nazario Ghirardine of Lucca, the *podestà* of Reggio, and his wife Lady Fiordoliva. While Salimbene was living in Reggio they were helpful to the Friars in settling a dispute with an abbess. Salimbene spoke highly of them and as an aside, he noted that she was the second wife of Lord Nazario and he was her second husband. What is even more surprising is that his former wife was still alive. Salimbene does not inform us of the fate of Lady Fiordoliva’s first husband but we are told the Lord Nazario had sent his wife away to one of his many castles for the rest of her life.²⁰

Salimbene does not seem to be upset by such seemingly aberrant behaviour. Noble birth seems to excuse actions that would be reprehensible to those of ignoble birth.²¹

He did not always claim friendship with the powerful and famous. Sometimes a close relationship was enough. He explained that he received his name from the last brother accepted by Francis into the Order. His original name had been either Balian or Sagitta, after, as he reminded us, his godfather, or Ognibene, which was the name used by

¹⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 13.

¹⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 44.

¹⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 29.

¹⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 168.

²⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 44.

²¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 13*Chronicle*, 16.

his family. The brother said that none but God is good but suggested the name, Salimbene, because Salimbene had made a good leap by entering a religious order. Plainly Salimbene was proud that he had been given his name by such an important Franciscan.²² When he was in danger of being captured by his father's strongmen, he was befriended by Lord Martin of Fano.²³ Many years later Salimbene was pleased that that he was able to recommend Lord Martin as an arbitrator to settle a dispute between Reggio and Bologna and that the arbitration was successful.²⁴ Salimbene's attitude toward the rich and famous add to the difficulties in using his work. When he expressed an opinion, it was likely shaped by his feelings toward the well born and must be used with some care.

However it is not always easy to foresee Salimbene's opinions. Salimbene is full of admiration for the Pellavicini family, who were citizens of Parma, even though they fought on the side of the Emperor. He notes that one member of the family was a great friend of the Friars. This not only speaks of the complexity of Salimbene's view of the world but also of the complex political relationships in Italy at the time. However, sometimes it was not enough merely to be noble to gain Salimbene's approval. He distinguishes between those who were noble and those who were good. When describing the powerful families in Romagna and Lombardy he said:

Moreover, there were many other noble and powerful men in Romangna and Lombardy of both parties, whom it would have been worth enumerating if they had been good men who loved God.²⁵

²² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 13.

²³ Lord Martin had a considerable reputation in Law and went on to be *podestà* of Genoa in 1260 and 1262. Baird "Notes," 663, n52.

²⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 16.

²⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 371.

When it came down to the final straw, a love for God (and perhaps gifts to the Friars to prove it) was of the greatest importance.

Salimbene's Attitude toward Lay Brothers in the Order

Salimbene carried this attitude toward the powerful and famous into his relationships inside the Order. He wanted the social structure inside the Order to mirror that in society outside the Order. As a result, he was disdainful toward lay brothers in the Order whom he equated with brothers from the lower social classes. This contempt for lay brothers is evident through his work. He noted that when he was living in Pisa his companion had been a "certain fickle and lightheaded lay brother"²⁶ Years later while living in Fucecchio this fellow "tempted by some unknown desperation or simple foolishness, threw himself down a well."²⁷ While the Brothers heard his cries and rescued him before he drowned, he simply disappeared after a few days. Salimbene hypothesized that the devil had carried him off and almost seemed to think that this was desirable.

Salimbene accepted that there are four reasons for admitting lay brothers to the Order. He said that the first reason was that any form of construction requires rough hewn stones for its foundation and in the early years of the Order lay members provided this foundation.²⁸ Second, Francis had imitated Christ who in the early years of his ministry called for the little ones including the sick and lame to be brought to him, so poor and illiterate brothers should be accepted into the Order. Third, a vision informed Francis that by accepting lay brothers into the Order the Order's number and therefore its grace would increase without bound. Finally, the abbot Joachim had forecast that there would be two orders in the final times. One order would consist of clerks alone while the other one

²⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 18.

²⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 18.

²⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 79.

would consist of clerks and lay people. By accepting lay brothers, the Franciscans were assuring their uniqueness.

In spite of this, Salimbene retained a distaste for the presence of "useless" lay people in the Order. By "useless" he meant that they were unavailable to provide religious service. He provided an example of a convent that contained only one clerk and he, just like the other Brothers, was required to take his turn in doing kitchen duties. When a company of Frenchmen arrived at the door and requested an immediate Mass the convent was unable to provide it because the only priest was busy in the kitchen.²⁹

Not only were lay brothers useless but Salimbene found them too numerous, ignorant, and inclined to disobey the Rule. Salimbene said that Elias made this condition worse by Elias's by failing to pass constitutions instituted to govern the Order and thereby to attain the desirable goals of preserving the Rule, regulating the Order and making it uniform.³⁰ He noted that when he lived in Sienna there were twenty-five lay brothers and in Pisa he lived with thirty lay brothers.³¹ In Tuscany, the number of lay brothers exceeded the number of clerks by four.³² When he was living in Tuscany, he noticed that many of the lay brothers, even some who were tonsured, were illiterate. Even worse, some of these lay brothers lived separate from the convent and spoke to women through their windows. Some even lived alone without the required companion. He repeated his contention that they were useless as confessors or spiritual advisors. He found one old man, Martin the Spaniard, particularly upsetting because he travelled through the town alone while tending the sick in hostelryes. It seemed that to Salimbene

²⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 83.

³⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 71.

³¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 79.

³² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 82.

tending the sick was not a useful task. He was also upset that the lay brothers tended to dress in a non-standard manner. He found that they wore cords with intricate knots in them rather than the simple Franciscan cord. Some also went so far as to cultivate long flowing beards after the manner of Armenians and Greeks.³³

Having lay brothers as companions was bad enough, but having them as a superior was even worse. Salimbene's dislike for Elias was magnified because he had appointed lay brothers to the position of guardians, custodians and ministers; a practice which Salimbene considered "absurd." He notes that he escaped the catastrophe of being supervised by a lay minister but many times through his life he was under the supervision of a lay custodian and more than once was supervised by a lay guardian.³⁴ Lay brothers were even empowered to attend chapter meetings as full delegates. Even when they were not there as delegates, many came to the meetings in great numbers and were useless. He noted that he once attended a chapter meeting at Sienna where there were over three hundred lay brothers in attendance who did "nothing but eat and sleep."³⁵ They even went so far as to condemn anyone who dared to speak in Latin. To Salimbene, who took great pride in his literacy and his knowledge of the Bible, this would be anathema.

This dislike for lay brothers in the Order is intrinsically connected to Salimbene's concept of the correct structure for society. Early in his "Book of the Prelate," a section of the *Chronicle* in which he describes his concept of the good prelate and provides Brother Elias as a counterexample, he makes much of Elias's low birth. Before Elias entered the Order, he had made his living by weaving and by teaching the children of Assisi to read their Psalters. To Salimbene the lines in society were drawn sharply. To

³³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 82.

³⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 81.

³⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 82.

justify his complaint that Elias did not show proper respect to the *podestà* he quoted a poem which he created by combining the works of Petecchio and Ugo di Perso:

Nothing is crueler than a humble man who has risen:
He strikes all because he fears all: he rages violently against all,
So that he may be esteemed powerful; no beast is more savage
Than the rage of a servant lose on free backs.³⁶

In another place he quotes Patecchio in the *Book of Pests*:

A servant risen all too high,
A pauper splendid in his own eye,
A butler on whom I cannot rely,

A peasant on a high horse prancing,
A jealous man with girls a-dancing,
A stubborn man never backward glancing,

A stingy man admired by the masses-
All of these are stupid asses.³⁷

Salimbene's concept of the importance of fixed social structure becomes clear when he discusses the importance of a prelate showing respect to his subordinates. He notes that in "certain religious Order" there were sometimes men who were noble, rich and powerful in secular life and who entered the Order to become contemplatives.³⁸ He notes that these men are endowed with wisdom, elegance, and learning in both letters and common sense and are men of high moral standing. To Salimbene it is inconceivable that a prelate who "is lacking in nobility" should be placed over these types of men.³⁹ However, Salimbene seems to have forgotten that they, themselves, were lay brothers even if they were of the nobility. His attitude toward the social structure in the Order becomes clearer when he quotes Ecclesiastes 10:5-7: "A fool set in dignity and the rich

³⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 43.

³⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 77.

³⁸ It may be assumed that he is thinking of the Friars.

³⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 103.

sitting beneath. I have seen servants upon horses: and princes walking on the ground as servants."⁴⁰ In his view, an order with both lay brothers and clerks is similar to a farmer who is ploughing "with an ox and an ass together."⁴¹ Plainly, he wanted the social structure of society maintained inside the Order. In a quotation from Numbers 18:1-4 he noted that it is clear that the Friars are to have two classes of members. The lower class was to act as servants to the clerks.⁴² It is inconceivable that the position of a servant should be filled by Brothers that had come from a higher social class. To Salimbene lay brothers and brothers from lower social strata had become indistinguishable from one another. In chapter six we shall see that this attitude was widespread throughout the Order by the later years of the *Chronicle*.

Lay brothers were not ignorant of the struggle for power in the Order. In one Chapter held in Pisa, a motion was introduced that a lay brother was to be admitted to the Order whenever a clerk was. To Salimbene's relief, this motion was defeated. He noted that during his lifetime the importance of lay members was reduced because, according to him, their entrance to the Order was "almost totally prohibited since they scarcely recognized in any case the singular honour bestowed upon them."⁴³ While this is an exaggeration, the Constitutions of Narbonne of 1260 severely limited the entrance of lay brothers into the Order. After 1260, the Order would admit only those lay brothers who could make a real contribution.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 141.

⁴¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 82.

⁴² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 287.

⁴³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 83.

⁴⁴ Moorman, *History*, 150.

Salimbene and Joachim of Fiore

Just as Salimbene was ambivalent about his relationships with lay brothers in the Order, Salimbene reveals a similar uncertainty toward the Calabrian prophetic writer Joachim of Fiore. While he later denied being a true follower of Joachim, his work is full of references to Joachim and the importance of his writings. Some Franciscans saw Joachim prophesying that the Franciscans would be the religious order that would initiate a new spirituality to the world. This was important to Salimbene. He had discovered the writings of Joachim early in his life with the Franciscans when he still had doubts about his choice of a new family. The writings of Joachim reinforced the correctness of his life choice because, in them, the Franciscans had a position in the world that was akin to that of the courtly ruling families.

Joachim of Fiore

Joachim, encouraged by the three popes Lucius III, Urban III and Clement III, spent his lifetime pondering the patterns of history discernable through meditation on the Scriptures. In spite of a major conflict with Peter Lombard over the doctrine of the Trinity, Joachim's ideas on history and the future attained great eminence in the early years of the thirteenth century.⁴⁵ The groundwork of all Joachim's doctrine was the study of Scriptures. His understanding of Scripture seems to have moved ahead in a series of sudden illuminations of intelligence separated by long periods of doubt, which acted as intellectual barriers to his understanding. To Joachim, this experience of sudden gifts of enlightenment was not a gift granted to him alone but a foretaste of the spiritual

⁴⁵ Marjorie Reeves, *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future*, (London: SPCK, 1976), 26. Both Joachim and Peter Lombard produced tracts in support of their doctrinal analysis. At the fourth Lateran council in 1215, Joachim's doctrine was condemned as heretical and his tract was burned. Because he had submitted his work to the Papacy, his personal reputation was preserved, but his followers felt that he had been unjustly treated.

intelligence vouchsafed to all men before the end of history.⁴⁶ This deep personal experience revealed to him the importance of the Trinity as the key to understanding Scripture. He quickly moved on to realize that the Trinity was also the key to understanding the destiny of all men.⁴⁷ Therefore, Joachim saw history as active in three successive stages – the age or *status* of the Father, the Age of the Son, and the Age of the Holy Spirit. However, his conception of history was more subtle than the assumption that one *status* would follow one another in a straight progressive sequence. In some way, he saw a subtle interweaving of the three persons throughout time. None the less, he did see in the work of the third person the culmination of history in the third *status*.⁴⁸

Yet even as he contemplated a third *status* he insisted that the two Testaments would never be abrogated. His work was full of diagrams attempting to display how he had integrated the numbers two and three into his view of history. History was completed in two parts, but hovering over these two parts was a third development, a new quality of life rather than a new institution. Joachim never used the word *etas* or *tempus* when he was thinking in terms of threes; he always used the word *status*. Thus, the translation “ages” is incorrect. He saw the Latin Church surviving until the Second Advent but its quality of life would be transformed from that of an *ecclesia activa* to that of a *ecclesia contemplativa*.⁴⁹

While reluctant to fix the exact date for the arrival of the third *status* Joachim lived in a state of constant expectancy. He said: “I suspect all times and all places.”⁵⁰ Through his writing he bequeathed to the world a set of metaphors, symbols and

⁴⁶ Reeves, *Joachim*, 4, 5.

⁴⁷ Reeves, *Joachim*, 5.

⁴⁸ Reeves, *Joachim*, 5, 6.

⁴⁹ Reeves, *Joachim*, 6-7.

⁵⁰ Quoted in Lambert, *Medieval*, 214.

scriptural parallels for apocalyptic speculation.⁵¹ In his work *Liber figuram*, tentatively dated 1200 and therefore late in his life, he drew a diagram of history, in which mankind is seen on the eve of the dawning of the third *status* which would be characterized by a new age of monks. A herald of the third age had already appeared in the form of St. Benedict of Nursia, founder of monasticism. A new order of monks, yet to come, would characterize the third *status* and would be agents of spiritual renewal.⁵²

Joachim and the Mendicants

Joachim did not know what this order would be. In the words of Marjorie Reeves, like Moses, he could view the promised land but was unable to enter.⁵³ To be a member of that new order held a strong attraction to the religious of the time and many believed that the spiritual understanding of the new age was to be bestowed upon their institution. In particular, the Friars, with their self conception as pioneers, saw themselves as natural candidates and the legend grew that Joachim had forecast two orders and that he had sketched the habits of the two Orders, the Dominicans and the Franciscans.⁵⁴

The ambiguity of Joachim's diagrams and verbal descriptions of the third *status* opened the way for the Franciscans, with their scriptural training and preaching with its taste for symbolism and anecdote, to express a great interest in Joachimism. The importance that the Friars attached to Francis combined with the sense that something new had appeared in the creation of the Order contributed to the acceptance of Joachimism in the Order and the assimilation of the Order as prophets of the third *status*.⁵⁵ Francis himself

⁵¹ Lambert, *Medieval*, 214.

⁵² Lambert, *Medieval*, 215.

⁵³ Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages*, (Oxford:Clarendon Press, 1969), 146.

⁵⁴ Reeves, *Prophecy*, 72-73.

⁵⁵ Lambert, *Medieval*, 218.

became identified by some Franciscan writers with the sixth seal in the Apocolypse, who in the Joachite hypothesis was the forerunner of the third *status*.⁵⁶

Salimbene's Attitude to Joachim

Salimbene's first contact with the writings of Joachim took place while he was living in Pisa during the period 1243-1247. During that time an old abbot from the Order of Fiore had moved all his books by Joachim into the convent because he was afraid that the emperor Frederick would destroy his monastery. Because Frederick had caused so much trouble with the church, the old man thought that in Frederick all mysteries were to be fulfilled. He taught Salimbene the rudiments of Joachite theory and Joachim's thought influenced the rest of Salimbene's life. He was not alone because Brother Rudolph in the convent at Pisa "laid aside his study of theology and became a great Joachite."⁵⁷

Salimbene refrained from saying whether he himself had become a great Joachite.

However from his future actions we can assume that he had been greatly influenced by the ideas of Joachim. In particular he was able to use them to justify his way of life.

Salimbene was always somewhat defensive about his abandoning his family and becoming a Franciscan. It is no surprise that he, just as so many other religious did, looked to the writings of Joachim for justification of his decisions, and this reveals itself throughout his *Chronicle*. In his castigation of Elias' decision to let so many lay brothers into the Order Salimbene was forced to admit that Joachim had predicted that there would be two orders. One order would consist entirely of clerks while the other would consist of both clerks and lay people. The very distinctiveness of the Franciscans depended on their

⁵⁶ Reeves, *Prophecy*, 176.

⁵⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 228.

acceptance of lay brothers.⁵⁸ A counterfeit work by Joachim (of which there were many) makes the importance of the two Mendicant Orders to the coming of the third status clear by saying: "These two orders will be born to the church in simplicity and humility, but in the process of time they will harshly condemn and reproach the Babylonian fornicator."⁵⁹ Yet again in a discourse on the seven ways of describing the Kingdom of God, he points out that only as little ones can all the truths of God be received. Only when all the conceit and vanity of the educated was dispensed with, could one truly receive the message of Jesus. Salimbene writes: "These little ones are the Friars Minor as Joachim explains 'Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come to me: for the kingdom of heaven is for such'"⁶⁰ In a segment of the *Chronicle* devoted to the denunciation of the heretical apostles he reiterated the idea that the little ones of Christ refers to the Friars.⁶¹ Plainly, he had not completely forgotten Joachim. The writings of Joachim reinforced his confidence in his choice of life and also reinforced his anger whenever the Franciscans were threatened.

While Salimbene had much respect for the Dominicans he was always pleased to find a reason to consider the Franciscans superior and, to do so, he again returned to the writing of Joachim. According to Salimbene it had been revealed to a certain spiritual brother of the Order of Preachers that the Order would have as many leaders as letters in the word *Dirigimur* (I am being directed). Since there were nine letters in the word and there had been seven leaders of the Preachers there could only be two more leaders of the Preachers. The Dominicans would not last much longer. Salimbene was pleased to point

⁵⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 80.

⁵⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 646.

⁶⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 419.

⁶¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 278.

out that Joachim had said "that the Order of the Preachers had to suffer with the Order of the clerks, but the Order of the Minorites would last to the end."⁶² Plainly, at least while writing this section of the *Chronicle*, Salimbene accepted the more apocalyptic analysis of Joachim's ideas. His understanding of the apocalyptic nature of Joachim's work is evident in another place when he quotes Joachim's interpretation of a verse from Apocalypse: "and they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them and make merry: and shall send gifts one to another, because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth."⁶³ Salimbene notes that Joachim interprets that passage with reference to the two orders and insists that all things predicted will be fulfilled in the time of the Antichrist.⁶⁴

Salimbene's apocalyptic interpretation of Joachim is clear throughout his *Chronicle*. However, it is a more subtle interpretation than was evident in some of the more radical Franciscan Joachimites. Delno C. West points out that twenty years after the death of Francis, some convents and a number of Friars had adopted the teachings of Joachim and accepted that these teachings indicated that the Mendicants were the fulfillment of certain predictions of Joachim concerning the spiritual leadership of the new age. To them, an apocalyptic church was to replace the utility and structure of the established church. West holds that Salimbene's understanding was, rather, that the distinction between the ideal of the church and its realization in history would come about by the light shed upon the faithful by the Friars. To him, the acts of individual men

⁶² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 586.

⁶³ Apocalypse 11.10 as quoted in Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 261.

⁶⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 261.

were an indication of the progress of God's plan.⁶⁵ West points out that to Salimbene, the stigmata granted to Francis show that he was a special emissary from God. However, in the same paragraph, Salimbene points out that a man named Ezzelino had all the attributes of the devil.⁶⁶ Salimbene fills his *Chronicle* with descriptions of such men who are limbs (*membrum*) of the fiend or "men of Satan."⁶⁷ Salimbene, by the use of such terminology, is arguing for the presence of the Antichrist and is therefore subscribing to a more radical apocalyptic interpretation of Joachim's work than West would accept.

Certainly, Salimbene's description of the three *stati* is not easy to distinguish from that of the more extreme Franciscan Joachites as described by West. Salimbene says that "the third shall be ruled over by the Holy Spirit through the religious orders."⁶⁸ Similarly his description of the seals of the New Testament sounds distinctly apocalyptic:

In these days shall be the opening of the sixth and the Babylonian persecution. . . After this will come the Holy Sabbath. . . And in this Sabbath the opening of the seventh seal will take place. After this Satan will be loosed. . . from his prison he will incite foreign people through the last Antichrist. . . and he will kill many saints, and in a short time he will be killed by the Lord. After this the day of Judgement."⁶⁹

Following this view of the last days, he pointed out that the Friars Minor and the Preachers were sent, just as prophets were sent by God to assist kings in the Old Testament, as the religious people prefigured in the New Testament that were to aid the world in its salvation.⁷⁰

⁶⁵ Delno C. West, "The Re-formed Church and the Friars Minor: The Moderate Joachite Position of Fra Salimbene," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum Periodica Publicatio Trimestris Cura PP. Collegii D Bonaventuræ*, 64(1971), 274-275.

⁶⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 186.

⁶⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 186, 196, 350, 368.

⁶⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 476.

⁶⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 448.

⁷⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 449.

Salimbene's apparently perplexing attitude toward Joachim is not made any clearer in his description of the three problems that make Joachim's doctrine difficult to believe. First, he condemned Joachim for writing a book which condemned Peter Lombard as a heretic. He said that Joachim can only be forgiven in the way Paul forgave the Jews. They had zeal but not knowledge. In the same paragraph, Salimbene pointed out that Peter Lombard had many errors in his *Sentences* which Salimbene had enumerated in a brief chronicle.⁷¹

Salimbene noted that the second reason that men did not believe the writings of Joachim was that Joachim had predicted future tribulations and those who live carnally fear tribulations and prefer consolation. He quoted Joachim as saying "for those who hate the kingdom of heaven do not want the kingdom of the world to end"⁷²

Salimbene insisted that the third problem in believing Joachim came from Joachim's followers rather than from Joachim. They were, if anything, too enthusiastic about his doctrines and attempted to set precise timing for events when Joachim himself did not. Salimbene quoted Joachim saying "You have troubled me, and made me hateful to the Chanaanites and Pherezites and both I, and my house shall be destroyed."⁷³ Salimbene was careful to point out that Joachim did not set a definite time for the coming of the Antichrist nor for the end of the world, "but he set a number of terminal points, saying 'God is powerful and able to make his mysteries clearer, as those who are then living will see.'"⁷⁴

⁷¹ This Chronicle has not been found.

⁷² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 230.

⁷³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 230.

⁷⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 231.

To Salimbene, the most important feature of Joachim's works was the important position the Franciscans assumed as forerunners of the third *status*. In a manner similar to his vision of the Holy Family it helped to relieve the occasional nagging doubt about the choice had made when he rebelled against his father.

Problems in Paris

The explosive ideas in the doctrine of Joachim were soon ignited. Brother Gerard of Borgo San Domino, who Salimbene had met at Provins, was sent in 1248 to study in Paris. He studied there for four years and as Salimbene said at the end of the four years, "he thought out the foolish plan of writing a little book"⁷⁵ He then magnified the error by publishing the book without having it cleared by the authorities. As Salimbene said, this book brought the Order into shame.⁷⁶ Gerard was a fanatical believer in the immediate advent of the third *status* and his book, *The Introduction to the Eternal Gospel*, promulgated the idea that the advent of the third *status*, utterly abrogated the Old and New Testaments and that authority had wholly passed to the Eternal Evangel of the Holy Ghost contained in the works of Joachim. As Reeves says, Joachim, in spite of himself, had become the prophet of a system that "might involve the overthrow of all previous institutions and authorities in a final Dispensation." even though he himself had stated that the Old and New Testament would live until the end of time.⁷⁷

Since the Mendicants were already unpopular at the University of Paris, the secular masters blew up the affair to huge proportions. Inevitably, the Papacy became involved and Pope Alexander IV condemned much of Gerard's work on October 23, 1255. The works of Joachim remained unscathed, but their condemnation was inevitable,

⁷⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 229.

⁷⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 229.

⁷⁷ Reeves, *Prophecy*, 60.

once they were seen to result in the kinds of conclusions that Gerard had drawn from them. At the council of Arles in 1263 the whole doctrine of the three *stati*, as preached by the Joachites was condemned. This was only a provincial condemnation and, in truth, Joachim's heresy was only technical. The doctrine itself was not wrong but was dangerous because it constituted an incitement to subversive thought.⁷⁸

Salimbene's Doubts about Joachim

It seems likely that this affair had at least some influence on Salimbene. But he had had some doubts about Joachim earlier. He points out that he was amazed to find out that Emperor Frederick II had died in 1250 because according to the Joachites the Emperor would die in 1260. Salimbene said that he had to hear it from Pope Innocent IV himself before he would believe it because "I was a Joachite and I fully believed and even hoped that Frederick would do even greater wicked deeds in the future than he had yet done, numerous as his past evils had already been."⁷⁹ Salimbene was hoping that in doing so Frederick would, without question, label himself the Antichrist, and in so doing indicate that the third *status* had arrived. As a result, in later years, when confronted with his Joachism, he said "but after the death of the Emperor Frederick and the passing of the

⁷⁸ Reeves, *Prophecy*, 62-63. Brother Gerard's book claimed other victims than himself. Brother John of Parma was Minister General at the time. Even though he was beloved of the brothers he was looked at with some suspicion by many within and without the Order because of his Joachism. (Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 248, 301) Eventually he was forced to resign because of his Joachism even though he could have done much for the church and the Order. Brother Bartholomew Calaroso of Mantua commiserated with Salimbene that because of his learning and great moral authority John could have reformed both the Order and the church. However because of his stubborn belief in "the fantastic prophecies of fantastic men" (Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 302) Salimbene agreed and pointed out that some men "who are so caught up in their earlier views that they are ashamed to retract what they said, lest they seem to be liars." (Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 302)

⁷⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 164.

year 1260 I laid that doctrine completely aside, and now plan to believe in nothing save what I can see."⁸⁰

This "cure" for his belief in Joachim appears to have been less successful than he might have hoped. He wrote his *Chronicle* decades after he had supposedly given up his belief in Joachim. Yet he described the flagellants as a movement that fulfilled Joachim's prophecies.⁸¹ He continued to use quotations from Joachim to explain the presence of the Mendicants.⁸² He described events and then illustrated them with a phrase such as "*exponit loacchym abbas*"⁸³ In spite of his denials, the ideas of Joachim remained important to him through his life. They continued to provide moral support to him in his choice of a new family.

Conclusion

Above all it is necessary to remember that our Salimbene is a persona buried in a text created by a sixty-year-old Franciscan Friar writing at the end of the thirteenth century. He writes so graphically and with such enthusiasm that we are likely to think that he is sitting beside us spinning his tales. He is such an extrovert that we are inclined to forget that he is only telling us what he wants us to read. His inclination to favour the rich and powerful probably, at least occasionally, warped his opinions. In addition, what he says is at least partially shaped by his reason for writing the document. While ostensibly he wrote it for his niece, an examination of the work suggests that there were other reasons for the considerable expenditure of effort.⁸⁴ Of the five reasons he gave for

⁸⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 302.

⁸¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 476, 504. According to Reeves Salimbene is the only Joachite to see the flagellants as a fulfillment of the Joachite prophesy.

⁸² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 586, 646.

⁸³ Salimbene, *Chronica*, 385. As the Abbot Joachim interprets that passage.

⁸⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 177-178.

providing the detailed genealogy of his family only two could be important to his niece. The large number of *exempla* he inserted into the document could hardly have been aimed at a middle aged nun. They are an indication that his work was very much a treatise on the correct way to live a life. In addition, Delno West insists that one of Salimbene's motives in writing his Chronicle was to promote the revelation of God to the thirteenth century as seen through the prophetic literature of Joachim.⁸⁵ Finally, the numerous statements of the importance of the Friars and the Preachers to the church indicate that he was writing at least partially for personal justification. When he joined the Franciscans over the objections of his father, he, like Francis, was taking an irreversible step. He saw any threat to the Franciscans or any indication that any part of the community did not share his fondness for the Franciscans as a judgement on his choice of life. As a result, to gain full value from his *Chronicle* it is necessary occasionally to read "against the grain". Merely because he had strong negative feelings toward someone or something, it does not mean that society as a whole shared these ideas. It could mean exactly the opposite.

⁸⁵ West, "Re-formed," 283.

CHAPTER THREE

THE FRANCISCANS AND THIRTEENTH CENTURY ITALIAN SOCIETY

When Francis first started his Order he wanted it to be isolated from the secular world and the organised Church. But even when Salimbene joined the Franciscan Order in 1238 only twelve years after the death of Francis, the separation between the Order and the secular world was diminishing. By the time he was writing his chronicle fifty years later the Franciscan Order had become an integral part of both. Therefore, his *Chronicle* provides us with much information about that time when the Order was becoming integrated with the secular world and the complicated relationships that were developing between the Franciscans and the governing structure of both Church and civic government.

The secondary literature does not cover this subject well. Hyde, in his important work on the commune, barely mentions the Mendicants. He states that: "The Italian communes . . . were essentially secular contrivances whose particularism flourished in spite of a universal religion and the claims of a universal Empire."¹ At one point he mentions that the *popolo* looked with favour on the confraternities established by the Franciscans but that is his sole significant reference to the Mendicants.² Moorman, in his history of the Franciscans, devotes a chapter to the relationship between the Papacy and the Order. He describes how the many Papal privileges granted to the Order increased its material well-being, but is silent on the relationship between the commune and the Order.³ Thompson, as might be expected, documents a society in which the exercise of religion was much more important. However, he, in his chapters on the Mendicants, only

¹ Hyde, *Society*, 8.

² Hyde, *Society*, 117.

³ Moorman, *History*, 177-187.

documents how important the Mendicants were in city government. For example, he records that by the end of the thirteenth century Friars were intimately involved in city government: both in the choice of candidates for election and in the supervision of elections.⁴ Yet he does not speculate on why they were so successful other than to praise their religious practice. Historians seem to see the Franciscans as a strictly church-based organisation, and therefore, do not see fit to examine the development of the relationship between the Franciscans and the secular world. An examination of Salimbene provides us with an indication of the way that the Franciscans made themselves an integral part of thirteenth century Italian city life.

Far from being a society with well defined "vertical structures of class" as proposed by Marxist historians or with nothing but "horizontal" bonds between kinship groups as proposed by Jacques Heers, the society of thirteenth century Northern Italy, depicted by Salimbene, had a complicated structure with multiple interrelationships between the upper class, the Church and government.⁵ Many, but not all, of these interrelationships were instituted and maintained by familial connections, which marriage often enhanced. However, familial connections were not always necessary. Salimbene provided us with examples of Franciscans who were able to maintain close relationships with members of both Church and secular government without any such blood relationship.

In this complicated societal structure, the roles of the individual in Church and civic government were not well defined. Sometimes individuals, while not formally taking a new position in the structure of society, acted as if they had, which in turn made

⁴ Thompson, *Cities*, 423-424.

⁵ See David Abulafia, "Introduction," to *Italy in the Central Middle Ages*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 3.

already indistinct boundaries in society even less clear-cut. For example, in two cases in the text, the *podestà* of the city assumed a religious role and, acting in conjunction with the Franciscans, led a parade through the city and even preached to the populace. In some cases, bishops acted as military officers. King Louis IX of France himself acted more as a spiritual leader than a secular one. As a final example of role confusion, Salimbene told us of a time of great voluntary lay spirituality called the Great Halleluiah when the Franciscans and Dominicans were able to obtain actual formal membership in city government by becoming *podestà*. The net result of these developments was that the boundaries between secular government, the military and Church government were even more fluid.⁶ This made it possible for the Franciscans to move into, and hold, positions in society that might normally have been forbidden to them. Friars were assimilated into senior levels of Church government and in this way cemented a more formal relationship between the Franciscans and the Church.⁷ In addition, powerful men and women joined the Franciscans further cementing the relationship between the governmental structure and the Franciscans.

This blurring of boundaries and flexibility in structure provided benefits to all parties. The secular government was able to make use of the Franciscans' ability as peace makers while the Church government was able to make use of the Franciscans' preaching abilities and their acceptance by the public to enhance the pastoral services provided to

⁶ This is not to say that the boundaries had been clearly defined before. Thompson provides examples where the *podestà* on orders of the commune performed religious ceremonies such as organizing the offering of candles to the local church at Candlemass. (Thompson, *Cities*, 162-170) However these duties were those of a lay person taking part in a religious ceremony rather than those of a priest.

⁷ While the Order had gained Papal approval to found a religious institution in 1209 and had therefore become a Church institution Francis's firm opposition to consecration for his brothers is an indication that he wished the Order to remain separate from the secular Church structure. Thomas of Celano, "The Remembrance of the Desire of a Soul," in *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume 2 The Founder*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong O.F.M. Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellman O.F.M. Conv., and William Short O.F.M. (New York: New York City Press, 2000), 342-343.

the populace. The Church both at the episcopal level and at the level of the Papacy used the Franciscans as ambassadors, spies and clerical inquisitors. The Franciscans, themselves, benefited, because the close relationship with the rich and powerful provided them with a ready source of money and sustenance. This, in turn, freed them from the necessity of begging and meant that they were better able to fill the new responsibilities that the other elements of society expected from them.

The Early Franciscans

In the early years of the Order the Franciscans were a nomadic group of preachers. A few of them were clerics but most, like Francis, were laymen. However, that is not to say that they all were recruited from the poor and powerless. According to C. H. Lawrence it is likely that at least a large number of them came from the affluent and the clerical elite. He argues that voluntary poverty was an ideal that did not have much meaning for those who are poor by birth or circumstances. Therefore, while the Franciscans recruited from all social groups except the unfree, their chief attraction was for the young of the affluent and powerful. Lawrence asserts that all of Francis's companions whose background can be traced were the children of well-to-do merchant or knightly families.⁸ However one can make the argument that it would not have been possible to trace the background of those who were not from the comparatively affluent.

Salimbene himself would give credence to Lawrence's position. He said that:

There are many men in these two orders [Franciscans and Benedictines] who, if they were not in the order would likely hold the prebends which these men [secular priests who oppose the Friars now have. And it would be very likely indeed, for these brothers were, and are, as noble, rich, powerful, learned and wise

⁸ He quotes Jacques Paul "The signification sociale du Franciscanisme," in *Mouvements franciscains et societe francais XII^e-XX^e siecles*," ed. A Vauchez (Paris 1984), 9-25; C.H. Lawrence, *The Friars: The Impact of the early Mendicant Movement on Western Society*, (London and New York: Longman, 1994), 34-35.

as these men are themselves and so they would be priests, archpriests, canons, archdeacons, bishops, archbishops, and perhaps patriarchs, cardinals, and Popes, as these men are now. Thus they ought to recognize that we have given over all these things to them while we go begging for our sustenance from day to day.⁹

Even given Salimbene's capacity for hyperbole and his fawning idolization of those of higher class, it seems likely that there was some truth to this boast.

While Salimbene's joining the Order resulted in an insurmountable break with his father, it seems likely that even after joining the Order many new members would retain some connection with their family. Thomas of Eccleston tells of a situation that was somewhat similar to that of Salimbene. In Northampton, Sir Richard Grubian had given land to the Franciscans for their convent located just outside the city walls. When his son wanted to join the Order Sir Richard was upset and told him that if he stayed with the Friars they would lose their land. The Friars gave the young man the right to choose even though it might have cost them their land. He chose the Order but in the end the father relented rather than lose his son and became a great friend of the brothers.¹⁰ At least some of the time, the results of comparable familial conflicts would have been similar to this. As a result, from the beginning the Franciscans had a relatively close connection with the powerful and affluent.

Familial and Other Relationships

Salimbene's chronicle is filled with revelations about familial relationships among the wealthy and powerful which indicate the importance of these relationships in establishing connections between the nobility, Church government and the Friars. He told

⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 423. We shall see later that by the time Salimbene was writing this the Order was doing very little begging.

¹⁰ Thomas of Eccleston, "The Coming of the Friars Minor to England," in *XIIIth Century Chronicles*, tr. Placid Herman O.F.M with an introduction and notes by Marie Therese Laureille, (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1961), 115.

us that Lord Dalio who was an advisor to the Emperor was married to the sister of a Friar.¹¹ Lord Pinamonte, who “forcibly took over the rule of” Mantua and “was feared like the devil himself”¹² was the father of a Friar Minor called Brother Phillip. Lord Bernard Bafulo had a daughter who was abbess in the convent of the Order of St Clare in Parma.¹³ Brother Ubaldino was the brother of Lord Signorello. The Abbess of the Monastery of St Clare was the aunt of the *podestà* of Faenza, Lord Lambertino de Samaritani of Bologna and Cardinal Ottaviano was her protector.¹⁴ Pope Innocent IV legitimized Lady Traversaria, who had been born illegitimate, so that she might inherit her father’s estate and then gave her in marriage to his kinsmen, Lord Thomas of Reggio, who was made Count of Romagna. When Lord Thomas died the good lady married Lord Stephen who was the nephew of the Marquis d’Este, son of the King of Hungary and half brother of St. Elizabeth on his father’s side.¹⁵ Again Salimbene provided us with a series of relationships which illustrate the complex social structure of the government of the cities of Italy.

Marriage Relationships

Familial relationships amongst the elite were frequently enhanced and broadened by marriage. John Brienne, King of Jerusalem was a friend of the Friars and was accepted into the Order by Brother Benedict of Arezzo.¹⁶ By accepting him into the Friars, the Franciscans, of course, established a relationship between the Order and his family. John was the father-in-law of the Emperor, Frederick II, who married John’s daughter,

¹¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 356.

¹² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 444.

¹³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 619.

¹⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 403.

¹⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 158.

¹⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 18.

Isabella, on November 9, 1225.¹⁷ Through that marriage he was the grandfather of Conrad, son of the Emperor. Through the marriage of his second daughter he was also father-in-law to Baldwin, Emperor of Constantinople, and upon Baldwin's death served as regent of the empire on behalf of his grandson. By accepting this one man into the Order, the Franciscans established a relationship with his family which, itself, had been extended by marriage.

Marriage relationships also served to establish relationships between the Papacy and the Franciscans. Salimbene told us that Lord Guarino, "a fine soldier skilled in warfare" was married to the sister of Innocent IV. She bore him six sons which made it possible for Innocent to establish many connections inside the Church and the nobility. Her first son was Lord Hugo de San Vitale. The second son was Lord Albert canon of the cathedral for many years and by Salimbene's reckoning a "handsome and honourable man, but not particularly learned." Salimbene also informed us that Lord Albert was buried in the wing of the cathedral reserved for the Friars Minor. It seems likely that such an honour would only have been granted to one who had been close to the Friars during their life.¹⁸ The third son was Anselm, who was inept at warfare because he had been reared in the Papal court amongst the cardinals and had "imbibed all the indolence and bad habits of the priestly Order."¹⁹ The fourth son was William who died early. The fifth son had feet in the camps of both the Church and nobility. He was Lord Obizzo, Bishop of Tripoli for many years, and later with the help of Cardinal Ottobono,²⁰ took the Bishopric of Parma away from its rightful incumbent. The sixth son was Lord Tedisio, "a

¹⁷ Baird, "Notes," 660, n22.

¹⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 37.

¹⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 38.

²⁰ Baird, "Notes," 664, n89. Salimbene says he became Pope Adrian but he only became Pope-elect. He was elected Pope July 11, 1276 and died August 18 of the same year.

strong, stocky man."²¹ Thus by the marriage of his sister to a member of the nobility, Innocent gained two pipelines into Church government, three into the nobility and, through Albert, established a relationship with the Franciscans.

The Franciscans did not depend entirely on familial relationships to establish links to the rich and powerful. In some cases, they provided services to them. Brother Peter de Fulconi of Reggio was a member of the household of Gregory X.²² Brother Vita, a musician, became a member of the household of the Archbishop Phillip and, with Phillip as patron, was allowed to enter and leave the Order many times.²³ Pope Alexander had such a strong friendship with Brother Rainald de Tocca, a Friar Minor, that he would go to the door in bare feet to open the door for him.²⁴ Even members of the Emperor's party maintained relationships with the Franciscan Order. Brother Bonaventure de Iseo, a companion of Brother John of Parma, was "beloved of Ezzelino da Romano who was the most powerful of Frederick's allies in Italy."²⁵

All these relationships served to strengthen the relationship between the Franciscans and the powerful of society. A combination of familiar relationships, relationships established by marriage, and relationships established for mutual benefit meant that, from the relatively early years, the Order was never again as isolated as it was in the first years of Francis's rejection of the world.

²¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 39.

²² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 502.

²³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 174.

²⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 462.

²⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 560-561. Ezzelino da Romano was the most powerful of Frederick's allies in Italy. He was an exceedingly cruel, unfeeling man. Baird, "Notes," 675, n75.

Movement into the Order and from the Order into Church Government

It was not uncommon for those in high places to join the Friars in their later years. Certainly, the primary goal in doing this was probably a spiritual one, but while cementing a relationship between the powerful and affluent and the Order may not have been the intention, these high-status members certainly brought both money and influence with them. The King of Jerusalem, John of Briene, became a Friar. Lord Martin of Fano joined the Dominicans after considering joining the Friars.²⁶ Two members of the Imperial party in Romagna, Count Taddeo de Boncompagno and Lord Jacopo, joined the Friars.²⁷ Lord Bernard Bafulo, a "famous knight . . . a man of great courage, proven in arms and experienced in war" joined the Friars. As a penance for his previous sinful life, he had himself tied to the tail of a horse and flogged as the horse led him through the city.²⁸ It was not just the nobility that joined the Order. The Friars seem to have been willing to accept even overt sinners who had renounced their evil ways and who were willing to donate some of their ill gotten gains to the poor and, of course, to the Order. Inspired by Lord Bafulo, two brothers, who had been usurers, joined the minorites. The brothers restored their "ill-gotten gains", gave clothing to two hundred of the poor, and also gave two hundred pounds imperial to support the Friars' building campaign. In addition, one of the brothers, Brother Illuminato, had himself scourged around the city with a purse of coins tied around his neck.²⁹ The purse of coins around his neck was an indication of the load that money impressed on men's souls. This is ironic because it was the money that had made it possible for him to enter the Order.

²⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 17, 16.

²⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 371.

²⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 618.

²⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 619.

Even as the nobility was joining the Friars, numerous Friars were being assimilated into senior levels of Church government. Brother Bartholomew became Bishop of Vicenza.³⁰ Brother Illuminatus, who had been secretary to Elias, became Provincial Minister of Francis's own province and later Bishop of Assisi.³¹ Brother Leo became Archbishop of Milan.³² Brother Boniface of Parma was made archbishop because he was related to Pope Gregory X.³³ In some cases a secular priest joined the Friars. A boy was born in Marseilles on the feast of St Benedict and was christened Benedict. After he grew up he entered the Benedictines, was elected abbot, became Bishop of Marseilles and entered the Order of St Francis, all on successive feast days of St Benedict.³⁴ Some Friars even became princes of the Church. Brother Bentivenga was a lector who first was made Bishop of Albano, and later a cardinal.³⁵ Clearly the Franciscans were establishing close relationships with the secular Church.

Not all who were so promoted were happy with the change. Brother Rainald was lector at Rieti when the bishop died. He was found so worthy by the canons that he was unanimously elected bishop by the canons of the cathedral in spite of his objections. He then went to Lyons in an attempt to get Innocent IV to relieve him of the burden of being made bishop. Innocent refused and consecrated him personally.³⁶

Problems did not end there for Brother Rainald. When he returned to Genoa he gave a lavish dinner for his friends after Mass. However Brother Stephen Angelicus noticed that several of the brothers genuflected before the bishop as they placed food

³⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 51.

³¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 13.

³² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 51.

³³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 60.

³⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 562.

³⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 509. Salimbene said that he was promoted by Nicholas III because he had once lived with him and because the Pope loved the Order dearly.

³⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 322.

before him and in a sermon the next day made note of the fact. Brother Rainald was struck to the quick, and realizing that he should have stopped the brothers from showing undue reverence toward him, knelt down and asked forgiveness from the custodian. He then went to a monastery of White Monks, where an old man who had voluntarily laid aside his bishopric lived. The old man castigated Brother Rainald for accepting a bishopric because he was already serving God as well as could be expected by being a member of the Order of St Francis. Brother Rainald knew this in his heart and resigned his position in spite of resistance from both the curia and Innocent. The cardinals were amazed because, as Salimbene said "Brother Rainald's action seemed to reflect adversely on them as if they themselves were not in a state of salvation, in full enjoyment as they were of the honours of high position."³⁷ Plainly not all members of the Order were willing to become submerged in the secular Church.

Individuals Who Acted as if They had Assumed a New Station in Society

The separation between stations in society was confused in other ways. Again this is not to insist that there had been a clear separation of secular and religious stations in society previously. Certainly, some secular leaders had some religious duties. However, some individuals, while not formally assuming a new station in society, began to act as if they had. In doing so, they provided an example that others, including various Franciscans, could follow. In addition, the Franciscans by associating with these individuals were able to assimilate themselves into the power structure of Northern Italy.

King Louis IX of France

One of these individuals was King Louis IX of France himself, who began to act more like a member of a religious order than a king. Salimbene's description of King

³⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 324-327.

Louis expresses how much the King impressed him. The King was "slender and delicate, tall and somewhat emaciated," and "had an angelic expression." He did not come to the church of the Friars Minor in royal pomp but in pilgrim dress with a staff and scrip³⁸ on his shoulder. He did not come on horseback but on foot. He "cared more for prayer and charity to the poor than he did for noble entourage . . . Truly, he was closer to the monk in the devotion of his heart than to the warrior in the pursuit of war."³⁹ Perhaps if he had taken a little more interest in military matters the crusade which he led would not have been such a fiasco.⁴⁰

Papal Legates

It was not just the nobility that assumed an uncharacteristic position in society. Salimbene told us that many religious acted more like soldiers than religious men. By doing so, they were able to gain favour with the powerful of society and thereby incorporate themselves into the ruling social structure. A lay brother of the Friars named Clarello marched at the head of the army that was attempting to take Parma. He came upon a farmer with three horses and took them from him. Mounting one of the horses and holding a long pole like a lance, he encouraged the army to advance. The army followed this herald and standard-bearer and "the Lord laid fear on the hearts of those inside, so that they did not dare to resist."⁴¹ St Francis would probably been astounded. Another Friar Minor, who, in an earlier life, had been an engineer in charge of making war machines for Ezzelino da Romano, was commanded by the Papal legate leading the

³⁸ A scrip was a bag or wallet carried by wayfarers. From the Medieval Latin *scrippum* pilgrims pack.

³⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 213.

⁴⁰ In 1250 Louis was captured by the Saracens. Over a quarter of his men were killed and he buried many of them with his own hands. Salimbene *Chronicle*, 334.

⁴¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 397-398.

Church armies against Parma to divest himself of the robe of the brothers, to put on a simple white robe and to construct a battering ram. He acquiesced and the city was quickly taken.⁴² Plainly these were roles for a Franciscan that were distinctly unusual. It probably, however, led to rewards for the order

It is not surprising that some Franciscans saw nothing wrong with acting as soldiers. Salimbene told us of two princes of the Church who acted as soldiers and by so doing, further confused the boundaries between stations in society. Franciscans were associated with both of them and thereby gained status in the community. In 1240, Gregory of Monte Longo, the Papal legate to Lombardy, led the forces that besieged Ferrara through the months of February, March and April, finally capturing the city's governor when the city surrendered.⁴³ In 1247, he led one of the armies that captured Victoria, the model city built by Frederick II.⁴⁴ Finally, and probably of most importance to Salimbene because Parma was his home city, Gregory led the forces that relieved Parma from a siege laid by Frederick. Salimbene seemed at once attracted and repelled by Gregory condemning him for his promiscuity,⁴⁵ but at the same time admiring him for his military skill and his faithfulness to the Pope.⁴⁶

Another Papal legate who was skilled in the art of war and acted more like a robber baron than a bishop was Phillip the Archbishop of Ravenna. In 1259 he led an army against Ezzelino da Romano who was holding Padua with 1500 knights.⁴⁷ Unfortunately, Ezzelino was living elsewhere and escaped capture. Salimbene said this

⁴² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 398.

⁴³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 157.

⁴⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 28, 38.

⁴⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 393. As usual, when given the chance, Salimbene used Gregory's sins as an opportunity to give a sermon on the importance of chastity.

⁴⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 391-392.

⁴⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 395.

was because Ezzelino had felt that it was impossible for the city to fall and therefore his army did not need his personal leadership.⁴⁸ It is also possible that he feared that Padua would fall and preferred to be absent when that accursed event occurred. Again Salimbene seems both fascinated and repelled by Phillip. He was "surrounded by a group of fierce and violent servants. Yet they [the servants of Phillip] all revered the Friars Minor as if they were the very apostles of Christ because they know that their lord dearly loved us."⁴⁹ There were forty of these men and they were always armed. It is no wonder that they followed the wishes of their leader because his punishments were severe. In one case he had a man dragged through the marsh like a fish because he had forgotten the salt. Another time he had a man turned on a spit over a fire.⁵⁰ He, however, repaid debts owed to him. Brother Enverardo, a member of his household, who was captured with Phillip by Ezzelino da Romano was made Bishop of Cesena after he was released from jail.⁵¹ Phillip's lifestyle resembled a warlord in another way. He had one nephew and one son whom he called a nephew. They both became very rich because "whoever would fill the hands of these two men could have any ecclesiastical office he wanted from the archbishop."⁵²

He seems to have liked Salimbene, because he provided him with numerous relics of the prophet Elisha.⁵³ Another time, when Phillip was visiting at Faenza, Salimbene was invited to a meal where he sat with the Archbishop while the archdeacon sat apart from them at a lower table. Salimbene was the only Friar who was not afraid of attending

⁴⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 397.

⁴⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 400.

⁵⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 400-401.

⁵¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 401.

⁵² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 401.

⁵³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 401-402.

the meal, so fearful was Phillip's reputation.⁵⁴ In both cases, the Papal legates acted and lived more like military leaders or members of the nobility. Again, the boundaries between secular government, the military and Church government were confused. At the same time, the Franciscans, by eating at the same table, both figuratively and in fact, were able to assimilate themselves into both the power structure of the nobility and of the Church.

Civic Role Confusion

Finally Salimbene provided us with three even more surprising cases of role reversal. In the first two cases, the secular leader of a city took on a formal religious role with the Friars providing prominent support. In the first of these cases, the *podestà* actually took on priestly functions and preached to the populace. In the third case, Franciscan and Dominican Brothers took on the actual secular duties of *podestà*.

The first case was the result of a frightening natural phenomenon – an eclipse. On Friday, 3 June 1239 “in the ninth hour” a total eclipse took place “to the dread and terror of all.” Men and women went about “sadly in the grip of panic and fear. And such was their fright that they hastened to confession and did penance for their sins. And enemies were reconciled with enemies.”⁵⁵ At this time of panic, the *podestà* of Lucca, Lord Manfred de Cornazano, took the cross of the Lord in his own hands and led a procession through the city. He was followed by the Friars Minor and clerks of other orders and he himself preached “the Passion of Christ and brought about peace between those who were at odds with one another.” Apparently Lord Manfred was closely associated with

⁵⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 403-404.

⁵⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 156. This turn of phrase is similar to that used by Salimbene when describing the events of the time of the Great Halleluiah. Salimbene was never one to waste a good phrase by using it only once.

the Friars as Salimbene called him "an outstanding benefactor of the Friars Minor." Even though the *podestà* had let the procession the Friars seem to have reaped the benefits because "there also many other noble knights and ladies who likewise bestowed many gifts on the Friars Minor."⁵⁶ Again, by allying themselves with the rich and powerful the Franciscans were able to reap rewards both financial and political. The motif of peacemaking associated with an outburst of spontaneous spirituality will again be evident in the movement known as the Great Halleluiah.

The Flagellant Movement

Some twenty one years later, during another spontaneous outburst of lay spirituality called the flagellant movement, the roles of *podestà* and religious leader again became confused. In 1260, on Monday, the Feast of All Saints, the outburst of flagellant spirituality appears to have reached a climax with parades through the city of Modena led by the bishop and by the *podestà*.⁵⁷ The next day, the excitement moved to Reggio where the *podestà* marched in the procession whipping himself.⁵⁸ While there is no indication that the *podestà* had actually taken on the role of priest and preached, his actions were arguably more religious than governmental. It could also be argued, as Thompson does, that his actions showed the religious nature of the governmental structure itself. Again, the roles of individuals in secular and Church government became confused and in the resulting confusion the Franciscans were able to find a place for themselves.

The Great Halleluiah

The third and most surprising case of role reversal took place during a spontaneous outbreak of lay spirituality that took place in 1233 and came to be known as

⁵⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 156-157.

⁵⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 474.

⁵⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 475.

the Great Halleluiah.⁵⁹ During this period of enthusiastic lay spirituality the roles of secular administrator and religious leader became one, with the result that various Mendicant leaders were acclaimed as peace arbitrator and *podestà*. Never before, and never again, did Franciscan or Dominican Brothers actually take on the position of *podestà* and therefore become an actual part of urban government. They attained some success as peace arbitrators and, as *podestà*, they were granted almost unlimited power to modify the city statutes in any way they wished. Their success was short lived however, and by the end of 1233 most of the peace treaties that they had arranged had been abrogated. Nevertheless, for many decades into the future Salimbene and other chroniclers remembered the period when the Great Halleluiah was upon the land with favour.⁶⁰ It was also the prime example of the Franciscans' making use of the confusion of roles in society to find a successful place for themselves.

The origin of the Great Halleluiah remains in doubt. Some writers rationalize that the population's receptiveness to the preachers of the time was due to the rash of natural disasters which overtook Italy at the time. Salimbene reports that poor crops in 1212 caused much famine.⁶¹ In 1216, the River Po froze and the same cold destroyed the vineyards so that wine became very scarce. The rich were even forced to drink wedding toasts with water.⁶² Other records indicate difficult weather conditions reached their peak

⁵⁹ Sometimes called the Alleluiah. The name came from the tendency of the crowds to sing that chant as they came to hear the preachers. Salimbene also used the names "The Great Devotion of 1233" and "The Great Devotion of the Friars Preachers" for the movement. Augustine Thompson, *Revival Preachers and Politics in Thirteenth-Century Italy*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 33. Thompson's work remains the definitive work on this movement of lay spirituality. An earlier work by Brown provides a short introduction to the events of 1233. See Daniel Brown, "The Alleluia. A Thirteenth Century Peace Movement," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 81(1988), 1-16.

⁶⁰ Brown, "Alleluia," 16.

⁶¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 4.

⁶² Leandro Alberti, *De Viris Illustrinus Ordinis Predicatorum*, (Ferra, 1516), fos 183-4. Quoted in Thompson, *Revival*, 29.

in the three winters which followed 1230. To make things worse a plague of insects attacked the crops for three successive years from 1232 to 1235.⁶³

If natural conditions were not bad enough, the early years of the thirteenth century were marked by almost continuous fighting between the various political and religious factions of Northern Italy. The first few pages of Salimbene's *Chronicle* are filled with references to seemingly endless battles that appeared to accomplish nothing. Except for the occasional period when treaties temporarily limited warfare, the summers appeared to have been spent in battles with the allies constantly changing.⁶⁴

Having suffered these acts of God and of man, it is not surprising that the citizens of Northern Italy were susceptible to any scheme for either explaining them or providing relief from them. Certainly, both miracles and a search for peace became signposts of the Halleluia movement as it spread across Northern Italy. As a result there is a tendency for historians to see a relationship between the Peace of God⁶⁵ movements of the eleventh centuries and the peace movements of the thirteenth century.⁶⁶ Augustine Thompson disputes this. He sees no organized imposition of the Peace in the cities of Northern Italy that would be equivalent to that described for southern France. Rather he sees peace making in Northern Italy to have been a project for individually commissioned mediators, even if they were encouraged and helped by the commune and the Church.⁶⁷

⁶³ Albano Sorbelli ed., *Corpus Chronicorum Bononiensium* 2, (RIS 18:1:2; Citta di Castello, 1911) Quoted in Thompson, 29.

⁶⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 11.

⁶⁵ One of the best collections of essays on the Peace of God movement can be found in: Thomas Head and Richard Landes eds., *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1992).

⁶⁶ Brown, "Alleluia," 7.

⁶⁷ Thompson, *Revival*, 157.

Early Preachers during the Great Halleluiah

The Great Halleluiah appears to have begun spontaneously as a religious movement and later became a political phenomenon with strong religious overtones.⁶⁸ The first preacher to appear was a man who called himself Brother Benedict. He was also called "Brother of the Horn" after the "horn of copper or brass which he blew loudly sending forth a sound sometimes sweet, sometimes awesome."⁶⁹ His appearance was as distinct as was his method of gaining attention. He had a long black beard that was circled around the waist with a leather girdle. His toga was made like a cloak, which had a huge wide cross on both sides.⁷⁰ He went into the churches and squares of the town followed by great multitudes of children bearing branches of trees and lighted candles. He often stood in front of the Episcopal palace, which was under construction at the time, and using his horn taught the children the Gloria from the mass with the children answering "Halleluia" after each line.⁷¹ The chanting of "Halleluia" gave the movement its name. He appears to have been a charismatic individual with the ability to inspire spontaneous religious processions into the churches and squares of Parma.⁷²

Salimbene was a boy of twelve at the time of the Halleluia and his excitement at the events of the summer of 1233 shines forth in the description of the events even though he was writing some fifty years later. One can imagine him as one of the throng of children following Brother Bartholomew and shouting the responses as Bartholomew blew his horn. He writes of a time of "happiness and joy, gladness and rejoicing, praise

⁶⁸ Brown, "Alleluia," 5.

⁶⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 48.

⁷⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 48. Salimbene does not say as much but this cross seems to resemble the cross of the crusaders.

⁷¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 48-49.

⁷² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 48-49.

and jubilation of quiet and peace”⁷³ Every parish devised a banner on which was depicted the martyrdom of its own saint. Large numbers of men, women and children came to the city from the surrounding villages so that they could partake in the combined celebration and worship. As the crowds proceeded through the town, they stopped in the local squares and lifted up their hands to God. Even knights and soldiers sang divine hymns.⁷⁴

One particular event stood out in Salimbene’s mind even though it appears that he was not present when it took place. Brother Jacopino held a great preaching service between Calerno and Sant’Ilario in the bishopric of Parma. A great throng flocked to this service. Again, the crowd which consisted of both young and old, and male and female together, came from Reggio and “from the mountains and valleys and fields and the remote villages.”⁷⁵ At this gathering, a woman gave birth to a son. In response to Brother Jacopino’s exhortation, a huge quantity of gifts were lavished upon her. In addition, she was given one hundred Imperial soldi from the men. While Salimbene makes no claim of a miracle, the scene is reminiscent of Jesus feeding his flock with the loaves and fishes.

Looking backward in time, Salimbene saw Brother Benedict as a new John the Baptist “going before the Lord ‘to prepare unto the Lord a perfect people.”⁷⁶ Benedict was not associated with any order and from Salimbene’s description, he was a simple and unschooled man. Like most men who met with Salimbene’s approval, he was described with the obligatory he “was . . . a good friend of the Friars.”⁷⁷ He soon moved on to Pisa leaving the stage for those for whom he had been the forerunner.

⁷³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 47.

⁷⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 47.

⁷⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 50.

⁷⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 48.

⁷⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 48.

In 1285 Salimbene listed those old time preachers that preached at the time of the Great Halleluiah and the towns in which they preached. They were all Mendicants and the two that preached in Parma were Brother Gerard of Modena, a Friar Minor, and Brother Bartholomew of Vicenza, a Dominican. A third preacher, a Dominican named Brother Jacopino of Reggio was born in Parma.⁷⁸ This is only a partial list, but Thompson notes that all the revivalist preachers that followed Benedict were Mendicants.⁷⁹ What is surprising that Salimbene leaves out of his list the most compelling revivalist of them all, Brother John of Vicenza, a Dominican Friar.⁸⁰

The successor to Benedict in Parma was Brother Gerard. He had begun his preaching career in Modena, where he had settled a dispute which had erupted between various factions in the city over the murder of the *podestà*. He did this so effectively that the grateful citizens helped in the construction of a new Franciscan church.⁸¹ Good deeds have their rewards. From there he moved on to Parma where Benedict had left off and other preachers had paved the way. Pope Gregory had appointed Guala, the bishop of Bergamo and a Dominican, assisted by the abbot of Ceretto, to settle a dispute between the bishop and the commune. Thompson opines that Guala, along with the other Dominicans who followed him, joined in with the preaching of Benedict. Therefore, when Gerard arrived in Parma, he found himself immersed in a city already in a state of religious exaltation. To his already proven preaching ability, he appears to have added the

⁷⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 49.

⁷⁹ Thompson, *Revival*, 33.

⁸⁰ His only mention of John is to make fun of him when he began to take himself too seriously. Both Brown and Thompson highlight Brother John's activities. Brown, "Alleluia," 8-14. Thompson, *Revival*, 63-79.

⁸¹ Thompson, *Revival*, 34.

claim of divine guidance, which manifested itself in visions and in the ability to perform miracles because miracles were an important part of the movement.⁸²

Indeed the feature that distinguished this revival from others was the presence of miracles. In 1285 when Salimbene lists the preachers at the time of the Halleluiah, he claims that, along with their preaching, all of the revivalists performed miracles.⁸³ In describing the year 1233 he speaks of the other great spiritual movement “when the Halleluiah was sung and the Preachers strove to work miracles.”⁸⁴ Salimbene also told us that it seems likely that some of the visions were a creation of careful stage managing by the revivalists. He wrote that these “worthy preachers met together and drew up plans for their sermons.”⁸⁵ In one sermon Gerard, after standing in a trance for some time, announced the very words that his fellow preacher John of Vicenza was using in his sermon which was taking place at the very same time but in a separate city. Since they had conspired together the accuracy of Brother Gerard’s vision was assured. As Salimbene pointed out, this allowed them to amaze the audience and as a result “many men renounced the world and entered the Order of the Minorites or the Dominicans” and “all manner of good works were accomplished . . . during the time of the spiritual movement”⁸⁶.

The revivalists did not limit themselves to preaching and working miracles. Soon, peace making became an important part of their message. By early July of 1233 Gerard had so galvanized the population of Parma that according to Thompson he convinced them to appoint him as arbitrator between the various factions in the city. He reigned as

⁸² Thompson, *Revival*, 35.

⁸³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 600.

⁸⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 477.

⁸⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 54.

⁸⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 54.

arbitrator from 15 July to 29 September, during which time he issued decree after decree, setting aside grudges and deciding lawsuits and ruling on points of law.⁸⁷ He was then made *podestà*. According to Thompson, this was done at his request, but according to Salimbene it was a spontaneous action by the citizens of Parma.⁸⁸ This assumption of secular power by the religious leaders of the movement is the event that sets the Halleluiah apart from other peace movements and outbreaks of lay spirituality. Preachers in the future continued to preach and put themselves forward as workers of miracles, but never again did they acquire political powers like those of 1233.⁸⁹ With the power granted to him, Gerard was allowed to amend the civic statutes in any manner which he chose.⁹⁰ Shortly after this period of energetic law-making he moved on. During his period as *podestà* he appears to have been unbiased in his decisions. Pope Innocent's brother-in-law, Lord Bernard, was not happy because Gerard failed "to recognize the claims of his friends."⁹¹ Salimbene said that Gerard had strong leanings toward the Imperial party, but it seems likely that Salimbene, just as Lord Bernard did, expected Gerard to favour the Church. His neutrality came as a surprise to those who expected favours. It appears to have been recognized by the citizens of Parma who showed their appreciation to the Friars Minor by filling in a large ditch which had disfigured the Friars' property.⁹² By making themselves part of the city government they had prospered both materially and spiritually.

⁸⁷ Thompson, *Revival*, 35.

⁸⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 52. Whether Gerard arranged to have himself declared *podestà* or his acclamation was spontaneous is probably not too important. However if there had been an indication that he had arranged for his appointment it is likely that Salimbene would have said something. He did not hesitate to note that the evangelists had conspired to generate supposedly inspired visions.

⁸⁹ Thompson, *Revival*, 215.

⁹⁰ We shall see that he was able to make the prosecution of heretics, which up until that time had been a responsibility of the Church, a responsibility of the civic authority.

⁹¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 52.

⁹² Thompson, *Revival*, 35.

Brother John of Vicenza

Gerard's place as the pre-eminent preacher of the Halleluiahs was soon overtaken by Brother John of Vicenza. He so impressed his contemporaries that enough information has come down to the present that it is possible to construct the beginning of a biography.⁹³ He first surfaced in the record during 1233 when he managed to arbitrate a long standing conflict between the Bishop of Bologna and the commune. In a manner similar to the actions of the commune of Parma, the commune of Bologna handed over the city statutes to Brother John for revision. He quickly consolidated his position with reforms which called for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. By doing so his reforms produced euphoria and created a climate which encouraged peace.⁹⁴

John had a remarkable ability to carry on such activities in several places at once. In short order he established his regime at Padua, Verona and several other cities in North Central Italy. In all cases he used the same tactics: he stimulated the desire for peace by means of religious enthusiasm and enlarged the base of support with grateful families by emptying the debtors' prisons. In a manner similar to that employed by Gerard he was able to persuade both the cities of Vicenza and Verona to employ him as *podestà*. The people of Verona went so far as to acclaim him "Duke and Rector of Verona."⁹⁵ As Duke and Rector, he further confused the line between the secular and sacred and began prosecuting heretics. While the prosecution of heretics had been the responsibility of the Church, the actual execution of heretics, once convicted, had been the responsibility of the secular government. As a religious, acting as a secular administrator, he did away with that legal problem. He personally convicted "sixty of the best men and women of

⁹³ Thompson, *Revival*, 39.

⁹⁴ Brown, "Aleluiah," 10.

⁹⁵ Brown, "Aleluiah," 11-12.

Verona."⁹⁶ The ability to prosecute heretics would make the Franciscans useful to the Papacy in the future.

In late July he returned to Padua where he sent emissaries to all of the places that he had visited in his travels announcing a general meeting of peace to be held near Verona. This meeting was not to settle local conflicts only, but was to involve anyone regardless of their status in society or their territory. John had certainly become a force with which to be reckoned.

At the meeting he outlined an ambitious plan for peace. He had each side pardon the other and arranged that exiles be allowed to return home unmolested, that goods stolen during wars be returned and that insults could not be addressed by vengeance but had to be adjudicated by John or one of his agents. To bond the peace he announced the betrothal of two-ten-year old members of opposing families. The following morning he had the principals before him to sign the requisite documents.⁹⁷

However, this time John had overstepped himself. Within a few days parties to the agreement began to complain that their erstwhile enemies had received a better settlement than they had. Even John was forced to admit that the agreement had not taken everything into consideration. He therefore revised the terms but at the expense of his credibility. Others, who had been present, on rethinking the state of affairs grumbled that their enemies had come armed and ready to inflict injury and therefore that they had had no recourse but to sign the agreement.⁹⁸

Within a week there was a disturbance at Vicenza which John was required to settle personally. People unhappy with the peace settlement had recalled the *podestà* that

⁹⁶ Maurisius, *Historia de rebus gestis Eccelini*, 38. quoted in Brown, "Aleluiah", 12.

⁹⁷ Brown, "Aleluiah," 12-13.

⁹⁸ Brown, "Aleluiah," 13-14.

John had replaced. John's popularity allowed him to overcome this minor setback but the magical esteem in which he was held had been lost. Shortly thereafter he was apprehended by rebel supporters from outside Vicenza and imprisoned. He was released in a short length of time but his peace plan proceeded to unravel. By the year's end it was nothing but a memory. Ironically, the next summer the plain of Paquara, where John's peace rally had been signed, was the scene of a battle between Imperial and Lombard forces.⁹⁹

Post Mortem for the Great Halleluiah

What explains the Great Halleluiah's success? Brown argues that while previous religious and political movements set the stage for the Halleluiah they do not provide a detailed explanation of the unfolding of the events of the movement. It took a unique blend of religious events and people to conflate previous movements in a way to produce the profound political events of the Halleluiah.¹⁰⁰ Thompson, on the other hand, does not see the movement as a spontaneous development. The results had to be cultivated and nurtured. The Great Halleluiah was successful, however briefly, because the Friars were able to identify and speak to their listeners' deepest needs and desires.¹⁰¹

Why then did the Halleluiah fail? Brown sees the failure as one of political ability. The high expectation of peace in the populace which was borne of religious enthusiasm died quickly because the political acumen was not available to match the zealots' ardour.¹⁰² Thompson, rather, identifies spiritual rather than political reasons for the failure. As John lost control he was forced more and more to rely on his military

⁹⁹ Brown, "Aleluiah," 14.

¹⁰⁰ Brown, "Aleluiah," 15.

¹⁰¹ Thompson, *Revival*, 212.

¹⁰² Brown, "Aleluiah," 15.

allies. With his imprisonment, the charisma which he had developed by his preaching and miracle-working vanished. Thompson posits that it is an unavoidable recipe for disaster when leaders whose authority is spiritual in nature take on political roles. By so doing their reputation for neutrality and divine power that was responsible for their success inevitably dissipates. When a revivalist becomes a politician similar to all others he simply fades away into obscurity.¹⁰³

An argument can be made that the failure was at least partially due to the character of John himself. Salimbene, never one to suffer fools gladly, seems to have understood the character of John. According to Salimbene, John was "so taken with himself on account of the honours bestowed on him for his eloquent preaching that he actually believed himself capable of working miracles without the help of God."¹⁰⁴ When he had his beard trimmed he felt it a great slight that the Friars did not gather up his hairs to be preserved as relics.¹⁰⁵ Plainly, a man who considered himself a saint could fool himself into overreaching beyond his or his movement's capability.

Finally, the question must be asked why the Friars became the city managers of choice in 1233. Thompson suggests that one precondition to calling in outsiders and granting them extraordinary legislative power was the rampant instability and the consequent lack of legitimacy of the region's government. At this time, previously disenfranchised groups such as guilds were seeking representation in the commune and according to Thompson, there was no acceptable way to redistribute power. The result was that the citizens chose to call on a trusted moderator. The Friars, with their aura of holiness and their proven ability as peace arbitrators, would have appeared as the ideal

¹⁰³ Thompson, *Revival*, 207.

¹⁰⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 55.

¹⁰⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 55.

choice for a neutral arbitrator to introduce stability to a new form of communal government. Yet Thompson points out that the Friars' legislation was so inconsequential that none of their constitutional statutes survived beyond the time of the Great Halleluiah. If, on the other hand, all that was required for the legitimization of a new form of government was the replacement of those who opposed it this was simply accomplished by the appointment of the Friars as *podestà*. Their actual legislation was of little importance. According to Thompson, whether it was because this extreme form of instability never recurred or for some other reason, the citizenry never again called on the Friars to be secular leaders and the Friars never again sought such positions.¹⁰⁶

However the actual assumption of positions in government was only the most extreme form of the Franciscans allying themselves with the powerful in the city. They were a new form of religious order and were attempting to find a place for themselves in Northern Italian society. Superficially, at least, they had overstepped the bounds of their ability and the result had been failure. However, Thompson holds that the real legacy of the movement was a new type of relation between the Friars and audience that consisted of an ability to sense the needs and fears of their hearers, to give them expression and to suggest concrete actions that would alleviate them. The Halleluiah preachers did not invent this form of preaching, but they certainly showed its power.¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, Thompson understates the lessons learned by the Franciscans. Salimbene's *Chronicle* shows that the Franciscans had learned more than how to preach. They went on to make use of all the forms of instability in the social structure of Northern Italian Society and

¹⁰⁶ Thompson, *Revival*, 215. Thompson notes that the only exception to this took place in Bologna in 1262 when the city government underwent reorganization, and called on two Frati Godenti to reform and codify the statutes. Thompson, *Revival*, 215, n35.

¹⁰⁷ Thompson, *Revival*, 218.

the lessons learned during the Great Halleluiah to firmly entrench themselves into the higher echelons of society.

Benefits Flowing as the Result of the Sharing of Power

There were mutual benefits for all parties in this sharing of power. For the Franciscans one of the prime advantages of an alliance with citizenry of higher status was that it provided a ready source of money and goods in the way of gifts. In the early years of the Order, Pope Innocent III had a convent and fine church built at Lavagna, his native land, where he wanted to keep twenty-five Friars Minor at all times. It was completely furnished with all necessary books and other supplies but the Friars turned the gift down. The Pope was forced to give it to another order.¹⁰⁸ In all of Salimbene's record this is the only indication that the Friars turned down a gift. Certainly the providing of a recompense to religious orders, either for services provided, or for prayers to be said after death, was not uncommon. Salimbene tells us that Clovis after being healed at the tomb of St. Martha gave many rewards to her convent.¹⁰⁹ But the Franciscans were different from previous orders, having been founded upon the basis of organisational, as well as individual, poverty and the receipt of large amounts of goods and money would seem to be a breach of the Rule of the Order.

Still Salibene's record lists many gifts given to the Order by individuals in both secular and Church government. The Archbishop of Vienne gave the Friars a bridge across the Rhone because, incidentally, he had given them a convent on the other side of the river. In 1239, after the eclipse, the noble knights and ladies "bestowed many gifts on the Friars Minor." Lord Burigardo sent a huge candlestick to the Friars Minor so that the

¹⁰⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 38.

¹⁰⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 295. Clovis was one of the first Frankish kings and died in 511.

body of Christ could be better venerated when it was elevated before the congregation during Mass. In 1283 Lord Bernard who was Papal legate to Lombardy and Romagna rewarded Friars who had served as his messengers with a wagonload of good wine and half a pig. In the same year Count Louis died and left his horse and arms to the Friars. The following year his widow sent a beautiful pallium of samite and purple for the altar of the convent of the Friars in Reggio. The deaths of those who had led a less than wholesome life could also be of advantage. Jacopo de Enzola, who had made his money from usury, left ten pounds to the Friars at Parma and ten pounds to the Friars at Modena. Criminals who reformed could be even more valuable. Earlier in this work it was noted that two brothers, who had been usurers, had given two hundred pounds to the Friars before joining the Order.¹¹⁰ For those Franciscans who saw the calling of the Order as pastoral service, this source of money was welcome because it freed the Order from the necessity of either begging or working. On the other hand, to those who saw the Order's calling as one of strictly spiritual service, the acceptance of these gifts was unacceptable.

There seems to be no question that Salimbene found himself in the former group. He spoke favourably of receiving gifts such as a candlestick from Lord Burigardo¹¹¹ and a gift of twenty pounds from Lord Jacopo de Enzola.¹¹² He commended the soul of the latter to peace because of the gift. In contrast, he speaks highly unfavourably of Lord William de Fogliani, the Bishop of Reggio because he did not provide a gift to the Friars.¹¹³ He never ceased to condemn lay members of the Order for being "useless," in

¹¹⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 594, 443, 524, 525, 616, 619.

¹¹¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 594.

¹¹² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 616.

¹¹³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 528.

other words being unable to provide pastoral services in exchange for gifts.¹¹⁴ On the other hand, he expresses some doubts about Brother John of Parma's Letters of Authority, which Salimbene felt might have been abused.¹¹⁵ Plainly Salimbene recognized that not all sources of money were without their attendant problems.

The advantage for the Friars was not only financial. The access to the homes of the powerful allowed the Franciscans to extend their influence throughout society. In one case, when Brother Hugh defeated Master Rainerio in debate he did it in the home of Count Raimond Berengar who was a "fine man and a friend of the Friars Minor." Salimbene noted that there were large numbers of "knights, potentates, judges, notaries and physicians" present. It certainly did no harm to the fame of the Order that the debate was won in the presence of so many important people.¹¹⁶

At times the Franciscans found it necessary to call on their friends in high places for more than financial help, as they found themselves at odds with some sections of the population. While Salimbene was living in Lucca, he made the acquaintance of Lord Nazario Ghirardine of Lucca and his wife Lady Fiordolivia.¹¹⁷ Lord Nazario had been *podestà* of both Reggio and Trent which indicates that he was well respected by those in power in the community. During this time a Friar, Brother Jacopo de Yeseo, attempted to remove the abbess of Gattaiola from her position because of misconduct. According to Salimbene, she was a "lowly daughter of a baker woman of Genoa."¹¹⁸ and her

¹¹⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 83.

¹¹⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 298.

¹¹⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 227.

¹¹⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 18. Salimbene lived in Lucca for two years after he had irreconcilably separated from his father. We know he was living in Lucca in 1239 during the eclipse of the sun that took place on June 3, 1239. He also says that he was living in Lucca when Elias was deposed which took place at the General Chapter meeting in Rome at Whitsuntide 1239. Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that the events took place sometime in the period 1239-1240.

¹¹⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 45

governance had been extremely cruel, shameful, and dishonourable. Knowing Salimbene, it is a question whether the problem was her lowly status, her gender or the quality of her governance. She fought back, and in order to gain the town's favour, she lavished gifts on the citizenry particularly favouring those who had relatives in the convent. A question arises about her ability to do this. If she was from a lowly background where did she obtain the money to purchase these bribes? Perhaps this was a case of Salimbene extending his verisimilitude too far. Not being content with bribery, according to Salimbene, she spread rumours around Lucca that the Friars had been acting in an immoral manner and that their daughters and sisters would not be safe from rape if the Friars remained in town. She seems to have gained some popular support and it was only with the help of Lord Nazario and his wife that she was deposed and that the "Friars Minor regained their good reputation and peace returned to the city."¹¹⁹ However this was only accomplished by the Franciscans allying themselves with those of high status in the community. Those of lower status had allied themselves with the abbess.

Salimbene provided us with another example of the Friars' alignment with those of higher status in society and the benefits that the Order gained as a result. In 1287 eighteen "trouble-makers" from the party of Gesso planned to come and pillage the convent of the Friars Minor at Montefalcone. However, news of this attempt escaped and when Jacopino de Panceri and Boniface of Canossa, the brother of the abbot of St Prosper in Reggio learned of this incident, they issued a warning to the trouble-makers and the robbery of the convent was called off.¹²⁰ That the trouble makers considered pillaging the convent of the Friars Minor says much about both the status and wealth of the convent. In

¹¹⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 45.

¹²⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 649.

the not too distant past it would have been common knowledge there would have been nothing to pillage in a Franciscan convent and even criminals do not like to waste their energy. In addition, it seems likely that popular opinion would have prevented the sacking of a convent. It is of further significance that the Friars' saviours were not the poor but were a nobleman and the brother of a senior Church official.

In return, secular leaders both in government and in the Church received many benefits from their association with the Franciscans, not the least of which was their ability as peace arbitrators. In the days of the Great Halleluiah, Italian society had discovered the Franciscans' value as peace arbitrators. This lesson was not forgotten even if the Great Halleluiah ended in an ignominious fashion. On the very day Salimbene was accepted into the Order, Elias, the Minister General of the Order, was on a mission from Pope Gregory IX to the Emperor Frederick.¹²¹ Given the warfare over the next few decades this mission was not very successful. On the other hand, Lord Martin, who had been instrumental in saving Salimbene from his father, was chosen by Salimbene as a mediator between the cities of Bologna and Reggio and this mission was more successful than that of Elias.¹²²

Salimbene informed us of four other times when Franciscans acted as peace makers. In 1265 a peace settlement was arranged between the exiles and men of Reggio through the efforts of several named Preachers and "some Friars Minor."¹²³ It appears that the Friars were minor players in this action. In 1282 a peace settlement was arranged between the Struffi, the Orsi, and the Salustri in a convent of the Friars Minor in Reggio

¹²¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 13.

¹²² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 16.

¹²³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 480.

through the efforts of Brother Johanno de Lupicini, lector at Reggio.¹²⁴ In 1285 a large exchange of prisoners between the men of Sassuolo and the men of Modena was arranged by a group of Preachers and Friars.¹²⁵ Finally, in 1285 a peace settlement was reached between the men of Sassuolo and the Modenese of the city party. In this case Salimbene himself was involved in the peace negotiations and, as a result, he provided us with a detailed account of the complex negotiations.¹²⁶

The Friars were also useful in the augmenting the pastoral service of local bishops. The Bishop of Ferrara kept two Friars in his household. Since he was notoriously avaricious, they must have provided some service to him, even if they "had a wretched time of it, getting enough to eat, on account of his avariciousness."¹²⁷ The Archbishop of Embrun always kept two Friars Minor in his household.¹²⁸ With their skill in preaching and hearing confession they would have been valuable vehicles to provide service to the laity. In return they received the gifts of the rich and powerful.

In addition to their function as preachers, the Franciscans were useful to the secular Church as ambassadors. Brother John of Piano Carpine was sent on a mission to the Tartars.¹²⁹ Lord Bernard, the Papal legate, sent Brother Fattibuono, the Guardian of the Friars Minor in the city of Forli, as a messenger to Lord Pinamonte. Earlier Lord Pinamonte had given orders that all messengers bearing letters in Mantua were to be beheaded. Nevertheless, he received Lord Bernard's letters because they were carried by a Friar Minor and were from such a great lord.¹³⁰ Salimbene also mentioned one case

¹²⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 522.

¹²⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 587.

¹²⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 593.

¹²⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 318.

¹²⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 323.

¹²⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 196.

¹³⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 443.

where the Franciscans saved the life of a Papal legate. Lord Phillip had been sent as a Papal legate to the Landgreve of Germany, who had succeeded to the throne after the death of Phillip. When Lord Phillip received word that the Landgreve had died, he realized that he was in danger because the protection granted by the Landgreve was no longer available. He made his way to the convent of the Friars Minor and asked the guardian for a robe of the Order. The guardian then proceeded to lead him out of the city. However, all but one of the gates were locked. At the fourth gate the legate "was so fat that he got stuck but the guardian put his foot on his posterior and pushed until he squeezed through."¹³¹ The legate escaped and "in every case that lay in his jurisdiction he gave us the right of preaching, hearing confession, and giving absolution."¹³²

This last account is an excellent example of the interrelationship between the powerful in the commune and the Franciscans, and how the Franciscans became more powerful within society. The legate lived because of help from the Franciscans. In gratitude he provided the Franciscans with the same right to provide the service to the population that the secular clergy possessed. This, in turn, allowed the Franciscans to increase their influence with all levels of society. In addition, Salimbene was able to portray the Franciscans in a favourable manner, even as he was able to subtly disparage a member of the secular Church.

The Franciscans and the Papacy

When Francis started his new movement in 1209, he went to Pope Innocent III and received permission (albeit with some doubts on the part of Innocent) to continue his new Order. However, he did not want to be closely associated with the secular Church

¹³¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 400. This would seem to be a subtle comment by Salimbene on the wealth of the secular Church.

¹³² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 400.

and for that reason, he insisted that the new Order have its own unique Rule. He also insisted that the Order not receive any Papal favours. The Papacy, however, was at this time attempting to exert its control over all parts of the Church and it was not long before the Order and the Papacy discovered a mutual benefit in working together.

Salimbene informed us of the close relationship between the Papacy and the Friars Minor and how it developed very early in the history of the Order. In 1228 he noted that Cardinal Ugolino, Bishop of Ostia, Ruler Protector and Corrector of the Order of the Friars and Papal legate in Lombardy conducted the first Mass in the Church of the Holy Trinity in Campagnola.¹³³ Cardinal Ugolino was later to become Pope Gregory IX. Ugolino had been a close friend of Francis but, even so, the appointment of a Protector for a religious order was uncommon. Brooke believes that Francis, himself, asked for the creation of the post and Thomas of Celano's first life of Francis would appear to support this claim.¹³⁴ This is an indication of the favoured relationship between some of the Popes and the Order. The close relationship between the Papacy and the Order that had been established by Francis and Gregory continued through the first years of the Order. In 1277 after the election of Pope Nicholas III, Salimbene notes that he had been Governor, Protector and Corrector of the Order of the Friars Minor and that all cardinals who had held that position had become Pope. It would appear that the appointment as Protector of the Order was a stepping stone to the Papacy and this says much about the close relationship between the Papacy and the Order.

¹³³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 10. Salimbene had his dates wrong. He said that these events took place in 1228 while in fact they took place in 1227. It seems likely, however, that the temporal order was correct.

¹³⁴ Brooke, *Early*, 61; Thomas of Celano, "Life," 245-247.

Problems between the Papacy and the Mendicants

The relationship between the Order and the Papacy did not always remain cordial. Nicholas III appointed, his brother, Lord Matthew Rossi¹³⁵ as Governor, Protector, and Corrector of the Order of Friars Minor despite the brothers petitioning that Lord Jerome of Ascoli be appointed to the position.¹³⁶ This certainly resulted in a cooling of the relationship between the Order and the Papacy. Salimbene told us that many of Nicholas's relatives had been elevated to the position of cardinal even though they were unworthy. Lord Jordano, the Pope's brother, was made cardinal even though he was "a man of little learning and scarcely even connected with the Church."¹³⁷ After this statement, Salimbene continued in a general diatribe against those who were chosen to be cardinals. He pointed out that Urban IV made his own nephew, Anger, a cardinal and yet he was so miserable a student that "the other students with whom he was studying used him to fetch the meat from the butcher's."¹³⁸ It turned out that Anger was Urban's son, not a nephew. This really made Salimbene angry. "Thus it is that they promote and lift up their illegitimate children and bastards, calling them their nephews, their brother's sons."¹³⁹

Relations between the Papacy and the Franciscans were at their most difficult when there were indications that the Papacy or the curia might limit the Franciscans' right to provide religious services to the laity. This would have severely limited their

¹³⁵ Salimbene says that Nicholas III was called John Gaitano while a cardinal. It seems that Nicholas was using his mother's family name Gaetana while Matthew Rossi was using his father's name. New Catholic Encyclopaedia <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11056a.htm>, March 11, 2007.

¹³⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 160. Jerome was Minister General from 1274-1279. He obtained his revenge when he was elected the first Franciscan Pope as Nicholas IV in 1288. Moorman, *History*, 183.

¹³⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 161.

¹³⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 161.

¹³⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 161.

power in the community and besides, there were certainly some Franciscans who felt that the secular clergy were either unable or unwilling to provide proper service to the populace.

Both Innocent IV (1243-1254) and Honorius IV (1285-1287) seemed at one time to be about to limit the Franciscans' rights to hear confession and say Mass. Up until this time Salimbene had considered Innocent an ally of the Order and was favourably disposed toward him, both because he had allowed Brother John to address the curia,¹⁴⁰ and because he had ordained Salimbene into the order of preaching.¹⁴¹ The thought that Innocent might become an enemy of the Order made Salimbene angry, and he was overjoyed when Innocent died. Innocent died just after writing a Bull limiting the Franciscan's powers, but before it could be disseminated. His successor Alexander IV cancelled the Bull much to the satisfaction of Salimbene and probably of the Order as well.¹⁴²

When Salimbene was near the end of his life a rumour was circulating that Pope Honorius was about to issue a letter limiting the power of the Franciscans. While this rumour appears to have been groundless, nevertheless Salimbene expressed his gratitude when Honorius died before the Franciscans could be harmed.¹⁴³ These disputes are significant because they point out that the relationship between the Franciscans and the Papacy was one of mutual benefit. When the Franciscans felt that they might lose benefits granted by the Pope, their loyalty to the Pope could rapidly vanish.

¹⁴⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 217-221.

¹⁴¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 168.

¹⁴² Moorman, *History*, 127.

¹⁴³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 625, 636.

Papal Privileges for the Franciscans

Except for these three disputes the relationship between the Papacy and the Franciscans, at least according to Salimbene, seems to have been cordial. Salimbene provides us with indications that the Papacy provided the Order with certain favours. He notes that Innocent IV always kept a large group of Friars around him and "was a very generous man as may be seen from his interpretations of the Rule."¹⁴⁴ Another Pope had granted a Papal privilege preventing anyone from wearing "that particular robe by which a Friar Minor is easily recognized."¹⁴⁵ This privilege was issued because a small group of monks in the March of Ancona had taken over the robe for themselves. In addition, Salimbene told us that in 1281, shortly after his accession to the Papacy, Martin IV gave to the Friars "the high privilege of preaching and hearing confessions."¹⁴⁶ In truth, the Order had had the right to hear confessions for a long time but when, where, and how often had been in dispute since the early years of the Order. Martin greatly extended the power of the Franciscans.¹⁴⁷

During the reign of Nicholas IV a dispute arose between the Cistercians and the Franciscans which was settled in favour of the Franciscans because of their relationship with the Papacy. A certain Friar left the Order and joined the Cistercians. He did so well in the new order that he was elected abbot of one of their large monasteries. The Friars, afraid that other brothers would leave, kidnapped him and kept him imprisoned in their convent. As a result the Cistercians issued a constitution against the Friars. The Friars at

¹⁴⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 38. The Rule of 1223 had allowed the Friars to have "spiritual friends" who could be called upon to help the Friars at least to provide themselves with clothes and for the necessary attention for the sick. Gregory had extended this idea so that the friends might hold property on behalf of the Friars. Innocent went even further and allowed the friends to hold money not just for 'necessity' but for 'convenience.' Moorman, *History*, 116-117.

¹⁴⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 248.

¹⁴⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 517.

¹⁴⁷ Moorman, *History*, 181-183.

this point made use of their relationships with the nobility and King Rupert issued a letter ordering the Cistercians to withdraw their constitution. If they had not done so, they would have lost any right to inherit any estate or even receive any gifts.¹⁴⁸ As might be expected they promptly repealed their constitution against the Friars.¹⁴⁹ Shortly thereafter Pope Nicholas IV drove the nail into the figurative casket and issued a privilege which stated that nobody who had left the Order could ever be elected prelate in another order.¹⁵⁰ Thus, by using its power in high places, the Order was, usually, able to obtain what it wanted no matter how significant or insignificant.

Franciscans' Service to the Pope

In addition to their primary purpose to provide spiritual guidance, both by example and by preaching, the Franciscans provided two important services to the Papacy. They could act as spies and messengers and they could act as inquisitors. The Franciscans were always travelling. While the average Franciscan did not travel as far or as often as Salimbene, as the Order expanded there was nothing so ubiquitous as a pair of Franciscans on the road.¹⁵¹ During a time of war and partial occupation by the enemy they provided an excellent messenger service. Earlier it was shown that the Papal legate, Lord Bernard, used Franciscans as a messenger to Lord Pinamonte.¹⁵² In 1235 a special messenger was sent to Gregory X to announce that the magistrates of Mantua had killed

¹⁴⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 629-630.

¹⁴⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 631.

¹⁵⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 632.

¹⁵¹ By the mid 1260's the population of Franciscans had grown to 17,500. (Brooke, *Early*, 283). Almost all of the major cities in the Italian peninsula had at least one convent. (Moorman, *History*, 155-162). With the large population of Franciscans spread over the peninsula there would always be some Franciscans on the road, either making pilgrimages to Assisi or for the transfer of individuals from convent to convent.

¹⁵² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 443.

their bishop.¹⁵³ In 1247 Salimbene, himself, acted as a messenger to Pope Innocent IV at Lyons, where he informed the Pope about the state of Parma, which, at the time, was being besieged by Frederick II.¹⁵⁴ Sometimes the messengers were sent out of the country. Brother John of Piano Carpine was sent by Innocent IV to the Tartars.¹⁵⁵ Being a messenger could be dangerous. Salimbene noted that in 1241 Frederick was keeping close watch over the roads in order to capture Church officials and many cardinals were captured by agents of Frederick. The agents of the Emperor captured Salimbene himself “many times during this period.” And he “thought out a method of writing letters in code out of pure caution.”¹⁵⁶

The Franciscans provided a second service to the Papacy; they acted as inquisitors. The Franciscans (and the Dominicans) had the advantage in searching out and convicting heretics that they had no close relationships with the populace which might have hindered their enthusiasm. In contrast to Dominic, who had created his Order as a means of fighting heresy, Francis had hardly referred to heresy at all. Preaching to him was a spontaneous manifestation of an interior life which accepted the created world and reflected a joy in nature. It was not long before the Church recognized this mental attitude as an indirect answer to the Cathar rejection of the world and the non-human Jesus. From this point on, the Franciscans came to play an important part in the war against heresy.¹⁵⁷

The Franciscans' ability to counteract heresy was made evident during the Great Halleluiah. The first series of mass executions in Italy began in the early 1230's yet many

¹⁵³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 65, 66.

¹⁵⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 29.

¹⁵⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 196-197.

¹⁵⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 164.

¹⁵⁷ Lambert, *Medieval*, 105.

people in Northern Italy doubted the legitimacy of criminal prosecution for heresy.¹⁵⁸ Until the early years of the twelfth century ecclesiastics themselves were divided on the question. With the publication of Gratian's *Decretum* in 1140, ecclesiastical opinion began to shift so that by the early years of the thirteenth century ecclesiastical opinion favoured the coercion of heretics. Lay opinion was slower to change and until the 1230's there was great resistance to the prosecution of heretics.¹⁵⁹ However preaching by the Mendicant Orders during the Halleluia of 1233 was able to overcome this resistance. John of Vicenza, the leading preacher, was particularly effective and had sixty Cathars burned at Verona. In September, the Dominican Peter of Verona was able to convince the Milanese to modify the city statutes to include a new statute on the punishment of heretics. With the help of the new statute he was able to have several heretics convicted and burned.¹⁶⁰ The chain of causal events is interesting. The preaching ability of the Mendicants led the populace to give them civic powers which, in turn, meant that they could add statutes against heresy to the law books. These laws allowed them to continue their perceived religious duties and prosecute heretics.

The Halleluia soon faded but the Franciscan and Dominican Orders had established themselves as an orthodox response to heresy. With the bishops' reluctance to prosecute heretics the Papacy increasingly came to depend on the Mendicants in their dispute with heretical ideas.¹⁶¹ Salimbene told us of Brother Phillip, a good honourable man, who lectured on theology. He was a successful inquisitor "seeking out heretics, and

¹⁵⁸ Peter D. Diehl, "Overcoming Reluctance to Prosecute Heresy in Thirteenth-Century Italy," in *Christendom and its Discontents, Exclusion, Persecution and Rebellion, 1000-1500*, ed. Scott L Waugh and Peter D. Diehl, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 48-49.

¹⁵⁹ Diehl, "Overcoming," 49.

¹⁶⁰ Diehl, "Overcoming," 59.

¹⁶¹ Diehl, "Overcoming," 59-60.

he captured, put to flight, and destroyed many of them on a region known as Similone."¹⁶²

The relationship between the Franciscans and the Papacy was similar to those that they had established with other segments of Northern Italian society. Both made use of the other's capabilities so that, as a unit, they were more powerful than when acting alone. The Franciscans' ability to make use of such synergy provides at least one reason for their great success.

¹⁶² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 444.

CHAPTER FOUR THE FRANCISCANS AND DISPUTES WITH THE SECULAR PRIESTHOOD

While the Franciscans gained the support of the superior members of the community and senior members of the Church, not all groups in Northern Italian society approved of the Franciscans. Salimbene's *Chronicle* states that even in its early years the Franciscan Order was in conflict with the secular clergy. The conflict appeared to be at its most severe with the parish priests whose income depended on day-to-day donations from local parishioners. Richard Trexler points out that both Pope Innocent IV and the great canonist Hostiensis were of the opinion that the income of parish churches was declining at this time.¹ Modern research shows that the two Church officials were correct. George Dameron points out that approximately one third of all parishes in Florence in the early thirteenth century did not provide enough income to support one priest at the level of an unskilled labourer.² While higher officials in the Church could call on the income from lands and other established wealth the local priest had no such ability. To live, the priest was forced to depend on mortuary income, testamentary legacies and altar offerings.³ As a result, the priests thought that any resources captured by the Franciscans were seen to be coming out of their pockets. However, Dameron argues that the extent of the conflict between the seculars and the Mendicants has been exaggerated and there has been a tendency to over emphasise the failures of the seculars even as the contribution of the Friars is overstated.⁴ R.N. Swanson agrees that the conflict has been exaggerated,

¹ Richard C Trexler, "The Bishop's Portion: Generic Pious Legacies in the Late Middle Ages in Italy," *Traditio*, XXVIII (1972), 400.

² Dameron, *Florence*, 128.

³ Dameron, *Florence*, 132.

⁴ Dameron, *Florence*, 9.

however he states that it cannot be ignored.⁵ While Salimbene certainly thought that the conflict was serious he had a tendency to overreact when the Franciscans were threatened. Even so, it seems that given the financial stress that the secular clergy were suffering the struggle was probably quite bitter. Hunger can increase one's anger.

The Franciscans and the Secular Clergy

While the majority of the conflict between the Franciscans and the secular clergy took place at the level of the parish priests, Salimbene told us that even some of the bishops were upset by the changes in society and the Church that the Franciscans were calling forth. In 1233 Gratia of Florence, Bishop of Parma, would frequently talk through the window with Salimbene's father as he walked by the Episcopal palace. The friendship was close enough that Salimbene's father received gifts from the Bishop. This friendship at first extended to Salimbene's brother, Guido, but after Guido joined the Order of the Friars Minor "he did not care for him any longer."⁶ As is so common with Salimbene, he provides this little fillip of information without any elaboration and leaves the reader guessing at his meaning. There are two obvious possibilities. One was that indeed the bishop did not care for the Franciscans. The other was that there was a personal reason for Guido's loss of friendship and that it merely occurred at the same time as he joined the Franciscans. The former seems most likely.

While Salimbene's little anecdote points out that friction had probably developed between the Franciscans and Gratia of Florence early in the Order's history, Salimbene

⁵ Swanson is of the opinion that there were two main bones of contention. Certainly there was an economic motive for the conflict. However he feels that the Friars, by a willingness to grant light penances and because of reputation for being willing to grant penances more easily, were gained popularity and undermined the secular priests' disciplinary control. In addition the laity just did not trust their priests. R.N. Swanson, *Religion and Devotion in Europe, c.1215-c.1515*, (Cambridge:Cambridge University Press,1995), 243-244.

⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 46.

does not tell us why the bishop may have disliked the Franciscans. He was not so reticent about two other conflicts that developed between the Franciscans and the secular priesthood. The first, which centered on the University at Paris, involved prestige and power. The second, while it certainly involved prestige and power, also involved money, which to some poor secular priests may have seemed more important.

Problems in Paris

The first conflict that Salimbene described took place in Paris, where the Mendicants' schools and the *universitas* came into conflict. Because many of the Friars were trained in Paris, this conflict was important to both of the Mendicant Orders. The *universitas* itself, was a new structure with its own guild of teachers, its own rules and a closed membership. The Mendicants had in turn established independent schools in Paris. The question then was how the new schools established by the Mendicants, who appointed their own teachers and refused to be subject to university discipline, fitted into the structure of the *universitas*.⁷

The Franciscans arrived in Paris about 1219 and soon found themselves absorbed into the life of the university. The first Franciscan master was Alexander of Hales who was already a master at Paris before accepting the habit.⁸ The Dominicans had arrived earlier and were establishing a school which followed the same pattern as the schools of the University. The Franciscans copied the Dominicans and in 1225, when four doctors of the university took the habit, were able to develop plans for their own school.⁹

⁷ Moorman, *History*, 124.

⁸ Burr, *Spiritual*, 4. Thomas of Ecclestone says that the master was Adam of Exeter while the *Chronicle of the 24 Generals* says that it was Alexander of Hales. Neither author gives a date but Thomas indicates that it took place near the same time that Adam Marsh entered the Order i.e. before 1232 and probably before 1226. Thomas of Ecclestone, "Coming", 109-110; 110 n 18.

⁹ Moorman, *History*, 125.

By 1229 there were two Mendicant schools at Paris, one Franciscan and one Dominican. Both schools were important to the Mendicants in Italy because Italian Friars were sent to Paris to study. Salimbene, himself, was sent to Paris to study but only spent a short time there, before leaving for Hyeres to learn more of Joachim from Brother Hugh of Digne.¹⁰ While most of the students of the Mendicants' schools were members of the two Orders, a few secular clerks were also admitted. At this time a dispute arose within the university itself, which resulted in the dispersion of the university. Since the two Church schools were not subject to university discipline they saw no reason to interrupt their work and continued on. By so doing, they drew into their schools any students who remained in Paris. When the university returned they found the Friars in a strengthened position.¹¹

Shortly after this, the Dominicans went a step further in claiming a strong position in the university. An English secular master, called John of St. Giles, was due to give a sermon in the Dominican church on the theme of voluntary poverty. In the midst of his sermon he descended from the pulpit and was invested with the habit of the Dominicans. This dramatic event caused a great problem because, by doing this, he created a second Dominican school that was teaching divinity, and many students were lost to the university. The Friars were also independent of the university and could not be relied upon to support the masters in the case of disputes between the regent masters and the

¹⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 202

¹¹ Moorman, *History*, 125.

Pope and/or the Bishop of Paris. In addition, they were able to charge smaller fees than secular teachers who depended on fees for their livelihood.¹²

The situation became even more serious in 1250, when the Pope granted an important privilege to the Friars. He ordered the chancellor of the university to grant the *licentia docendi* (License to preach) to such Friars who were eligible to receive it even though, through humility, they may have not applied for it. The university replied with a statute which stated that each religious college must be satisfied with one master and one school and forbade any bachelor from proceeding to a doctorate unless he had lectured in the school of one of the regent masters. This marked the beginning of a campaign which upset the work of the university and the Friars for many years.¹³

In a manner which resembled the conflict between the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor, over the next few years the university attempted to exert its authority over the Friars even as they, using the power of the Church and Papacy, attempted to express their independence. The climax came when the Chapter of Paris, under Orders from the Pope, suspended the whole body of secular masters and scholars.¹⁴

John of Parma's Speech in Paris

It was at this time that John of Parma intervened on behalf of the Franciscans. He came to Paris and addressed both the Friars and the university in the hope of making peace. That John of Parma, who was the minister general of the Order, felt that it was necessary to travel to Paris to settle what some might have considered a trivial and regional dispute indicates its seriousness. Salimbene provided us with a précis of his

¹² Moorman, *History*, 125-126. Moorman does not give a date for this event. However given the timing of the incidents that surround it in Moorman's *History* John's surprising act probably took place in the early part of the fourth decade.

¹³ Moorman, *History*, 126.

¹⁴ Moorman, *History*, 127.

speech. True to John's nature, the speech was humble and conciliatory. He ended the speech with an *exemplum*. A great rich and powerful king planted a plant in his garden which many wished to destroy. But the king built a wall around the garden so that the plant could prosper. John said that the king was the heavenly farmer while the garden was the Church of the Order of the Blessed Francis. However, the plant came from the learned masters because those in the Order learn from the scholars. He finished by saying:

You are our lords and masters; we, your servants, sons and disciples. And if we have any learning, we wish to acknowledge that it has come from you. I place myself and the Brothers who are under my rule under your discipline and correction.¹⁵

According to Salimbene they "were all satisfied and 'their spirit was appeased with which they swelled against' the brothers."¹⁶ Salimbene was both too optimistic about the result of John's sermon and slightly confused about the chronology of events. He contended that John's talk was given to answer the publication of a work by master Guillaume of St. Amour, called *De periculis novissimorum temporum*, a scathing denunciation of the Friars.¹⁷ It seems, rather, John's sermon was given before the publication of Guillaume's work and was not as successful as Salimbene said. John, of course, could only speak for the Franciscans and resistance to the Friars remained alive in the university. In 1254 the University sent a long circular letter to the leaders of the Church and all scholars setting out their grievances. They picked an auspicious time because Innocent IV was at that time considering limiting the powers of the Friars.¹⁸ However, when he died in December of that year, his successor Alexander IV

¹⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 299-300.

¹⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 300.

¹⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 299; Baird, "Notes," 664, n79.

¹⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 425.

immediately cancelled the letters that he had written to reign in the Friars.¹⁹ Then early in 1255 Alexander issued a bull *Quasi lignum vitae* which annulled the suspension of the Friars at Paris and reinstated the two Dominican doctors. In the face of such an overwhelming attack the university dissolved itself.²⁰

Further Disputes in Paris

The attempt at reconciliation by Brother John now was a thing of the past. The situation was exacerbated by the publication of a series of tracts which made the conflict no longer one of constitutional power but rather of the integrity of the Friars as a whole. In 1254 Brother Gerard of Borgo San Donnino published his infamous tract which called into question the existence of the Church in its present form.²¹ This weakened the case for the Friars and opened the door for William of Saint Amour to publish his tract which taught that "no men of a religious Order who lived on alms while preaching the word of God would be saved."²² Given the temper of the times it was very important that the Friars were being attacked as false apostles and forerunners of the antichrist.²³ This opened the floodgates for a pamphlet war with both sides producing pamphlet after pamphlet denouncing the position of the other side. As a result, the question morphed from one of the heresy of Gerard's tract with its extreme Joachite leanings to the question of the Franciscans' concept of poverty. Far from being settled, the controversy raged on for years.²⁴

¹⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 426.

²⁰ Moorman, *History*, 127-128.

²¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 229.

²² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 300.

²³ Moorman, *History*, 128.

²⁴ Moorman, *History*, 130.

Salimbene can be excused for his errors in timing and fact. He was not present at John's speech but rather was told of the events by master Benedict of Faenza, a physician who had studied in Paris for many years, and who greatly loved Brother John. Salimbene had never studied in Paris and, therefore, the events would have been somewhat remote to him. What was important was that he defend the Order and that his good friend, Brother John, was seen in a positive way.

The Franciscans and the Parish Clergy

Salimbene also revealed another conflict between the secular clerks and the Franciscans which involved something much more important to the poor parish priest than power and prestige: money. Salimbene provides us with the first glimpse of this dispute as he describes the last days of Innocent IV. Until the last days of his reign the Friars had considered Pope Innocent IV a friend because he had defended the Friars against the complaints of the secular clergy. According to Salimbene the secular clergy had complained to Innocent that "because these two Orders [the Friars and the Preachers] celebrate Mass so well that all the people turn to them." They asked that the Friars be forced to say Mass at a time when the seculars were not saying Mass. Innocent pointed out that since secular priests say Mass through the day it would be impossible to find a time when Mass was not being said. To the horror of the Friars, word later reached them that Innocent had changed his mind and was going to forbid the Friars and Preachers from opening their church doors from matins until after tierce.²⁵ The Minister General, John of Parma, sent Brother Hugh to Innocent in an attempt to have the letter in which the new regulations would be promulgated destroyed. Innocent refused and as Salimbene

²⁵ Salimbene was quick to point out that Innocent was planning to exempt the Friars from this Order. Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 425.

said: "because God wished to kill him as indeed he did."²⁶ By that he meant that in refusing to destroy the letter God was able to find a reason to kill him. To Salimbene's mind, God favoured the Franciscans over the Papacy and the secular Church.

Conflict at the Synod of 1260

This did not end the problem of the overlapping responsibilities. In 1260 a synod was called together by the Archbishop of Ravenna, at the instance of Pope Alexander IV, ostensibly to discuss the Church's reaction should the Tartars make aggressive moves against Christendom.²⁷ The council came to an agreement that all clergy who had prebends "would be required to help defend the Roman Church for the common good of Christianity against the Tartar threat."²⁸ In other words they would be expected to contribute money when requested. This demand for cash seems to have triggered a spontaneous outpouring of protest against the Mendicants.²⁹ The coincidence of a request for money and the spontaneous outburst against the Mendicants is significant and indicates that the secular clerks were feeling significant financial pressure from the Friars.

The clerks had four complaints and they admitted that all were related to their ability to earn their livelihood. The Brothers failed to teach the doctrine of tithes; they acted as confessors, which office properly belonged to the regular clergy; they gave burial to the dead; and they exercised the office of preaching, which also belonged to the secular clergy.³⁰ As might be expected this outburst from the secular clergy upset both

²⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 425.

²⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 404.

²⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 406.

²⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 406.

³⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 404.

Obizzo of San Vitale, the Bishop of Parma, and Lord Phillip, the Archbishop of Ravenna who had called the council together.

First the Bishop of Parma castigated the clergy present. He insisted that the actions of the Mendicants, far from being a hindrance to the secular clergy, were rather a help and assistance to them. The archbishop, who reacted in a rough manner to anyone who contradicted his wishes, also condemned the clergy with words that were not likely to reconcile differences.³¹

You stupid fools, I did not call you together so that you could rise up and attack those two Orders, who were sent by God to help your Church and to save the Christian people and all men who will be saved.³²

As might be expected the clergy did not accept these words with grace and continued to murmur against the Friars. The archbishop became even angrier and pointed out that, since so many of the clergy were immoral, it was necessary for the spiritual health of the population that the Friars be given the right to hear confession. He asked the question of the group:

Shall I allow the priest Gerard (who is here present) to hear the confessions of women when I know well that his house is filled with sons and daughters . . . And should such a man, this priest Gerard, be alone in such matters without any witnesses.³³

This message struck close enough to home that the council was able to adjourn without further disturbances, but the secular clergy's complaints were not forgotten.

³¹ Salimbene noted the harsh measures the archbishop took against any of his staff who made any mistake whatever. For example, his administrator was cast into prison where he was eaten by rats. Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 401

³² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 405.

³³ The archbishop's outburst would appear to support Swanson's contention that the laity did not trust their priests. Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 405.

Salimbene's First Defence of the Franciscans

Salimbene was not at the synod, but one day while he was on his way to Bologna, he met three archpriests who were his friends and acquaintances, and had been at the synod. As might be expected, with his curiosity ever alive, he questioned his companions about the conference. They remained bitter because they had received no satisfaction for their complaints. Quite the contrary, they had been forced to endure insults and slander. Salimbene reported that they asked him to visit with them in order to discuss their complaints and he was willing to comply.³⁴

The three archpriests reiterated the complaints of the clergy at Ravenna in even stronger terms than the clergy at Ravenna had done. While only the first two complaints were directly related to the income of the seculars, it seems clear that if the population was attending Mass conducted by the Friars and listening to them preach, it was likely that they would be less inclined to pay their tithes and be more inclined to be buried in graveyards associated with the Friars. While the incursion of the Friars into the provision of spiritual services normally supplied by the secular clergy had cost the secular clergy respect and a certain amount of money by the loss of tithes, the real financial loss came with the loss of sepulture. The Church did not live by everyday alms but by its landed investments and these were reinvigorated by the testamentary charity that went with sepulture.³⁵

Salimbene began his defence of the Friars by pointing out that it was hardly possible to introduce the subject of tithing into every sermon. While he admitted that tithing was commanded by divine law it was not up to the Friars to remind the people of

³⁴ Salimbene. *Chronicle*, 406.

³⁵ Trexler, "Portion," 408.

their duty. The clerks might as well "complain of us because we do not harvest and winnow your crops for you."³⁶ The secular clergy would only have a complaint if the Friars were actually preaching against the practice. He then went on to provide the biblical justification for tithing. However, the catch came at the end. The tithes were instituted by God to maintain a minimum level of support for the Church. When Salimbene saw the overabundance of food in the houses of the secular clergy and the great lands that they possess he could not "in conscience see how I could dare preach that a tenth should be given to them."³⁷ This feeling of distaste was made even stronger when he saw the riches being provided more readily:

to their rich relatives, to their lovers, concubines and whores than to Christ's poor. For I have gone through a whole year begging alms without receiving a crust of bread from men such as this . . . They prefer, however to lavish their goods on the hosts of minstrels and jongleurs³⁸

By referring to the errors of some of the seculars, Salimbene had very cleverly moved the blame from the Friars to the seculars. He used this method of argument frequently in his discussion of the conflict between the seculars and the Friars because he knew that it would be very successful. R. I Moore has argued that at the end of the eleventh century a fear of pollution, a fear that society was being subverted by mysterious enemies, gripped the population of Europe. The pollution of priestly incontinence and simony were high on the list of sources of pollution, because one's very salvation was at risk. While theology might have insisted that the sacraments provided by a simoniac or incontinent priest were

³⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 406.

³⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 408.

³⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 408-409.

valid it seems that Christian sentiment did not share that belief.³⁹ Salimbene was clever enough to be aware of this and make use of it.

Salimbene used the same technique of reversing an argument to solidify his justification of the Friars hearing the confessions of parishioners without obtaining the permission of their regular clergy. First, he pointed out that all confessions given in good faith are valid. Since the Pope had granted the power of absolution to the Friars, by doing so he had at the same time granted the right for sinners to go to those who had been given the power of absolution (the Friars). Otherwise the granting of the power of absolution to the Friars would have been meaningless. Once a man had confessed and been absolved by one who had been granted the power to do so by a higher authority he was no longer bound to confess to his local priest. If he were so bound, then the original confession would have been valueless and a double tribulation would arise. Since this was right neither in divine nor in human law it was not necessary for a man to confess to his own priest. To solidify his position, he pointed out that if a priest solicits a woman to sin and she confesses her sin to him she is in danger, and by doing so, again pointed out the errors of the secular clergy.⁴⁰ Again he turned the argument of the seculars around. Rather than the Friars being a problem, he made them out to be a solution to the public's mistrust of the secular clergy.

To reinforce his contention that the secular clergy had lost their right to a monopoly on hearing confession, Salimbene told two salacious tales of despicable behaviour by priests. The first was told by Pope Alexander IV to Brother Bonaventure⁴¹

³⁹ R.I Moore, "Family, Community and Cult on the Eve of the Gregorian Reform," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, Volume 30 (1980), 65-69.

⁴⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 411.

⁴¹ Bonaventure was Minister General of the Franciscans from 1257-1274.

when he was asked if he ever regretted that the Friars had been granted the right to hear confession. A woman, after confessing to a priest, was solicited by him to enter into an affair. She put him off and later sent him a pie filled with excrement which by a series of accidents was served to the bishop while he had guests. The result was that the priest's behaviour became known to the bishop and he was punished severely. Alexander in telling this story seemed to be saying that such things would not happen with the Friars as confessors.⁴² Again Salimbene has reversed the argument. The secular clergy are the problem rather than the Friars.

In the second story a woman was raped. After confessing her misfortune to her priest, she was in turn raped by him behind the altar. The same thing happened to her a second and a third time. Finally she was reduced to carrying a knife for self protection. When Father Humile, a Friar, questioned her about the knife she confessed her sins to him and she was absolved. Here the Friars not only provided a counterexample to the misbehaviour of the secular clergy but actual relief to the suffering woman.⁴³ In both cases, however, Salimbene had reinforced his arguments by providing examples of hideous behaviour by the secular priests and, by doing so, removed the blame for the dispute from the Friars and planting it firmly in the seculars' court.

His argument in favour of the Friars being allowed to preach was based almost entirely on the points previously made. First, he argued that the Papacy had given the right to the Friars, even though the Franciscan Rule stated that the Brothers were not to preach in any bishopric against the will of the bishop. Salimbene's argument was that while the secular clergy had the right to that office as long as there was no one better to

⁴² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 413.

⁴³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 415.

perform it that was no longer the case, because the seculars had made themselves unworthy to perform the office. They had not followed the ways of wisdom and did not have the divine wisdom necessary for the salvation of souls committed to their care. On the contrary they had turned to worldly knowledge. The only reason they studied the decretals was to increase their riches and ecclesiastical offices.⁴⁴ The Friars on the other hand had made the people accustomed to hearing preachers who were knowledgeable and who lived a good life. To emphasize his point he quoted Gregory saying that: "it follows that a man who leads a despicable life will be scorned in his preaching" and Jerome saying: "A man whose word is destroyed by his work loses credibility."⁴⁵ By raising the issue of the misbehaviour of the seculars Salimbene, again, removed the blame from the Friars and placed it firmly on those claiming damage, the secular priests.

Salimbene did not waste time or effort on circular arguments in defending the Friars' right to receive the bodies of the dead for burial in their convents, even though it was the most serious complaint that the seculars had made against the Friars. Multiple Popes including Leo III and Clement III had stated clearly that every man had the right to choose his own burial place, even if it was not connected with his family. The church providing sepulture and therefore receiving the bequest from the dead, was required to provide a share of the bequest to the church where the deceased had taken communion. Salimbene admitted that this was the case, but pointed out that the size of the share varied with "the reasonable custom of the region."⁴⁶ Of course the size of the share to be returned was the important point but Salimbene, as might be expected, glossed over this important point.

⁴⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 415-416.

⁴⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 430.

⁴⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 410.

The right of a home parish to a share of the deceased's bequest when he was buried away from the parish lot had been established in the decretals of Gregory IX. (1227-1241) The home church not only had a right to a share of the legacies left to the church providing sepulture, *pro anima* (for the soul) of the deceased but also to a share of the *funeralia* (monies received by the burial church during the course of the funeral observances themselves).⁴⁷ However, the decretals of Gregory said nothing about the size of the share that would be correct. From the writings of Innocent IV (1243-1253) and Hostiensis⁴⁸ two things were clear about the problem of sepulture. The law was vague and the income of parish churches from testaments was declining.⁴⁹ This was because so many bequests were privileged and could not be apportioned to the home parish. Monies donated between the living were exempt from apportionment Money given in the name of the deceased on the feast days of the Church could not be apportioned. Money given on the anniversary of death for church ornaments, for candle or oil, or in other words for anything connected with the cult of death could not be apportioned. Legacies not made in consideration of a church but because of a relationship or friendship were exempt. Grants left for the poor were to pass directly to the poor. Legacies for the crusade or legacies to churches outside the diocese were exempt from apportionment.⁵⁰

While each of these exemptions had rational motivations they also provided inviting loopholes and it seemed that the Friars were not beyond using these loopholes. Testators were encouraged to word their bequests in such a way that they were not subject to apportionment. The only way that the seculars could regain some of this money

⁴⁷ Trexler, "Portion," 400.

⁴⁸ Innocent IV was one of the foremost of the lawyer Popes. Hostiensis was one of the great experts on canon law during the thirteenth century.

⁴⁹ Trexler, "Portion," 400.

⁵⁰ Trexler, "Portion," 406.

was to fall back on a claim of fraud. Earlier canon law had provided examples of fraud. If a testator gave a small sum to the bishop but a large sum to others, fraud was present. Innocent IV gave another reason to suspect fraud. If a small sum was given to apportionable entities and a large amount to exempt places or privileged bequests, fraud was present.⁵¹ That these loopholes were being used became plain when Boniface VIII (1294-1303) in 1300 produced new legislation in his bull *Super cathedral*. He insisted that a quarter share of all bequests to the Friars be given to the home parish even if the deceased was buried in the local church. A standard means of fraud had been to leave gifts to single Friars for specific (in other words exempt) uses. After *Super cathedral*, these gifts to individuals were subject to apportionment.⁵² These changes were well in the future but give some indication of methods that the Friars had been using to increase their income at the time of Salimbene's discussion with the archpriests.

Salimbene ended his discussion with the archpriests with a description of the death of Innocent but not before telling a joke at the expense of the secular priests. He alleged that at one time when the secular clerks and prelates were gathered together in a synod a letter arrived in their midst. It read as follows: "the princes of darkness to the prelates of the Church. We send abundant thanks to you for as many souls as are to you committed, just so many are to us transmitted."⁵³ By insinuating that the secular clergy was somehow in league with the Powers of Darkness he was making use of the public's fear of eternal damnation. He was able to indicate that any favouritism granted to the Friars acted for the benefit of the population and any benefit to the Friars was incidental.

⁵¹ Trexler, "Portion," 407.

⁵² Trexler, "Portion," 410.

⁵³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 425.

Salimbene's Second Defence of the Franciscans

Some fifteen years later when Salimbene was living in Faenza, he was accosted by a man in secular life named Mantulino. Mantulino repeated the four complaints of the secular clergy against the Friars that had surfaced at the Synod in Ravenna. However two new related complaints were added to the list. The Friars made problems for the secular priests on solemn feast days because their conventional Mass drew away all of the offerings. Lastly the Friars were great ladies' men and like to look upon women and talk with them, which was against the teaching of Scripture.⁵⁴

Salimbene answered the first four complaints in a manner similar to the rebuttals he had provided those many years before. His answer to the new complaint that the populace preferred the Friars' Mass was to repeat the old grievances that most priests were unworthy. Some were usurers, others produced bastards. They took money that should be spent on church fixtures and spend it on themselves so that they have

small rusty tin chalices filled with bitter wine or vinegar for the Mass. And their holy wafers are so small that they can scarcely be seen between the fingers, and they are not round, but square, and moreover are befouled with fly specks.⁵⁵

His answer to the sixth criticism was to dismiss it as "malicious slander of those who seek to put 'blot on the elect.'"⁵⁶ Those who criticise are similar to the jongleurs, minstrels and the so-called court knights who think to excuse their vanity and lasciviousness by defaming others. This is not much of an argument and Mantulino emphasized that this was not a complaint made by a jongleur but the Bishop of Forli. This appears to have animated Salimbene to provide a better argument. He elaborated his argument by noting that the Mendicants are poor men who live by alms and women are

⁵⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 430.

⁵⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 430-431.

⁵⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 431. A paraphrase of Ecclesiasticus 11.33.

by their nature more compassionate toward the poor. Therefore the Mendicants received many of their alms from women. It was therefore necessary for them to go to women who were in need of consolation if the Friars were not to be considered ungrateful for the very alms received. To limit danger, however, they were forbidden to talk with women while drinking wine. It is interesting that Salimbene again equates the Franciscans with the poor. He then returned to the oft repeated theme that the secular clergy were corrupt and provided two examples of secular priests who had sinful relationships with women. To clinch his argument, he pointed out that he had never been in the house of Lord Marco Michelle, who was one of the leaders of society and one of the most powerful men in the city, while Matulino was a frequent visitor. So he asked "Who then is the greater ladies' man you or I."⁵⁷

Conclusion

While this ended the discussion with Matulino, the relationship between the seculars and the Friars remained fractious. Twenty seven years after the synod at Ravenna, the problem of the relationship between the Friars and the seculars remained troublesome. To the horror of the Friars, word had reached them that Pope Honourius IV was going to issue a letter to the Friars and Preachers taking away their right to hear confessions and to preach. This was supposedly being done at the beckoning of "prelates beyond the mountains"⁵⁸ who had spent a hundred thousand pounds to bribe the Pope. This would certainly have been a financial blow to both Orders. To those who felt it a moral duty to preach and minister to the populace it also would also have meant a condemnation of their choice of life. The rumour appears to have been untrue: however

⁵⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 433.

⁵⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 636.

the brothers "gave themselves up wholly in prayer to God beseeching help in the critical time."⁵⁹ When Honorius died on the fourth day of Holy Week, 1287, there was great relief in both Mendicant Orders.

This problem of overlapping responsibilities for pastoral service and the realizing of money from providing pastoral services was not settled for a long time and was not limited to Italy. In 1301 a dispute arose between the rector of the Church of St. Saviour York and the prior and brothers of the Order of St Mary of Mount Carmel, York. It seemed that the brothers had erected a priory within the parish of St Saviour without permission of the rector. While the complaint does not say so, it seems likely that St. Saviour noted a reduction in weekly collections. Both parties referred the complaint to Rome but a compromise was reached. A fee was paid to St. Saviour by the brothers and they were allowed to stay.⁶⁰ This seemed to indicate that the problem was one of finance rather than one of prestige.

A century later the problem was still present. In 1402 a parish priest in the Diocese of Lincoln petitioned his bishop to force certain Friars to provide him with the one quarter share of a nobleman's armour and horse which was their due. The Friars had carried off the body to their convent, no divine service was held in his home parish, and the Friars would not relinquish the share that the common right of the Church demanded.⁶¹ The more things changed the more they stayed the same.

It seems likely that Salimbene did not exaggerate the conflict between the seculars and the Mendicants. The outburst at the synod in 1260 appears to have been spontaneous

⁵⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 636.

⁶⁰ John Shinnors and William Dohar eds., *Pastors and the Care of Souls in Medieval England*, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998), 117-120.

⁶¹ Shinnors, *Pastors*, 117.

and closely related to the question of money. That the priests would rebel so openly against an archbishop who did not hesitate to use brutal punishment to obtain his way says much about the intensity of their opinions. In addition the dispute appeared to have had a long life. It was still prevalent in the fourteenth century in spite of the attempts of senior Church officials to solve it. There seems to be no question that the secular priests were suffering. Given Salimbene's bias in favour of the Franciscans, it is not possible to say with any certainty that this was entirely due to the Franciscans. His *Chronicle* merely confirms that there was a conflict with the secular priesthood which continued for decades. Moore's work would argue that the suffering of the seculars was at least partially due to the public's loss of trust in the seculars and a coincident fear of them. Whether this was due to the Franciscans or not does not matter. What matters is that the secular priests thought that it was the case.

CHAPTER FIVE SALIMBENE, THE FRANCISCANS AND NEW RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS

Just as the secular clergy resented the Franciscans, the Franciscans themselves felt much the same way about any new religious movements that came into being and threatened their position as part of the established structure of Church and government. Any loss of prestige could lead to a loss of monetary contributions from society and, in addition, many Franciscans would feel that it was a personal affront. The Franciscans saw any assets that the new religious movements were able to obtain as a threat to their own financial well-being. An examination of this conflict also provides us with an idea on what characteristics the Church expected in an ideal order. An order itself, like its individual members, was to be both useful and obedient.

The fourth Lateran Council in 1215 banned the approval of new religious movements by the Church. In spite of this, many spontaneous religious movements came into being throughout the thirteenth century. These popular movements did not always meet with enthusiasm from what can be called the regular clergy, the professed religious of Latin Christendom. Monks and Friars could not remain indifferent to these movements because if the populace deemed their response to the new movements inappropriate, their relationship with the laity, (especially the rich, famous and powerful) or the Papacy might have been compromised.¹

Gary Dickson discerns three attitudes that monks and Friars assumed toward popular religious enthusiasm: "negation, including mockery, derision, denunciation, and accusations of heresy; affirmation, including praise, endorsement, support, and evident

¹ Gary Dickson, "Encounters in Medieval Revivalism: Monks, Friars and Popular Enthusiasts," *Church History*, 68:29 (June, 1999) 265.

desire to take part and outright participation; and charismatic dominance."² By charismatic dominance he is referring to the situation in which a recognized holy man or woman who belonged to some recognized branch of the clergy (either secular or regular) either initiated a revivalist movement or took charge of a pre-existing one. According to Dickson, monastic or Mendicant leadership of a popular movement was achieved when a doubly charismatic individual "that is charismatic both personally and by virtue of his or her office . . . achieved a precarious mastery over the religious crowd."³

It is possible to see all of these attitudes in Salimbene's and the Franciscans' reactions toward new religious movements. The attitude taken seems to be a function of whether the new order was a threat to the Franciscan's place in society. However, there is a fourth reaction that can be observed in Salimbene's work. Sometimes the Franciscans simply ignored the new order.

Marc Boriosi emphasizes this polemic attitude toward other religious movements in Salimbene's work. He posits that it was possible to see three main parties in the Franciscan Order at the time of Salimbene. First, the spirituals, many of whom were followers of Joachim of Fiore, who rejected any rule but the early rules of Francis, felt that his *Testament* must be followed to the letter and who ruled out the acceptance of any privileges granted by the way of papal orders since the death of Francis. Secondly there was the party which consisted of the majority of Franciscans who looked only to live a spiritual life and wished to follow the rules as promulgated by the minister and provincial generals. Finally, there was a clan of university doctors who were greedy for special privileges, and who wished to turn the Order into an institution whose sole purpose was

² Dickson, "Encounters," 265.

³ Dickson, "Encounters," 268.

to serve the Church by providing pastoral care to the laity. However, the boundaries between these three groups were not sharply defined and there was a wide range of opinions in each party. He is unable to place Salimbene in any of these groups and this may be an indication that Salimbene was truly a reflection of the Order. What Boriosi sees instead is a man at the end of his life defending his choices in life.⁴ One is never sure on which side of a dispute he will fall. This is certainly evident when his responses to new religious orders are examined.

Whether the Order shared Salimbene's feelings toward new movements is a question that must be examined. In most cases, it seems that, just as Boriosi observed, Salimbene's reactions to new movements were similar to that of the Order. The only difference was one of degree. Salimbene's reactions to new orders ranged from dismissal to derision to wholesale approval, and appears to have been predicated on whether the new movement was felt to be a threat to the Franciscans' place in society. The Franciscans were Salimbene's new family, and when he felt that a new movement threatened his new family, his denunciation of the new movement could be thunderous. In a similar manner, when the Franciscans thought that a new movement was dangerous to their position in society they attempted to bring the whole weight of the Church and secular government upon it before it could gain significant influence. This chapter examines the Franciscans' and Salimbene's reactions to several new religious movements to discover how they resembled my proposed model.

⁴ Mark Boriosi "The *Cronica* de Fra Salimbene, Une "Cronique-Polemique"?", *Collectanea Franciscana* 66 :1-2 (1996), 141-143.

The Great Halleluiah

The Great Halleluiah is one example of a religious movement in which the Mendicant Orders were able to take charge of an existing revivalist order. Earlier in this thesis, its origin was described and it was noted that the movement began as spontaneous religious movement, which then became a religious order with political overtones as the Mendicants assumed control and actually became secular administrators.⁵

With the departure of Benedict, the forerunner of the movement, revivalist preachers spread out across Northern Italy preaching morning, noon and night and triggering an eruption of spiritual enthusiasm that was not seen again for three decades. The two most important leaders of the movement after the departure of Benedict were Brother John of Vicenza and Brother Gerard of Modena.⁶ These two men assumed leadership of the movement and their popular appeal was such that over time they were able to assume the civil leadership of several cities.

The assumption of overt control of a movement that began as a spontaneous movement was not something that could develop in an impromptu fashion. It required careful management by the man or men involved. In addition, for a man or men to take over a religious movement required an auspicious alignment of events. The population had to be desperate for a solution to seemingly insoluble problems and, even more important, men had to be available with the answers that were acceptable to the populace as a whole. Plainly this was the case here, because the new leaders of the Great Halleluiah were able to advance even further and assume control of civic government.

⁵ See pages 82-84 above.

⁶ Thompson, *Revival*, 33.

Even though it eventually ended in failure, his joy at the events of the revival is evident in Salimbene's record.

Salimbene's reaction to the Great Halleluiah is complex. Certainly he was overjoyed that the Franciscans had attained such power. However this approval of the Franciscans' success is combined with a strong personal element. He was a young boy at the time of the events that he depicted and exciting events from boyhood have an effervescence which is not as evident in those that occur in later life. Only four years later he joined the Franciscans. It seems likely that his own conversion to Franciscanism was triggered by the miracles, charismatic preaching, peacemaking and the ardent evangelism that he witnessed. That he did so against the wishes of his father is an indication of the depth of his conviction.⁷

The Flagellant Movement

Another religious revival, the flagellant movement, also received accolades from Salimbene. The reaction of the Franciscans to this movement while superficially similar was different from their reaction to the Halleluiah. Certainly they took part in the processions, but they did not overtly take charge of the movement. The movement remained, to a large extent, a spontaneous outbreak of spirituality and no evident leaders arose. However, the Mendicants were able to make use of the movement over the next century to act as a catalyst for the development of confraternities. In that way, they took charge of the flagellants and made use of them as a tool to promote their own expansion.

⁷ Dickson, "Encounter," 267. Delno C. West Jr. "The Education of Fra Salimbene of Parma: The Joachite Influence," in *Prophecy and Millenarianism, Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves*, ed Ann Williams (Burnt Hill, Harlow: Longman, 1980), 195.

According to Salimbene the flagellant movement began in 1260 in Italy and spread rapidly "throughout the whole world."⁸ Even allowing for his hyperbole there does not seem to be any doubt that the movement spread rapidly through Europe. While in many ways this movement was similar to the Great Halleluiah it differed in one fundamental fashion. Again, men of all positions in society, both noble and common went in procession led by the bishops and men in religious orders, but in this case instead of singing they were naked and were whipping themselves. The emphasis in the Great Halleluiah movement was on praise while the flagellant movement was a penitential movement. It certainly flourished. Priests were overwhelmed by the number of people who confessed. Songs of praise were sung, peace was made and men restored their ill-gotten gains. In a fashion similar to the Great Halleluiah, flags were made for each parish and men moved in a parade from town to town singing and whipping themselves.

The parades were not limited to the clerics. The *podestà* of Modena and the bishop together led a march through the city of Reggio.⁹ This seems to have aroused the enthusiasm of the citizens of Reggio because they then made "flags for every parish" and along with their *podestà* "went in procession through the city" before moving on to Parma.¹⁰

Salimbene was living in the convent in Modena in 1260 and with the permission of his guardian some of his friends from Sassuolo led him to their town "because they – Both the men and women – loved me dearly."¹¹ Later they took him to Reggio and Parma and while he was in Parma, the movement took place there. It appears that Salimbene,

⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 474.

⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 474.

¹⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 474, 475.

¹¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 474.

himself, was conscripted to lead the band of flagellants as they moved from town to town. The movement lasted for several days and "there was no one so stern or so old that he did not gladly whip himself."¹² If anyone refused to whip himself, he was considered to be "worse than the devil." Salimbene confided that "some misfortune usually befell those who would not scourge themselves, so that they died or became gravely ill."¹³ Dickson points out that in some cases the flagellant movement was seen as a crusade against heresy and therefore it had become a supreme test of loyalty to the Church and to the faith.¹⁴

Given that the flagellant movement was seen by some to be an arm of the Church, it is not surprising that not all secular leaders were as enthusiastic about the movement as was the *podestà* of Modena. Those who were in opposition to the Papacy's aims would feel threatened by such a movement. Pellavicino, who was ruling Cremona at the time, had gallows erected along the banks of the Po and issued orders to hang any flagellant that crossed. This understandably upset some of the more enthusiastic young men of Parma who were determined to cross, "gladly ready to die for the Catholic faith and divine honour in remission of sins."¹⁵ The *podestà* of Parma sent public criers throughout the city prohibiting anyone, under heavy penalty, from crossing the river. He did this for two purposes: to save his young men from death and so that Pellavicino would not have an opportunity to do evil.¹⁶ Salimbene and the Church were to have their revenge, however. In 1267, a peace settlement was reached through the mediation of the Papal

¹² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 475.

¹³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 475.

¹⁴ Gary Dickson, "The Flagellants of 1260 and the Crusades," *Journal of Medieval History*, 15(1989), 248.

¹⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 475.

¹⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 475.

legate between the exiles from Cremona and those within the city. As a result Pellavicino was deposed. Salimbene traced his loss of power to the erection of the gallows that were to act as a warning to the flagellants.¹⁷

The flagellant movement was similar to the Great Halleluiah movement in that it seems to have begun as a spontaneous upwelling of spirituality which involved the whole community and was at least partially a reaction to the war and the resulting instability in the community. What separates the origin of this movement from the Halleluiah was the absence of any catalyst such as Brother Bartholomew.

The penitential nature of the movement is made clear by two details of the movement. Miracles do not seem to have been prevalent during the time of the flagellants, if they were present at all. In addition, there do not seem to have been any outstanding individual preachers that stood out in Salimbene's memory.

Norman Cohn suggests that the famine of 1258 and the outbreaks of plague in 1259 may have been a trigger for the welling up of religious enthusiasm.¹⁸ John Henderson argues that the political state of Italy, which was constantly torn by the Guelph-Ghibelline struggle, was the trigger for the movement.¹⁹ Gary Dickson traces the beginning of the movement to the battle between the Sieneese and Florentines in September 1260 in which the Sieneese scored an unexpected victory after performing "a virtual paroxysm of communal penance."²⁰ He explains that some Perugians had been fighting on the side of the Florentines and shortly after the battle the population of

¹⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 484.

¹⁸ Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1970) 128; quoted in John Henderson, "The Flagellant Movement and Flagellant Confraternities in Central Italy, 1260-1400," in *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian: Papers Read at the Sixteenth Summer Meeting and the Seventeenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. Derek Baker, (Oxford: The Ecclesiastical History Society, 1978), 149.

¹⁹ Henderson, "Flagellant," 149.

²⁰ Dickson, "Flagellants," 232.

Perugia took to the streets in an outburst of lay devotion. However there are indications that the exuberance predated the battle. An edict was issued on May 4 that proclaimed a general holiday for fifteen days to be utilised for devotion.²¹ It is likely that the movement was the result of many causes but as Andrew Gow said: "sparks from outside may have occasioned mass outbreaks of flagellantism but the religious tinder was already present."²² Each city had to be primed with the ingredients for a native enthusiasm or the movement would not have been able to progress from city to city.

Even though Salimbene, himself, seems to have led one of the processions on its way from city to city, his personal enthusiasm for the movement appears to have been minimal. In this he was not unique. Henderson points out that the chroniclers of the movement almost seem detached in their description of the flagellants.²³ Reeves notes that Salimbene, like all other contemporary chroniclers of the flagellants, found the movement mysterious and puzzling.²⁴ Certainly Salimbene's reaction to the flagellant movement differed from his reaction to the Great Halleluiah. He only devoted a few paragraphs to it and his language was restrained. He said that "all men, both great and small, noble and common, went in procession, naked, whipping themselves through the cities . . . and peace was made and men restored their ill gotten gains."²⁵ In contrast his enthusiasm for the Halleluiah was hardly restrained. He referred to it as a

²¹ Henderson, "Flagellant," 150.

²² Andrew Gow, "Popular Persuasions: Flagellants and the Construction of Sanctity in Latin and Orthodox Christendom," in *Fonction Sociales et Politiques du Culte des Saints dans les Societes de Rite Grec et Latin au Moyen Age et a l'Epoque Modern. Approche Comparative*, ed. Mark Derwich and Michel Dmitrev, Institutum Historicum Universitatis Wratislaviensis : Opera ad Historiam monasticam spectantia, Series 1, Colloquia 3. (Wroclaw: Pracownia Badan and Dziejami Zakonow i Kongregacji Kosielnych, 1999), 459.

²³ Henderson, "Flagellant," 153-154.

²⁴ Reeves, *Prophecy*, 55.

²⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 474.

time of happiness and joy, gladness and rejoicing, praise and jubilation, of quiet and peace, with all weapons laid aside. . . even the knights and soldiers sang songs and divine hymns . . . huge companies of men and women, boys and girls, came to the city from the villages . . . and they walked about as men saved."²⁶

Since the flagellant movement was a penitential movement and the Great Halleluiah was one that emphasized praise and rejoicing, given Salimbene's predilections, it is not surprising that he would prefer the latter to the former.

However, the flagellant movement was very important to him because it reaffirmed his apocalyptic beliefs in Joachim of Fiore.²⁷ For Salimbene the flagellant movement signified the beginning of the third division of history as prophesied by Joachim of Fiore. The third *status* was to be ruled by the Holy Spirit and as Salimbene said "the flagellant movement which took place in the year 1260, Indiction III, began, they say, this third age, when the flagellants called themselves voices 'of a God and not of a man.'"²⁸ For a man who had supposedly cast off his belief in Joachim, this statement is remarkable. Salimbene is, if nothing else, undecided about Joachim.

The flagellant movement took place during an unprecedented period of Joachist agitation during which the papal commission had banned Gerald of Borgo San Donnino's work, the trial of John of Parma took place, and Joachim of Fiore's prophetic teachings had been condemned at the provincial council of Arles. Dickson disagrees with Raoul Manselli's opinion and contends Joachism or some form of pseudo-Joachism played a significant part in the coming of the movement.²⁹ He cites a text that corroborates

²⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 47.

²⁷ According to Reeves, Salimbene and Milioli were the only Chroniclers who specifically connected Joachim's prophecies with the flagellant movement. Indeed since the devotions were focussed on the Virgin and the Humanity of Christ rather than the third figure of the trinity it appears that it was the wrath of God that was expected rather than the Age of The Holy Ghost. Reeves, *Prophecies*, 54-55.

²⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 476.

²⁹ Raoul Manselli, "L'anno 1260 fu anno gioachimento? in *Il movimento dei disciplinati nei vii centenario dal suo inizio*. (Perugia: 1962), 99-108. noted in Dickson, "Flagellants," 253.

Salimbene which, while pretending to describe the Perugian origins of the flagellants, also sounds a characteristic note of eschatological anxiety.³⁰ What was strange about Salimbene's commentary on the flagellants is that he failed to mention the place of their origin, even as he emphasised the importance of the year 1260. Dickson insists that this is an indication of an habitual association in his mind between the flagellants and Joachim's emphasis on the importance of the year 1260. To Dickson, the pilgrimage and mission of the flagellants are evidence of a transmutation of the Joachite speculation into a popular apocalyptic anxiety centered on the year 1260. It enabled the flagellants to rationalize as well as internalize the crises which were the precondition for a revival.³¹

The flagellant movement differed from the Halleluiah in another way. The Halleluiah movement arose quickly, was taken in hand by the Mendicants, and in the space of a year disappeared. The flagellant movement, however, while it did not burn quite so brightly as the Halleluiah movement, had greater staying power. According to Henderson, the most significant legacy of the 1260 movement was the inspiration it provided for the foundation of confraternities which were becoming characteristic of Italian religious life. They were not, of course, an isolated phenomenon because confraternities belong in the same tradition as guilds on the one hand and the penitents and the "third orders" on the other hand.³² While only a few confraternities can trace their origins to specific events, the 1260 movement appears to have been an immediate impetus to the formation of *laudesi* companies whose main function was to sing lauds in

³⁰ E. Ardu, "Frayter Raynerus Faxanus de Perusio," in *Il movimento* 1962, 84-98. Quoted in Dickson, "Flagellants," 255.

³¹ Dickson, "Flagellants," 256-257.

³² Henderson, "Flagellant," 155.

the vernacular to their patron saints.³³ These companies were founded sometime before the majority of the flagellant companies, but by the first half of the fourteenth century the flagellant companies had become common. Henderson posits that by that time a difference had developed between Christ's role as envisaged by the popular imagination of 1260 and his role in the confraternities. Rather than a remote deity determined to punish erring humanity, He came to be seen more as the Redeemer, the Son of God, who was prepared to suffer death so that mankind could be saved. Flagellation, then, was seen less as a form of penance than as a way of sharing His suffering.³⁴ Again, however, the Mendicants had been able to exercise what Dickson calls charismatic dominance. They had taken a form of religious fervour and adopted it to their own needs. Even though the flagellant movement was a distinctly different movement from the Great Halleluiah, the Franciscans were able to use a similar strategy in answer to both. This is another indication of the adaptability, which enabled them to survive and prosper.

Salimbene's reactions to the flagellants was ambivalent. Certainly he welcomed them as an indication that Joachim's prophecies were accurate. He may have been upset at some of Joachim's early failures at forecasting the exact time for events but even at the end of his life he never ceased referring to the flagellants and Joachim's third age in the same breath. However, his actual reaction to the flagellants remained cool in spite of his being commandeered into leading one of the parades. He appears to have welcomed the peace between men and the many conversions that resulted from the movement. There is no indication that he saw it as anything more than a movement useful to the Church. However his coolness toward the movement may also have stemmed from his antipathy

³³ This is surprising since the two movements would seem to be quite different. One was a movement for praising while the other was a penitential movement. Henderson, "Flagellant," 156

³⁴ Henderson, "Flagellant," 156-157.

toward the laity and those of lower status in the community since the flagellant movement was dominated by the laity. This may also explain his reticence about the confraternities associated with the movement. At this time they were an expression of lay piety and had not yet been taken in charge by the Mendicants. Even so, they were a common feature of Italian society at the time and their number appears to have increased at the time of the flagellants. Yet Salimbene remained silent about them when he was willing to discuss many other seemingly less significant events. In many ways he certainly remains an enigma.

The Godenti

The Franciscans did not always adopt new religious orders and make use of them to increase their influence in Italian society. Sometimes, if the new movement was inconsequential, it was simply easier to ignore it.

Another order that developed at the time of the Great Halleluiahs was called the Order of the Knights of Jesus Christ. This order was started by Brother Bartholomew of Viacenza, a Dominican who had a large convent in Parma. Salimbene refers to him as a good man and notes that he later became the Bishop of Viacenza. This order began in Parma and seems to have remained small before dying out.³⁵

Sometime after the first order died out, another order that resembled it began under the guidance of Brother Riffino Gorgone of Piacenza, a Friar Minor. The members of this new order wore the same uniform as the earlier order and like them had white saddles with red crosses. Membership in the later order, as in the previous order, was limited to those who had been knights. While those in the new order called themselves

³⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 477. I have been unable to find any reference to this Order in the secondary literature.

the Order of the Knights of St Mary, the populace, as Salimbene sneers, called them Godenti,³⁶ because as he said "they do not wish to share their goods with others but to have them solely to themselves."³⁷ It might be expected that Salimbene, with his predilection for favouring the rich and well born, and because the order was started by a Franciscan would have shown some partiality for this order. This was far from the case. He said in a scoffing manner that they "believed that by joining the order they had accomplished a great and wonderful thing."³⁸ He pointed out that the order was not favoured by the curia for five reasons. They had never used their riches for good purposes. They had robbed other men and even after joining the order had not made restitution. After wasting all their resources, they had petitioned the curia to obtain the convents of more worthy orders. They were avaricious men and, as the apostle Paul says, "the desire of money is the root of all evils."³⁹ Finally they were of no use to the Church except, perhaps, to save their own souls.⁴⁰ In spite of their supposed little moment in the curia, they were confirmed and their Rule adopted in 1261.⁴¹ Given Salimbene's propensity for hyperbole, the confirmation of the Order might have been expected to set off a torrent of rage. However, he dismissed them from his *Chronicle* with a pun and moves on to what he considers more important matters.⁴²

The Godenti appear in cameo roles in the years following. A monk murdered in 1287 was a member of the Godenti Order in Reggio.⁴³ Later in the same year there was a

³⁶ Also called the Jovial Friars.

³⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 477. Godenti is the past participle of the Italian verb "to enjoy." To the populace the Order was concerned more with extravagant consumption than with spirituality.

³⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 477.

³⁹ Timothy 6.10 quoted in Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 477.

⁴⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 477-478.

⁴¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 476.

⁴² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 478.

⁴³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 633.

dispute over the possession of the church of St. Nicholas in Reggio between Conrad Canini de Palude, William de Foligiani, the bishop of Reggio, and the Godenti. While Salimbene found the Godenti laughable and self-serving, he did not find them threatening.⁴⁴ It appeared that the citizens of Bologna agreed, because in 1288 they stripped them of their exemptions from taxes on inheritances and real estate.⁴⁵

This probably explains why the Order was accepted by both the Franciscans and Salimbene. The populace, by their choice of nickname for the group, showed that they, too, had contempt for this Order. Again, an order that limited itself to a small select group of the population and whose members were seen to be self-serving and lax posed no threat to the Franciscan Order. For a religious organization that had so little possibility of development, it was not even worth the effort to ridicule them. They could be simply ignored.

The Order of the Sack

The same can not be said for the Order of the Sack.⁴⁶ The Franciscans saw this Order as a significant competitor for the hearts and minds as well as the pocket books of the populace. In conjunction with the secular clergy they were able to bring the whole weight of the Church upon the new Order and force it to resign from the field. Once it

⁴⁴ Salimbene was not the only writer who made unpleasant comments about the Godenti. Dante in his *Inferno* describes a Fra Alberigo, a member of the Godenti, who because he arranged for the assassination of his dinner guests had his soul immediately transported to Hell even as his body continued to live on the earth. Dante, *Inferno* XXXII, 120-132.

⁴⁵ Thompson, *Cities*, 95.

⁴⁶ Some of the earliest work on the Order of the Sack by Richard Emery relies upon Salimbene along with the records from the Council of Lyons in 1274 and various papal registers. Richard W. Emery, "The Friars of the Sack," *Speculum*, 18:3(July, 1943), 323-334. Later work done by Boriosi, in his analysis of Salimbene's *Chronicle* makes use of the history of the Order of the Sack to emphasize his point that Salimbene wrote his *Chronicle* in a manner that would justify the Franciscans' actions with respect to other Religious orders. Boriosi, "*Cronica*," 127-165.

had agreed to changes that limited its threat to both the Franciscans and the secular clergy it was allowed to continue to function until its end.

According to Salimbene, this Order had its beginning in 1248 in Hyeres. The first member was inspired by a sermon of Brother Hugh of Digne and he first asked to become a member of the Friars Minor. He was refused and went off to start his own order.

Salimbene says that they went and made multicoloured robes for themselves and set off begging in the town. They were remarkably successful and as Salimbene said "these [The Brother of the Sack] are suddenly greatly magnified." Salimbene reasoned the Order's success stemmed from the training that the Dominicans and Franciscans had given the people. Mendicancy had been taught to all men.⁴⁷

However, Salimbene contradicts himself. In a later entry in the *Chronicle* he said that the first man of the Order of the Sack was called Raymond Attanulfi, a native of Hyeres. He was a knight in the secular world and at one time had been a Friar Minor. During his novitiate he had been released from the Order because, Salimbene said, he was ill. Salimbene even names Raymond's companion. Raymond's son was also a member of the Order of the Sack and later went on to become the Archbishop of Arles.⁴⁸ Plainly the Order was not totally excluded from the Church hierarchy.

Salimbene had two main complaints against the Order. First, their clothes were not acceptable for an Order that was sworn to poverty. They made their robe out of fine linen, not of goathair, and, underneath, they wore the best kind of garments. Their sandals were similar to those that the Franciscans wore. This probably bothered the good brother more than the robe. As he said, "whenever someone wishes to start a new order they

⁴⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 248

⁴⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 249.

always take something from the Order of St. Francis – either the sandals, or the cord, or the robe.”⁴⁹ Secondly, they provided competition for the Friars Minor. Not only were they successful in begging but they were sought out for their preaching and in order to hear confessions. Salimbene puts these words into a “spiritual daughter” of the Friars. “In truth Brothers, I say to you that we already had so many sacks and scraps emptying our barns that we have no need of these Brothers of the Sack.”⁵⁰ Salimbene’s abhorrence of all who were not of an acceptable status shines forth in the sentence.

Eventually in a Church council at Lyons in 1274, the Order of the Sack was ordered to disband. Those members, who wished, could stay in the Order but the Order was ordered not to accept new members. Thus the Order was bound to die and orders that have no future tend to be of little significance in the present. Salimbene applauded the obedience of the Brothers of the Order of the Sack and explained that the end of the Order was legislated, because the Pope did not want too many Mendicants putting a burden on secular society.⁵¹

There is a little more to the end of the Order than Salimbene reveals. In 1251 Innocent IV ordered the Bishops of Marseilles and Toulon to grant a Rule to the new group and this was done on May 10 of the same year.⁵² In addition, the Order had actually been granted a license to preach by Pope Alexander IV. By 1274 the Order had a large number of establishments in Western Europe.⁵³ Just before the opening of the Council at Lyons, Alexander put the Order under his personal protection. Yet shortly

⁴⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 248.

⁵⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 249.

⁵¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 263.

⁵² Emery, “Friars,” 325.

⁵³ Early research had placed the number of convents at seventy four. G. M. Giacomozzi, *L'Ordine della Penitenza di Gesui Cristo*, (Roma, 1962), 254 quoted in Boriosi, “*Cronica*”, 156. Later research has indicated that the number of convents was in excess of one hundred. Richard W. Emery, “A Note on the Friars of the Sack,” *Speculum*, 35:4 (October, 1960) 591-594.

after the beginning of the debates at Lyons, by virtue of Canon 23, the Order was ended.⁵⁴ Marc Boriosi says that the reason can be seen in the statement that Salimbene put into the mouth of his spiritual daughter. Having solid popular support and a solid administrative structure, the Brothers of the Sack provided too much competition both to the Franciscans and to the secular Church. Therefore, as was explained by Micheline de Fontette, there was no option but to sacrifice the Brothers of the Sack to an "Altar of Friendship."⁵⁵ Richard Emery sees things slightly differently. He agrees that there was no indication that the Order of the Sack was destroyed because of any inherent fault. However, many of the assembled clerics at Lyons felt bitterly toward the whole Mendicant movement. The Franciscans and the Dominicans were too firmly ensconced in the ecclesiastical establishment to be removed but newer and smaller orders were more vulnerable.⁵⁶ These two explanations are not in total disagreement. If the Franciscans felt that the Order of the Sack were developing into a threat to the Franciscans' position in society, nothing would have prevented them from making use of the innate bitterness of the secular clergy toward the smaller Mendicant Orders. After the Order ceased to be a threat to the Friars Minor, Salimbene could discuss them with less than his usual acerbic style.⁵⁷

This Order threatened to become a real competitor for the Franciscans. In spite of their sumptuous clothing, they appeared to be quite popular and, from the comments of Salimbene's "spiritual daughter" were beginning to interfere with the money and goods

⁵⁴ Giacomozzi, 284. Quoted in Boriosi, "*Cronica*," 156.

⁵⁵ Micheline de Fontette, "Religionum diversitatem et la Suppression de Ordres Mendicants in 1274 *Annee Charniere. Mutations et Continuites*, (Actes du Colloque International du CNRS 518 : Paris, 1977), 227, Quoted in Boriosi, "*Cronica*," 156.

⁵⁶ Emery, "Friars," 327.

⁵⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 263.

that the Franciscans had obtained from their efforts. Luckily for the Franciscans, the secular Church also saw the Order of the Sack as a threat and a merger of their two efforts to get the better of the Order of the Sack was possible.

The "False Prophet" Albert

Not all religious movements were so easily overcome. Some movements developed so quickly that the Franciscans, while disapproving of the new order, were not able to develop an immediate answer. In 1279 a man named Albert who had been living in Cremona died. Salimbene described him as a wine carrier (*portator*), wine drinker (*potator*), and indeed a sinner (*peccator*).⁵⁸ After his death many miracles took place in Cremona near his tomb. The occurrence of miracles soon spread to Parma and Reggio. In much the same way that the Halleluiahs movement grew, a cult began to grow around Albert. All the wine carriers assembled in church and men and women considered themselves blessed if they could give the wine carriers something. People formed societies, parish by parish, and marched in procession through the streets behind the obligatory banners to the Church of Saint Peter, where Albert's relics were preserved. When the Parish priests saw that the wine carriers were becoming wealthy with the gifts from the devout, they painted pictures of Albert in their churches so that they, too, would receive larger offerings from their people. This appears to have been successful, because the extraordinary sum of three hundred Imperial pounds was collected at Albert's shrine.⁵⁹ Salimbene was upset at this and pointed out that no man's saintly relics were to be held in reverence, unless he was first approved of by the Church and his name was

⁵⁸ Thompson gives his full name as Alberto de Villa d'Ogna. He also provides details about the cult that Salimbene either didn't know or kept from his *Chronicle*. Thompson, *Cities*, 201, 204-5, 430; Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 512.

⁵⁹ Thompson, *Cities*, 205.

written in the catalogue of saints.⁶⁰ However the will of the crowd was too strong for the secular clergy to resist.

Salimbene gives four reasons for the success of the cult. The infirm wanted to regain their health, the curious wanted to see novelties, the clerks were envious of the modern religious orders and, finally, because the bishops and canons wanted to raise money. He notes that twice before in his lifetime certain cities had made themselves to be fools by prematurely assuming certain men to be saints: Padua through Antonio Peregino and Ferrara through Armanno Punzilovo.⁶¹

Things were certainly becoming serious. It seems almost sure that the cult would have had some influence on the money flowing to the conventional churches and to the Mendicants. Even worse, some were beginning to doubt the Friars' monopoly on saints that could do miracles.⁶² Luckily for Salimbene's peace of mind a relic of Albert (the little toe of the right foot) was due to arrive in Parma from Cremona. When it arrived it was processed to the Church of the Glorious Virgin and put on the high altar whereupon it was found to be a clove of garlic.⁶³ The Parmese felt betrayed and it can be assumed that the cult soon lost much of its immediate importance in lay spirituality.⁶⁴ However it was a near thing and Salimbene was plainly upset by any religious movement that could reduce the importance of his order.

In this case the Franciscans were lucky. The spontaneous development of the new movement fell apart when their relics were seen to be false. However movements based

⁶⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 512.

⁶¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 514.

⁶² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 513.

⁶³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 513.

⁶⁴ Thompson says that the cult was ended by a Franciscan inquisitor. Thompson, *Cities*, 430. However, the Order did not totally disappear. As late as 1424 Bishop Ludovico Donato of Bergamo approved a Rule for a confraternity dedicated to Saint Albert. Luigi Ginami, *Il Beato Alberto di Villa d'Ogna*, (Milano:Paoline Edirorial Libri, 2000) Plate opposite page 96.

on the heroic efforts of a dead man and the miracles that follow him are difficult to combat, a principle that the Franciscans knew all too well because, of course, that was at least some of the source of their own strength.

The Apostles of Gerard Segarello

Salimbene saved most of his invective for the Apostles of Gerard Segarello. This Order, which has been given various names such as False Apostles or Apostolic Brethren, began in Parma.⁶⁵ Their exact date of origin is questionable. According to Salimbene and Bernard Gui, they originated in 1260. This is the same year as the flagellants appeared and is also the year that Joachimites predicted would begin the third age, the age of the Holy Spirit. However there are records of the commune of Parma mentioning the Apostolici in 1250.⁶⁶ Unlike the flagellants, the Apostles of Segarello did not vanish and remained a thorn in the side of Salimbene for the rest of his life.

Salimbene was living in the convent at Parma when a young citizen of Parma named Gerard Segarello came to the convent beseeching the Friars to let him join the Order. To Salimbene, he was everything that was undesirable in a new brother. He was "a man of base family, an illiterate layman, ignorant and foolish."⁶⁷ Plainly the rest of the Order felt the same way and he was refused entry. He spent days meditating in the church and eventually developed a method of worshiping Christ in his own way. According to

⁶⁵ They are also known by the names Apostolici and Apostoli. Thompson makes a brief note of them as one of the many religious groups which were common in the communes of thirteenth-century Italy. Thompson, *Cities*, 136, 138, 420. They nevertheless spread throughout much of Southern Europe and lasted for nearly a century. They were also one of the movements which made use of an extreme interpretation of Joachim of Fiore's writings to produce an apocalyptic view of the future which the Church declared heretical. As a result, reference to them may be found in works on medieval heresy and on the life and works of Joachim. Lambert, *Medieval*, 219-223. Gordon Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages: The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent c. 1250-c. 1450*, (New York: Manchester University Press, 1967) 82, 171, 191-5, 196. Reeves, *Prophecy*, 242-8, 414-15.

⁶⁶ Thompson, *Cities*, 420.

⁶⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 250.

Salimbene, he modelled his actions after a painting of the apostles in the church. He let his hair and beard grow long and put on the sandals and cord of the Friars Minor. In his description of Segarello's actions, Salimbene, as might be expected, repeats the maxim that "whoever wishes to start a new order always steals something from our Order."⁶⁸

Segarello then had a garment made for himself of rough grey cloth and a white cloak of course woollen fabric. He sold his house and distributed the money to men who Salimbene called rascals.

Segarello then went alone through the streets of Parma with his mantle about his shoulders. Salimbene condemned him for travelling without a companion, but since he was the first and (at that time) only member of the new Order this is somewhat illogical. As he went through the town he repeated a corruption of the words "Do ye Penance." It is clear from Salimbene's description that most members of the Friars thought him a great source of hilarity. This would change shortly.

The Friars Minor had a servant, Brother Robert, whom Salimbene characterizes as a disobedient and shameless young man although it is not clear that the Order itself felt that way about him. Gerard Segarello was able to persuade Robert to join his Order and become his companion. As a result Salimbene compares Robert to Judas Iscariot and quotes Proverbs to show that a servant should be treated harshly if one does not want him to be stubborn. To make it worse, according to Salimbene, Robert left the Order as a thief, carrying off with him with a cup, a knife and a tablecloth that had been entrusted to him as a servant.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 250.

⁶⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 252-253.

The arrival of Robert seemed to act as a catalyst for the new Order. As Salimbene reports "And, behold suddenly their numbers multiplied to thirty, and they gathered together into a single house, eating and sleeping together."⁷⁰ Worse was yet to come. The citizens of Parma took the new Order to their hearts and gave to them even more liberally than they did to the Minorites and Preachers. This is born out by the records of the commune of Parma. In 1262 Segarello's followers were enrolled on the city alms list.⁷¹

Salimbene's objections to the Apostles were many and varied. Many of the stories that he tells of the actions of the Apostles appear so scurrilous as to be fiction of the sort designed to drive the Order into disfavour. Supposedly, Segarello slept naked with the daughter of a widow in Order to test his ability to remain chaste.⁷² Salimbene also insists that members of the Order were willingly seduced by prostitutes.⁷³ Segarello's illiteracy also made him subject to ridicule. In one case, his illiteracy led to his being misunderstood and resulted in embarrassment to him and great amusement for the Friars.⁷⁴ Even ceremonies that were serious and important to the Apostles were made a source of amusement. In one, the brothers stripped naked and exchanged clothes. Salimbene said that they were nude so that they might follow a nude Christ.⁷⁵ It seems

⁷⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 253.

⁷¹ Thompson, *Cities*, 420.

⁷² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 251. This procedure known as *Mulierum Consortia* (Consorting with a woman or in modern terminology syneisactism) was not uncommon in the early Church. It was apparently relatively common in the Celtic Church. Roger E. Reynolds, "Virgines Subintroductae in Celtic Christianity," *The Harvard Theological Review*, 61:4(October 1968). 547-566; Robert d'Arbrissel (died 1117) an ascetic who established a monastery at Fontevault was condemned for the practice. Louis Gougaud, "Mulerum Consortia: Etude sur le Syneisaktisme Chez les Ascetes Celtiques," *Eriu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning*, 9(1923) 149-150; Some scholars have seen it as another form of trial by ordeal in which the woman is analogous to the water or the hot iron. Dominique Iogna-Prat, "La femme dans la perspective penitentielle des ermites du Bas-Maine (fin XI^{ème} debut XII^{ème} siecle)," *Revue d'Histoire de la Spiritualite*, 53(1977), 59-61.

⁷³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 264.

⁷⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 251.

⁷⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 259.

more likely that this was a ceremony to show their utter detachment from individual ownership of goods.⁷⁶

Ever resourceful, Salimbene listed twelve examples of foolishness practised by the Apostles and some of these are more revealing about Salimbene's attitudes and the state of the Franciscan Order than the Apostles. He condemns them for travelling alone. Even as he notes that they are not proper Apostles, he condemns them for not following the same rules as Franciscans. He also condemned them for being more severe than the Franciscans because they, in a search for true poverty allowed only one robe, while the Franciscans allowed two.⁷⁷ He noted that they had no Rule, forgetting that the Franciscans themselves had no Rule in their early years.⁷⁸ Salimbene's prejudice in favour of those with a higher status is obvious in another of his complaints about the Apostles: They "lay aside those occupations most fitting for them that is to say, herding cows, keeping pigs, farming," or scouring latrines.⁷⁹ The same contempt that he revealed for lay brothers is evident when he condemns the Apostles for giving nothing in return for receiving alms.⁸⁰

Salimbene here revealed the most important reason for his opposition to the Apostles. He notes that a "borrower is servant to him that lendeth."⁸¹ One who receives a benefit is required to return it. However the Apostles were unlettered and ignorant and therefore could not preach or celebrate Mass. They therefore cheated those from whom they received alms, as well as those to whom the alms properly belonged, that is the

⁷⁶ Lambert, *Medieval*, 221.

⁷⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 278.

⁷⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 268.

⁷⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 269, 292

⁸⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 283.

⁸¹ Proverbs 22.7 as quoted in Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 283.

Friars Minor and the Preachers.⁸² They were making fools of themselves and “cheating people out of their alms and laying a heavy burden on the Christian people who are already heavily burdened with a great multitude of Mendicants.”⁸³

This would not have been a problem, if the Apostles had not gained some popularity. Other orders which sprang into existence did not receive nearly the same enmity from Salimbene, because they were not as popular and were not a threat to the Franciscans. This could not be said about the Apostles.

The Apostles were clever and were willing to make use of any opportunity that presented itself to them. A nephew of a certain Friar Minor had learned some of his uncle’s sermons. When he was refused entry to the Friars Minor he joined the Apostles. The Apostles would go into a church and call for silence and then the boy would preach. He was surprisingly popular. At one time Brother Bonaventure de Iseo was preaching in Ferrara when he noticed his audience leaving. This had never happened to him before. When questioned, a member of the congregation told Bonaventure that they were rushing to the cathedral to hear the boy preach and that they wanted to get there while there was still room.⁸⁴ In another case while Salimbene was living in Ravenna, the Apostles had the boy preach in Ursiana Church and even though it was a large church it was filled to overflowing. This was repeated in city after city and there were always huge crowds.⁸⁵ Plainly the Apostles were early masters of crowd psychology.

⁸² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 283.

⁸³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 287.

⁸⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 260-261.

⁸⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 262.

While Salimbene dismissed the Apostle's use of children as a simple novelty designed to attract crowds and of no more importance than "peddlers with their spiels,"⁸⁶ he justified the Church's use of children sitting on the bishop's seat on the Feast of Innocents in two ways. First the children chosen to sit on the Bishop's seat were learned, honourable, and noble children who had been allowed to enter the Order of the Minorites and Preachers. For his second reason, he fell back on Joachim. Joachim had said that, in the third age, children would be chosen to preach the gospel of the kingdom for the sake of those who have contempt for old things.⁸⁷ However, it is clear that Salimbene considered the young of which Joachim spoke to be the young members of the Friars and not the Apostles.

Salimbene's position as a follower of Joachim provided another reason for his intense dislike of the Apostles. They, like many other religious at the time, claimed to be the monastic group that would issue in Joachim's third *status* of history. They, like the early Franciscans, lived for the day, begged only for the necessities of the day and of course had only one habit in contrast to the Franciscan's two. Whether their popularity was due to this obvious poverty or due to the personal appeal of Gerald Segarello is not possible to say for certain. But in claiming to be one of the orders that was to issue in the third *status*, Salimbene felt that the Apostles were moving in on territory properly belonging to the Friars and the Preachers. He argued that while the two Orders, the Preachers and Friars, were prefigured in the Old and New Testament, the Apostles were not. He interpreted Joachim to say that the Friars were to be the fisherman of the New

⁸⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 261.

⁸⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 262.

Testament and the Preachers were the hunters of Jeremiah from the Old Testament.⁸⁸ He noted that the Order of St Francis was incorporated in 1207 and since that time both the cardinals and the Papacy had greatly loved the Order because of its great use to the Church and because they had been sent for the salvation of the world. To Salimbene, for the Apostles to assume that name was not only sinful, but blasphemous. Finally, returning to Joachim, he noted that Joachim had described the seven orders that will appear after the ruin of the Antichrist and that none of them resemble the Apostles of Segarello.⁸⁹

At one point in his *Chronicle* Salimbene gave the impression that the Apostles were a spent force. He describes how the organisation split and how one of the faction's leaders came to him for help to escape to the Templars.⁹⁰ He also described how Gerard Segarello was arrested by the Bishop of Parma and put into chains. He was later released and Salimbene pictured him as a member of the Bishop's court more devoted to clumsy humour than religious fervour. However they were still present in 1284 when Salimbene noted that twelve women were searching for Gerard.⁹¹ In 1286 several Apostles were put to death for supposedly tricking a young man into letting them seduce his wife. In the same year he noted that Gerard Segarello had become demented and had assumed the costume of a jongleur.⁹² However, the Apostles did not disappear. Instead, under the leadership of Fra Dolcino, they became a truly heretical sect by extending the teachings of Joachim further than even his most ardent disciples would have dared. Dolcino believed that there were four *stati*. The fourth *status* would follow the third in which all

⁸⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 287-288.

⁸⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 289-293.

⁹⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 256.

⁹¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 570-571.

⁹² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 571.

the clergy and religious would be killed. Only after that could the Church be good, poor and properly reformed.⁹³

That Salimbene devoted so much energetic invective toward the Apostles is instructive. He wrote his *Chronicle* in the eighth decade of the thirteenth century when supposedly the Apostles were a spent force. If so, it would have been an unnecessary expenditure of effort. Plainly he was fully aware of the continuing threat that the Apostles constituted to his spiritual family.

So, indeed, was the Church. While the bishop of Parma did not move against them, the Council of Lyons in 1274 banned unauthorized orders. In 1285 Honorius IV banned them explicitly. In the 1290's proceedings were taken against some members. Segarelli was first imprisoned and later burned in 1300. Even after Dolcino himself was captured and burned in 1307 some adherents of the Order existed well into the fourteenth century.⁹⁴

Salimbene had given up much when he entered the Franciscans and abandoned his actual family for a new spiritual one. Whether it was in his visions of the holy family as Franciscans, in his vision of Mary and the Christ child or in his adoption of Joachimism and its description of the importance of the Franciscans, he was always looking for justification for his choice. The Apostles were too much of a threat both to the Order and to Salimbene's peace of mind to be simply ignored.

The Ideal Religious Order

From Salimbene's praise of the Franciscans, and his condemnation of other new orders which differed from them, it is possible to arrive at some idea of the characteristics

⁹³ Reeves, *Prophecy*, 243-245.

⁹⁴ Lambert, *Medieval*, 221-222.

of the ideal order as envisioned by Salimbene and the Church. These requirements can be summed up in two words: useful and subservient. Historically all members of a religious order had had to swear an oath of poverty, obedience and chastity. The attributes of its individual members however do not define the characteristics of an order. The most important reason that Salimbene had found to condemn the lay members of the Franciscans was that they were "useless," in that that lay members were not available to furnish pastoral services such as providing confession and saying Mass. To Salimbene the Apostles failed in exactly the same way. They were unable to return the benefit that they were gaining by receiving alms. Salimbene seemed to see salvation as a zero-sum commercial transaction. To be a moral transaction it was necessary for the quantity of goods exchanged to be roughly equal. For their alms, the Franciscans returned pastoral services. Neither the Apostles nor lay brothers could do this, so they were effectively stealing their alms.⁹⁵ This understanding of the purpose of an order was shared by the Church and led to the "clericalization" of the Franciscan Order.

Any order also had to be subservient to those in power. This does not just mean that the individuals had to be obedient but that the order itself had to be obedient. The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 was an attempt by the Papacy to exert control over the whole Church and it is therefore not surprising that the council forbade the creation of any new orders that lived under any new Rule. In the eleventh and twelfth century the Church had suffered many spontaneous religious movements and too many of them had fallen into heresy. It was therefore essential that any new order make itself subservient to the Church. In this, Salimbene and the Church were in full agreement. He noted that the office of preaching required two things: knowledge and ordination by the properly

⁹⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 287.

constituted authority.⁹⁶ Again, the Apostles failed this test because they refused to be restrained by the authority of the Pope. In contrast, the members of the Order of the Sack were willing to curtail their activities and Salimbene praised them highly. After they had made themselves subservient to the Church, it was willing to let them live out their lives as members of the Order as long as the Order did not continue to recruit new members.⁹⁷ Given its objectives, the Church was not wrong in its mistrust of spontaneous spirituality. In their later years the heresy of the Apostles became more severe. Under Gerald Segarello the heresy of the Apostles had been relatively insignificant. With Dolcino at the helm, they adopted some of the more extreme views of the followers of Joachim of Fiore in which the Church would be superseded by a new organisation. The followers of Albert the wine carrier promised to be so successful at collecting money that both the Church and the Franciscans would have suffered. In both cases, the Church would have suffered greatly if the two orders had prospered.

In addition to these two characteristics, one of which was overtly stated and the other understood, Salimbene added that the foundation of any order included poverty and chastity.⁹⁸ There is no argument over what was meant by chastity. However, the meaning of poverty to a religious order was not as easily defined. To Salimbene, poverty meant that he, himself, did not actually own anything. The Franciscan Order, itself, insisted that they owned nothing and that all their worldly goods were owned by the Papacy. However, Salimbene and his Order had the use of many large buildings, countless books and enough clothing that Salimbene and his brothers were not actually threatened with physical harm from the elements. By the last years of his *Chronicle*, it would seem that

⁹⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 269.

⁹⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 263.

⁹⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 266.

no one in the Order had a need to beg and Salimbene describes many opulent meals that he enjoyed whether from the beneficence of the King, of a countess, or of the newly consecrated Franciscan bishop Rainald.⁹⁹ Poverty no longer meant suffering but had become something superficial.

In addition, Salimbene expected the order to reflect society. In his ideal order there would be two strictly defined categories of brothers. One was to act as servants to the other group of men who were fully literate and served the pastoral duties of the Church.¹⁰⁰ Salimbene's *Chronicle* shows that this transformation was well underway by the last years of the thirteenth century. Because Salimbene had a tendency to confuse the literate with the cleric and with those of higher status, in his ideal order all those in the latter group would be recruited from rich and powerful families. It is not clear that the Church shared these views.

Conclusion

The reaction of The Franciscan Order to new religious movements depended on whether they were a threat to the Order's position in society. The great Halleluiah was not a threat to the Order, partially because it was a spontaneous and unorganised movement and partially because many of the main players were themselves Franciscans. The flagellant movement, again, was spontaneous movement of lay spirituality which, because it was short-lived and because it had no central organisational figure, posed no threat to the Order. The Godenti posed no threat because of their limited membership and because they were seen by the populace to be somewhat laughable. The religious movement around Albert failed spontaneously. The Order of the Sack, in contrast, was

⁹⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 214, 209, 323.

¹⁰⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 287.

seen to be a threat to the Order and forced the Franciscans to work in conjunction with the Church to end it. Only then could Salimbene say kind words about it. The Apostles remained a threat to the Order and the Church through to the end of the thirteenth century. Salimbene knew this and as a result devoted a great deal of energy and imagination in denouncing them.

CHAPTER SIX EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL CHANGES IN THE ORDER

The increasing interaction with the established church and secular government resulted in changes to the Order. Some of these were obvious in the new and relatively grand buildings which the Franciscans acquired, which were built for their use or which they themselves built. Other changes were more subtle and revealed themselves in changes in the social structure of the Order. The most important of these was an increasing respect for social status, which at the same time meant that lay brothers were progressively seen as unimportant and irrelevant.

The Franciscans' Changes to the Physical Map of the City

In her study of architecture and authority in Medieval Italy, Maureen Miller traces the development of the bishops' palaces in the cities of Northern Italy. She argues that the real changes in episcopal architecture took place even as the bishop was losing power to the commune.¹ At the same time as the bishops' positions in the political structure were weakening, they were reasserting their relationship with the community. They changed the external appearance of their palaces from that of fortresses to that more common to the homes of wealthy merchants. The external decorative schemes used in the facades of the palaces began to match local conventions. They also placed entrances and windows so that they opened into public space rather than into closed private courtyards. By doing so, she argues, they were claiming a connection to the public space of the piazza and the public life of the community that took place there.²

In a similar fashion to the bishops, the Franciscans also made a claim on the public space of the city. However, they began to make their mark from the early years of

¹ Maureen Miller, *The Bishop's Palace*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 145.

² Miller, *Bishop's*, 157.

their existence. It is clear from Salimbene's *Chronicle* that from the earliest years for which he provides a record, that the Friars were expanding their real property holdings in the cities, and by doing so, placed their imprint on the society of Northern Italy as well as on the map of the city.

Their building projects started out small. Salimbene noted that the Archbishop of Vienne, "who greatly loved the Order of St Francis," "out of his love for the Friars Minor," had a stone bridge built over the Rhone to the convent on the other side of the river which he had also provided.³ Over time the transactions became more significant. In 1256 the Bishop of Reggio, Lord William de Fogliani, sold the Emperor's palace to the Friars Minor so that they might use it as a convent. The Bishop's predecessor, Lord Nicholas, had obtained the palace from an Emperor as a gift with the condition of hospitality.⁴ The brothers had obtained the money from the sale of their convent to the Sisters of the Order of St Clare which is an indication of the complexity of their real estate transactions. Many years later, during the reign of Pope Gregory X, because they had purchased the palace with the condition of hospitality, they were required to obtain the permission from the new Emperor to continue living there. Since the Emperor, Lord Rudolph, had been elected by the will of Pope Gregory X (1271-1276), it is no surprise to learn that the Emperor "rejoiced greatly to have such guests and whatever he owned there by law he freely gave to the Friars Minor."⁵ He sent two letters patent with the letter and

³ Salimbene does not give a date to this but he states that the archbishop was good friend of Brother Hugh and mentions the gift in the entry for 1248. It would appear that Salimbene does not know when the gift was granted. This would argue for it being relatively early in the Franciscans' history; perhaps even before Salimbene joined the Order or at least before he had made some of his travels and become acquainted with so many individuals in the Order. Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 224.

⁴ Fogliani's predecessor died in the court of Frederick II in 1243, so it seems likely that Frederick II is the Emperor to whom Salimbene refers. Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 166.

⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 473.

promised that if things went well for him in gaining full control of the empire, he would provide stronger confirmation.

The permission was needed because, by 1272, the Order had obviously become even larger and the brothers thought expansion was needed. The Friars bought many houses near their convent. Salimbene hastens to add that the city sent agents to estimate the value of the houses and that there was full agreement about the price. The brothers did more than enlarge their convent. They built a new street "straight through the house of Lord Arduino de Taculi in a straight line in front of St James Church."⁶ Plainly the Friars were placing their imprint on the map of the city. The large and ornate buildings would also be a reminder to all walking by that the Franciscans were becoming increasingly wealthy and allied with the rich, famous and powerful. While Salimbene does not describe the buildings as ornate, that a palace fit for an Emperor had to be expanded into the neighbouring lots indicates that the buildings being built were not the hovels that the Order had inhabited in the early days.

The luxurious buildings were not limited to Italy. The original buildings which the Order occupied in England had been quite humble. They built cells in the first convent in London and filled up the chinks in the cells with grass. At Shewsbury the walls of the dormitory were torn down because they were built of stone and replaced with walls of mud. The first building constructed at Cambridge was so small that fourteen of the rafters were set up in one day by one carpenter. However this did not last. Thomas of Eccleston told of the construction of large buildings in England only a few years after the Order's arrival. In an attempt to justify the construction of large buildings, Brother William of York said that it was necessary to erect buildings that were somewhat large,

⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 496.

lest future brothers would make them too big.⁷ Brother Haymo, the Provincial Minister of England, while dedicating a building at Gloucester, said that he was in favour of increasing the grounds of the convents so that the Brothers could grow food rather than begging for it.⁸ It is not clear from Thomas's work where the Franciscans' convents were located. However in one of Thomas's anecdotes, the Franciscans were located just outside the main gate. They would have been one of the first things a visitor to the town would see. In addition, it would be a favourable place to obtain alms. In a manner similar to that in Italy they were making a claim on the geography of the city.

Salimbene provided a few more details of the Friars' construction program which further indicated that the Franciscan buildings were becoming part of the geography of the city. In 1285 construction was begun on the Church of the Friars Minor at Reggio. The first stone in the main column was laid by Brother Gilimo de Conrado of Reggio by the street near the church of St James which was of course where they had built the addition to the convent in 1272.⁹ While it seems likely that the Dominicans were also involved in a general expansion of living quarters, Salimbene only mentions the Dominicans' buildings twice. Salimbene noted that "Dominicans do not have a convent there [Hyerres] for they love to dwell in large convents, never in small ones." He also mentioned that in 1283 the Parmese built a stone bridge between the convent of the Humilati and the convent of the Preachers. As a final indication of the influence that the

⁷ Thomas of Eccelstone, "Coming," 100, 115, 114, 138-139.

⁸ Brother Haymo was Provincial Minister of England from 1239-1240. Eccleston's record is therefore consistent with records from Gloucester that indicate that Greyfriars at Gloucester received an increase in its land grant in 1239. I.M. Ferris, "Excavations at Greyfriars Gloucester in 1967 and 1974-5." *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, 119(2001 2002), 98. Haymo went on to become Minister General from 1240 to 1244. According to Moorman, it is not known what legislation actually took place under his leadership but it seems likely that he would have favoured the continued expansion of the Franciscans' building programs in the cities. Moorman, *History*, 107.

⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 588.

Friars were having on the geography of the city, Salimbene told us that in 1283 the Friars Minor of Parma built a beautiful refectory in Prato San Ercolano. This was the same location where the Parmese in ancient times held their fairs, and later in carnival week had held tournaments.¹⁰ Just as the bishops had done by establishing entrances which faced the public square, by building in that area, the Friars were wedding themselves to the social geography of the city.

Objections to the Franciscans' Building Program

As the Order increasingly became an order of clerks an improvement in living conditions was necessary. It is impossible to study if one is forced to live with many brothers in a single small room. Therefore it was necessary for the quarters to be subdivided to provide peace and quiet for study. The books that the Order owned required better protection from the elements that the earlier hovels of the Order could have provided.¹¹ Nevertheless there was much opposition to the grand buildings being built.

Not surprisingly, some of the most vociferous opposition to the large churches and convents came from within the Order because, of course, the tradition of rejecting large and opulent buildings goes back to the early days of the Order and to Francis, himself. Francis's feeling toward buildings was well known. He hated pretence in houses, abhorred having fine furnishings and disliked anything that recalled the ways of the world.¹² Thomas of Celano noted that he taught the brothers to build "poor little dwellings out of wood and not stone."¹³ Plainly his idea of the correct housing for his

¹⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 227, 529.

¹¹ Lambert, *Poverty*, 90.

¹² Thomas of Celano, "Remembrance," 287.

¹³ Thomas of Celano, "Remembrance," 285.

brothers was strictly minimalist. When he spoke to the brothers about housing, he quoted Matthew and suggested that they live in an even simpler fashion than wild animals.¹⁴ In another case he revealed his feelings clearly, when after he had been away to a Chapter meeting, he returned and found a house that had been built for the Order. He began to tear it down out of anger until he was assured that the Order did not own it.¹⁵ The buildings that the Order made use of by the end of the thirteenth century would have caused him some discomfit.

Francis was not the only one to object to opulent buildings. Legend has it that Leo, one of the first brothers to join Francis, broke a jar that was put on the steps of the first Franciscan basilica in Assisi to collect alms for the building because the building was already *tam excessa*.¹⁶ Another brother, Giles, who was also an early admission into the Order, felt much the same way about the building program. When he was given a tour of the new basilica at Assisi, legend has it that he said to the brothers, "Now you have need of nothing but wives."¹⁷ The opulent buildings led to resistance in England as well. Brother Henry of Reresby, after his death, appeared in a vision and said that the brothers would not be damned for their excesses in the matter of buildings but would certainly be punished.¹⁸ In 1257 Saint Bonaventure, the new Minister General, noted in a letter that the Order belied their dedication to poverty through sumptuous living and frequent moves

¹⁴ The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air nests: but the son of man hath not where to lay his head. Matt 8:20 (Douay-Rheims Version)

¹⁵ Thomas of Celano, "Remembrance," 285.

¹⁶ Brooke, *Early*, 35, 36, 99. The date for this legendary act is somewhat inconclusive. It seems to be dated to the first or last years of Elias's term as Minister General ie. either 1230 or 1239.

¹⁷ Baird, "Notes," 676, n.88.

¹⁸ The date of the vision is not given but Henry died before he was able to take up his position as the first provincial minister of Scotland which was established in 1233. Thomas of Ecclestone, "Coming", 125.

to better quarters. Again, in 1266 he chastised the Order because they pestered the laity with fund raising and with the resulting funds constructed sumptuous buildings.¹⁹

In contrast, Salimbene saw nothing wrong with the increasingly ornate buildings. While he objected to the supposedly ornate clothing of the Order of the Sack, he saw nothing in the ornate buildings of the Franciscans that was in conflict with the Order's claim of poverty.

Internal Changes in the Franciscan Order

As the Order changed from a small group of itinerant preachers to a large organization allied with the rich and powerful in Northern Italian Society, the Order underwent significant and interrelated internal changes which were more important than those which were external and therefore easily visible. First, the Order which at one time was very careful about receiving gifts was increasingly willing to accept any gift. Indeed they expected to receive a gift whenever someone of wealth or power died. This reduced the need for begging. Secondly, the Order was ever more willing to grant sepulture in their convents. Thirdly, as a result of these changes the Order was becoming increasingly conscious of social hierarchies and lay members of the Order were becoming increasingly less important.

Of course all these developments were related. By the middle of the thirteenth century the Friars numbered approximately 17,000.²⁰ It would have been impossible to support that large a number of men by begging in the manner of Francis and his original flock. The Order had to find another way to support itself. It found its support by becoming an external arm of the Church and by receiving gifts from the wealthy and

¹⁹ David Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), 1-2.

²⁰ Brooke, *Early*, 283.

powerful.²¹ These became more plentiful with the granting of special privileges to friends of the Friars.

Salimbene's *Chronicle* clearly documents these changes in the Order. In an earlier section of this document it was shown that after turning down a gift from Innocent III the Order was more and more willing to accept gifts of goods or money either from the living or dead: upstanding citizen or sinner.²² One result of this was that begging became increasingly unnecessary for the Order. Shortly after his acceptance into the Order in 1238, Salimbene worried whether he would be able to carry out the duty of begging, particularly in districts of Parma where he was well known. A vision of the holy family acting as Franciscans, going from house to house and begging for food reconciled him to his fate as a Franciscan.²³ In only one other place in the *Chronicle* did he make mention that he, himself, was begging. When he was defending the Franciscans from the taunts of the secular clergy for not preaching tithing, he asked how he could possibly preach that such unworthies should receive tithes "for I have gone through a whole year begging alms without receiving a crust of bread from men such as this [secular clergy]"²⁴ It does not appear that begging was as important to the Friars in the last half of the thirteenth century as it was to the itinerant band that followed Francis. This in turn reduced the importance of lay members of the Order. When begging was a critical means of gaining support, it could be argued that the lay member was as valuable as the clerk. When the chief means of support for the Order was gifts from those who had received parochial services from the Order, this argument was no longer tenable.

²¹ Moorman, *History*, 118-122.

²² See page 95 above.

²³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 20.

²⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 408.

Landini downplays the importance of this factor in the clericalization of the Order however it was perhaps more important that he would admit.²⁵ In a letter to the Order, Bonaventure (Minister General 1257-1274) describes those who are worthy to be admitted to the Order and calls them "useful." While he does not totally exclude the importance of the layman, to his mind the ignorant layman is a hindrance to all that the Friars are called to do in the Church.²⁶ In this, his attitude toward the lay Brothers does not differ significantly from that of Salimbene.

At the same time the Franciscans increasingly expected a gift whenever anyone who was wealthy or powerful died. In 1283 the Bishop of Reggio, Lord William de Fogliani, died. According to Salimbene he was an "avaricious and unlearned man like a layman" who loved to "live in splendour and to eat every day as much as he could hold." He provided nothing to the poor while living and indeed did not arrange marriages for young girls but stole their dowries. "Whatever he could plunder he plundered." To make it worse, "he gave nothing to men of religious Orders, to the Friars Minor or the Preachers, or to any other poor men." Salimbene's feelings toward the bishop are most explicit when he states, "I know that a dog shit on him after he was buried." Why Salimbene should have expected a bequest from a man that had been so avaricious in his life is surprising, unless it had become common practice even if there was no love lost between the individual and the Friars.²⁷

Increase in the Granting of Sepulture in Franciscan Graveyards

The expectation of a bequest was probably related to the increasing incidence of sepulture in Franciscan convents. In 1248 Salimbene went to live in Aix-en-Provence.

²⁵ Landini, *Causes*, 107.

²⁶ Landini, *Causes*, 140.

²⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 528.

When the Count of Provence died, he requested that his body be buried in the convent of the Friars Minor. The Brothers refused, "since at that time they almost always refused sepulture because they sought to avoid the labour and because they were at odds with the regular clergy." They also refused sepulture in their church to St Elizabeth.²⁸

Salimbene next mentions this problem of the sepulture of St Elizabeth and the Count of Provence while defending the Franciscans who, in 1260, were in a dispute with the regular clergy. This time, in speaking of this event, he was almost apologetic and appeared to decry the actions of the Order. He said "we committed the grossest kind of impropriety (which we now recognize) because we refused burial to St. Elizabeth . . . and to the Count of Provence" who "had been a great friend of ours."²⁹

The problem of granting sepulture to non-Franciscans continued to be troublesome to the Order. In 1260 at the Chapter of Narbonne a constitution was passed that told the brothers to bury no one who can be refused "without notable scandal."³⁰ As with most such rules the interpretation was most important and the ambiguity of the resolution at Narbonne allowed many interpretations.

Salimbene's change in attitude toward burial in Franciscan grounds appears to mirror a significant change in the attitude of the Order.³¹ From that point on he increasingly mentions in his *Chronicle* that a certain individual was buried in the convent of the Friars. Lord Phillip, the Archbishop of Ravenna and the Papal Legate to Lombardy

²⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 108-109.

²⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 429.

³⁰ Burr, *Olivi*, 34 n.54.

³¹ In 1266 Lord Bonaventure the current Minister General of the Order wrote a letter chiding the brothers for their search for money. In particular he chastised them for their competition with the parish clergy for burials and legacies. Burr, *Olivi*, 2. The letter does not appear to have been too successful. Burr notes that numerous statutes and letters were released in an attempt to limit the number of bodies of non-Franciscans buried in their graveyards. They seem to have been as successful as the resolutions of the Chapter of Norbonne. Burr, *Olivi*, 104, n.30.

was buried in the convent of the Friars Minor at Pistoia.³² In 1272, Lord Gerard of Tripoli and was granted sepulture in the monastery of St Prosper in Reggio.³³ In the same year Guido Gaio de Roberti was buried in the church of the Friars Minor. In 1279 Lord Aimerico de Palude died and was buried in the convent of the Friars Minor in Parma.³⁴ Peter, King of Aragon, was granted sepulture in the convent of the Friars Minor in Villanuova in 1285.³⁵ Two years later the same privilege was granted to the Marchioness of Este and in the same year Lord Salvino de Torre of Milan was granted an even greater honour. He was buried in the convent at Parma where the Brothers themselves were buried.³⁶ While the total number of sepultures mentioned in the *Chronicle* is small, they are significant because, before 1260, even those who were or were expected to be saints were refused. After 1260, even the wife of the Marchioness found space available.

Closely allied with the granting of sepulture was the issuing of Letters of Authority. This practice was begun by Brother John of Parma when he was Minister General. These were letters, sealed with the seal of the Minister General, accepting "spiritual sons and daughters into the spiritual benefits of the Order of the Friars."³⁷ Salimbene said that this concession "has perhaps been the efficient cause for these people to lay aside their sinning ways and be converted to God."³⁸ Even Salimbene seemed to think that there might be danger in this practice, for while he applauded Brother John for originating it, he noted that Brother John was careful and "the petitioners had to

³² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 434. The date here is questionable. It was noted in the *Chronicle* when Salimbene has made one of his digressions and so the timing is difficult. However we know that the Archbishop called a synod in Ravenna in 1260 so it was certainly after that.

³³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 497.

³⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 510.

³⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 602.

³⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 656.

³⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 298.

³⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 298.

demonstrate that they were truly devoted to God and to the Order, as well as being *especial benefactors* of the Order."³⁹ (emphasis mine). These letters, while superficially acceptable in the hands of one who was careful in their use, offered a great temptation for those who were less careful. Plainly the letters were designed for the rich as the requirement for "especial benefaction" ruled out the poor. These letters seem to have granted, in some cases, the right to be buried in the Friar's habit and the privilege of being prayed for by the Friars. Thus, by providing a suitable donation, an individual could be associated with the Friars during and after life. This practice became increasingly common through the last half of the thirteenth century.⁴⁰ Salimbene's worries about the inherent problems with the new practice were well-founded. However it combined with the increased granting of sepulture in Franciscan graveyards undoubtedly increased the Franciscans' financial wellbeing.

Changes in the Internal Social Structure of the Order

The increasingly reliable source of monetary support was coincident with a third major change within the Order: an increasing concern with social status. Moorman makes a brief note about this change but quickly passes by.⁴¹ Early in his *Chronicle*, in the Book of the Prelate, Salimbene had had harsh words for the abbots of the Benedictine Order. He noted that they tended to stay in office too long and therefore became insolent and treated their subordinates badly and held "them to be of no more worth than the fifth wheel of a wagon."⁴² He went on to say that their abbots ate meat with secular men while their subordinates ate vegetables in the refectory. They also behaved toward their

³⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 298.

⁴⁰ Moorman, *History*, 120, 355.

⁴¹ Moorman, *History*, 121.

⁴² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 93. This is a favourite saying of Salimbene.

subordinates in a niggardly and unseemly manner.⁴³ By contrast he praised the Order of Peter the Sinner because “the priors serve the subordinates at the collation on fast days.”⁴⁴ He provided an illustration of incorrect behaviour in a religious order with a humorous anecdote about a novice in the Cistercian Order. When a certain novice said in the presence of his abbot “This is mine,” he was reprimanded in these terms: “nothing is your own, far from it! We are all equals here.” And the Novice replied: That’s what everyone says, but some are more equal than others.⁴⁵

Again, as with so many of his seemingly strongly held opinions, Salimbene revealed an ambivalence about this one. In one place in the *Chronicle* he uses biblical passages to prove that inside the Order there should be two classes of Brothers. One class was to act as a servant to the other and plainly the division should be based on whether the individual was a clerk or not. As we have discussed above, in his diatribe against Elias for allowing so many lay brothers into the Order, he considered lay brothers “useless.”⁴⁶ To prove his point he offered the parable in which the only priest in a convent was preparing the meals for the day and was unavailable when a company of Frenchmen came to the convent asking for Mass.⁴⁷ In this case, he reduced the “usefulness” of the Order to providing parochial service to the laity. Providing an example of spirituality was no longer important.

Yet, there were times when he did not seem to be happy with changes taking place in the Order even though they mirrored his viewpoint. Frequently his model for

⁴³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 92-93.

⁴⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 97.

⁴⁵ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 95. Given that most of the work done on Salimbene was done in the last half of the twentieth century it is unlikely that George Orwell knew of Salimbene. The surprisingly similar statement to that made in Orwell’s *Animal Farm* is most likely a coincidence.

⁴⁶ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 79.

⁴⁷ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 83.

correct behaviour was Brother John of Parma. When John was only a lector (but famous for his learning) he was visiting in a convent in Bologna with his companion and certain other Brothers. The Brothers of the convent sought to lead him away to eat in the infirmary in order to honour him. He refused to eat without his companions.⁴⁸

Salimbene told with favour another anecdote about Brother John. After he had been made Minister General, and while he was visiting the convent at Ferrara, John noticed that the same Brothers were eating with him every night. While he was washing his hands in preparation for dinner he heard one of the Brothers discussing who should be allowed to have dinner with him. When he asked why those Brothers in particular were to be invited to share his dinner he was informed that they were the most worthy to sit with him. That some Brothers would be excluded made him angry because "this is an office in which all Brothers know how to partake with the Minister."⁴⁹ It seems likely that the Brothers being excluded were the lay brothers. As Brother John pointed out, all brothers whether lay or not, have an equal ability to eat. In this office, at least, Brother John saw to it that social distinctions had vanished. Salimbene then noted, with satisfaction, that lowly brothers, who "rarely ever ate outside of the refectory" were able over the next few nights to eat with Brother John.⁵⁰ Plainly this was unusual and it is an indication that an increasing concern with social status was creeping into the Order. Even more surprising Salimbene does not appear to like it.

There are further indications of a social structure being imported from society into the Order. In 1249 Salimbene was sent by his Minister to the Minister General. On the way he stayed at Hyeres, the convent of Brother Hugh of Digne. Although Hugh was

⁴⁸ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 307.

⁴⁹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 307.

⁵⁰ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 307.

“substituting for the Guardian,” he ate informally with Salimbene and his companion. The Brothers were amazed at the friendliness and informality with which Brother Hugh received Salimbene for “it was not the habit at that time of Lent to eat with anyone.”⁵¹ While Lent is a time of sacrifice and prayerful isolation, it seems unusual that the Guardian should withdraw from the convent. This would seem to be an indication that those of higher rank in the Order were beginning to separate themselves from others of lesser rank.

Brother Rainald, the reluctant bishop, after returning from Lyons, where he was consecrated, gave a splendid dinner to the assembled brothers and he ate with them “in the refectory in a friendly, down-to-earth manner.”⁵² Given the Rainald’s character, this should have been no surprise but Salimbene showed great pleasure at the bishop’s actions. The next day the bishop was condemned in a sermon for allowing the Brothers who were serving food at the meal to genuflect to him. That he allowed it to happen and that nobody had made note of it at the meals said much about the changing social structure in the Order.⁵³

It was even becoming expensive to join the Order. Salimbene told of the tale of three students from Tuscany, who were studying in Bologna. All three decided to enter the Order of the Friars Minor at the same time and so one of them was sent back to Tuscany “to get money so that they could buy the proper dress and meet their expenses, as is fitting for those who renounce the world and enter a religious order.”⁵⁴ One was

⁵¹ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 320.

⁵² Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 323.

⁵³ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 324.

⁵⁴ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, 582.

forced to make use of the goods of the world in order to prepare oneself to relinquish them. The irony appears to have escaped Salimbene.

Conclusion

That a social structure should be imported into the Order is not surprising. Once a relatively dependable source of money to maintain the Order became available it would have seemed only sensible to align the structure of the Order to make it as compatible with that source as possible. The Church, in turn, expected that the Order would provide parochial services to the laity and therefore, as Salimbene argued, lay Brothers who could not provide the sacraments of the church were indeed "useless" to the Order. Later apologists such as Landini while not using the expression "useless" have argued that the Order came to understand that its main purpose was to provide confession and Mass to the populace. The lay brother was unable to assist in these endeavours.⁵⁵ In the early years of the Order all brothers were forced to beg to obtain sustenance and lay brothers were as useful as clerical in providing this service. When a ready supply of goods and money could be obtained by a synergistic relationship between the Franciscans, church, secular government and the nobility the only service left for the lay brother to provide was an example of spirituality by the adoption of voluntary poverty. In the new Franciscan Order this was not enough, especially in a changing order where real poverty and sacrifice were disappearing. Francis would probably have been troubled.

⁵⁵ Landini, *Cause*, 139.

CHAPTER SEVEN CONCLUSION

This thesis has detailed two reasons why Salimbene's *Chronicle* is an important historical document. It provides a window into the development of the cities of Northern Italy in the thirteenth century and it also provides documentation on the development of one of the medieval church's most unusual religious movements, the Franciscans.

Because of his travels, Salimbene provides a geographic cross section of the governmental development of the Northern Italian cities in his time that is unique. His work points out that while historians search to provide an outline of civic development that is alike from city to city, historical events are not readily forced into a simple structure. Salimbene describes a developmental process in the civil government of Northern Italy that was closer to anarchy than the orderly evolution that is pictured by many historians.

In addition, Salimbene describes a society in Northern Italy which is not easily portrayed as either dominated by class or kin, even though modern historians make the attempt. Rather, he depicts a society with multiple interrelationships between the upper class, the church and government. This complicated societal structure meant that the roles of individuals were not well defined and enabled some individuals to move into positions from which they might otherwise have been forbidden.

Because of its uniqueness, Salimbene's work is valuable to historians of thirteenth century Italy, but there is a tendency to use it when it is not strictly applicable. As his work plainly shows, there was a great variety in social and government structure from city to city and the structure in individual cities changed over the lifetime of the

document. Because it is sometimes the only historical evidence available, historians have a tendency to use it as a general source for all cities in Northern Italy for the whole period of the thirteenth century. For example, Thompson uses a single reference to Salimbene to suggest that certain behaviour was common through the twelfth and thirteenth century and through all the cities in Northern Italy.¹ The document itself would argue against such a generalization.

Against the background of the developing civic governments of Northern Italy Salimbene provides modern historians with a unique view of the Franciscans in their early formative years. They were one of the organizations that took great advantage of the flexibility of role definition in Italian society. By doing so, they were able to assume positions in the social order which established associations between the Order and secular church government, civic government and the Papacy. This was of mutual benefit to all. For example, civic governments made use of the Franciscans' proven ability as peace makers. To accomplish the aim of the Lateran Council of 1215 to establish control over local church matters, the Church, both at the episcopal level and at the level of the Papacy, made use of the Franciscans' preaching ability and the trust that the populace had in the Order. The Papacy, in addition, made use of the Franciscans as spies and inquisitors. The Franciscans' acquaintance with the powerful and well born provided them with a ready source of money, which meant that they were no longer required to beg for a living. They were therefore better able to fulfill the new responsibilities which they had assumed, or which had been thrust upon them. The synergistic relationships

¹ Thompson, *Cities*, 286. He notes that in one story told by Salimbene that women were given confession behind the high altar. He made the assumption that this was common even though it was noted on the same page that this was forbidden by many Synods.

were strong and were very difficult to resist for an order that was developing a relationship with, and searching for a place in society.

While senior members of the church were happy to see these developments in the Franciscans other members of the church hierarchy, especially the parish priests, were not. Many of them existed in a state of near poverty and Salimbene claims that their resistance to the Franciscans had a financial basis. They felt that the Franciscans by assuming parish duties were interfering with their already limited financial returns. Salimbene made it clear that the conflict between the secular priesthood and the Order continued for many years and was not settled when he was writing in the 1280's. Salimbene's *Chronicle* also suggests that a large number of the laity simply did not trust their priests to provide spiritual guidance and indeed some may have felt that some members of the priesthood actually posed a danger to the populace. This made it easier for the Franciscans to assume clerical duties and, of course, would have made the secular clergy even angrier.

The Franciscans were only one of a series of spontaneous spiritual movements which emerged in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Just as the secular priesthood felt that the Franciscans were competition for limited finances so the Franciscans felt that other non-orthodox religious movements were likely to limit donations to the Franciscans. They therefore developed a four pronged approach to counteract these new movements: they could act with the secular church to overpower them; they could take part in them; they could take charge of them, or, if the new movement was not a threat, they could ignore them. Salimbene provided us with examples of all four approaches. This is not to read a conspiratorial manner into all of the Franciscans' actions with

respect to "competitors". It seems more likely, that at least some of the time, they merely responded to outside forces in a manner that was most convenient at the time. However, in the case of The Friars of the Sack, there does not seem to be any question that they acted in concert with the secular Church to force the Papacy to destroy the Order.

Finally the changes in the activities of the Franciscans resulted in significant changes in the Order itself. What had been an order that had taken pride in the limited nature of its physical plant was now increasingly making use of elaborate buildings which were more and more making their mark on the geography of the cities.

More significant, and less self-evident, the relationship between the brothers themselves changed. An order which had been started by a layman and which had valued both lay and cleric equally, increasingly began to value the cleric more highly than the "useless" lay member. As regular sources of remuneration became available to the Order and the need for begging decreased, it changed so much that its founder would probably not have found a place in it.

The changes in the Order and its relationships with other sections of Northern Italian Society are of course closely related and cannot be investigated individually. The clericalization of the Order would not have been possible without it establishing a relationship with the wealthy and powerful which, in turn, would not have been possible or necessary if the Order had not been seen to be a useful tool by both civic and church government. Taken together however the changes in the Order would indicate the correctness of Landini's hypothesis on the reason for them. Because the church did not possess a developed theology with respect to the position of the layman in the church the

Order could only survive as a distinct way of life in one way. It had to clericalize.² It can only be regretted that by doing so, its distinctness was greatly reduced and, to some extent, the genius of Francis's spirituality was lost.

While the events described by Salimbene are of great importance to the historian, his work is valuable for another reason. It reminds us why history remains so fascinating. He is so skilled at describing strikingly significant detail that he renders characters and events vivid and unforgettable. These individuals vary from the saintly Brother Rainald who agonizes over accepting a bishopric, to Brother Benedict of the Horn who lured the children to follow him, to the papal legate, Phillip, who acted as a warrior and was surrounded by forty armed men. Salimbene even has the ability to focus on the distinguishing characteristics of men he has not met and render them in a scene which seems to capture the very essence of the individual's personality. He reminds us that in spite of the separation of some eight hundred years and their immersion in a completely different social milieu, the human beings described by Salimbene closely resemble those who walk the streets with us. They remain exasperating and satisfying, noisy and peaceful, dishonest and trustworthy, wise and stupid, and above all else, entertaining.

² Landini, *Causes*, 143.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Francis of Assisi. "A Letter to the Entire Order." In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume I The Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong, OFM Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellmann, OFM Conv., and William J. Short, OFM, 116-121. New York: New City Press, 1999.
- _____. "The Admonitions." In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume I The Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong, OFM Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellmann, OFM Conv., and William J. Short, OFM, 128-137. New York: New City Press, 1999.
- _____. "The Earlier Rule 1210-1221." In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume I The Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong, OFM Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellmann, OFM Conv., and William J. Short, OFM, 63-86. New York: New City Press, 1999.
- _____. "The Later Rule." 1223. In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume I The Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong, OFM Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellmann, OFM Conv., and William Short, OFM, 99-106. New York: New City Press, 1999.
- _____. "The Testament." 1226. In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume I The Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong, OFM Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellmann, OFM Conv., and William J. Short, OFM, 124-127. New York: New City Press, 1999.
- Fratris Thomae vulgo dicti de Eccleston. *Tractatus de Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*. Ed. A.G. Little. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1951.
- Leo, Rufino, and Angelo Companions of St. Francis. *Scripta Leonis, Rufini et Angeli Sociorum S. Francisci*. Ed. and trans. Rosalind B. Brooke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Salimbene de Adam. *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*. Translated by Joseph L. Baird, Giuseppe Baglivi and John Robert Kane with Introduction and Notes by Joseph L. Baird. Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1986.
- _____. *Cronica Fratris Salimbene de Adam*. Ed. Giuseppe Scalia. Bari: Laterza, 1966.
- Thomas de Celano, Fr., OFM. "Fasciculus I Vita Prima S. Francisci Assisiensis et Eiusdem Legenda ad Usus Chori." In *Analecta Franciscana Tomus X: Legendae XIII et XIV Conscriptae ad Codicum Fidem Recensitae*, 1-126. Frauenberg: Bibliotheca Conventus Fuldensis OFM.

_____. "Fasciculus II Vita Secunda S. Francisci" In *Analecta Franciscana, Tomus X: Legendae S. Francisci Assiensis Saeculis XIII et XIV Conscriptae ad Codicum Fidem Recensitae*, 129-268. Frauenberg: Bibliothega Conventus Fuldensis OFM, .

_____. "Tractatus de Miraculis." " In *Analecta Franciscana, Tomus X: Legendae S. Francisci Assiensis Saeculis XIII et XIV Conscriptae ad Codicum Fidem Recensitae*, 269-331. Frauenberg: Bibliothega Conventus Fuldensis OFM, .

Thomas of Celano. "The Life of Saint Francis by Thomas of Celano." 1228. In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume I The Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong, OFM Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellmann, OFM Conv., and William J. Short, OFM, 171-310. New York: New City Press, 2003.

_____. "The Remembrance of the Desire of a Soul." 1245. In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume II The Founder*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong, OFM Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellman, OFM Conv., and William J Short, OFM, 233-396. New York: New City Press, 2001.

_____. "The Treatise on the Miracles of Saint Francis." 1252. In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents Volume II The Founder*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong, OFM Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellman, OFM Conv., and William J Short, OFM, 397-470. New York: New City Press, 2001.

Thomas of Ecclestone. "The Coming of the Friars Minor to England." In *XIIIth Century Chronicles*, ed. and trans. Placid Herman, OFM, 79-192. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1961.

Secondary Sources

Abulafia, David. "Introduction." In *Italy in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. David Abulafia, 1-26. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Ascheri, Mario. "The Italian City-state and Its Inheritance." In *The Medieval World*, ed Peter Lineham and Janet L. Nelson, 451-467. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

Baird, Joseph L. and Guiseppe Baglivi. "Salimbene and *Il Bel Motto*." *American Benedictine Review* 28 (1977) :201-209.

Barraclough, Geoffrey. "The Making of a Bishop in the Middle Ages." *The Catholic Historical Review* 19 (1933-34): 275-319.

Beck, Henry G.J. "The Dispute over Franciscan Poverty 1226-1318." *The Ecclesiastical Review* 109 (1943): 331-350;418-436.

- Bolton, Brenda. "Innocent III's Treatment of the Humiliati." In *Popular Belief and Practice: Papers Read at the Ninth Summer Meeting and the Tenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. G.J. Cuming and Derek Baker, 73-82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- _____. "Tradition and Temerity: Papal Attitudes to Deviants 1159-1216." In *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest; Papers Read at the Tenth Summer Meeting and the Eleventh Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. Derek Baker, 79-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- _____. "The Poverty of the Humiliati." In *Poverty in the Middle Ages*, ed. David Flood, 52-59. Dietrich-Coelde-Verlag: Franziskanische Forschungen, 1975.
- Boriosi, Mark. "The *Chronica* de Fra Salimbene, 'Une "Cronique-Polemique"?'." *Collectanea Franciscana* 66:1-2(1996): 127-165.
- Brentano, Robert. "Early Franciscans and Italian Towns." In *Monks, Nuns and Friars in Medieval Society*, ed. Edward King, Jacqueline T. Schaefer, and William Wadley, 29-50. Sewanee: Press of the University of the South, 1989.
- _____. *A New World in a Small Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- _____. *Two Churches: England and Italy in the Thirteenth Century*. 1966. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Brooke, Rosalind B. *Early Franciscan Government Elias to Bonaventure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Brown, Daniel A. "The Alleluia. A Thirteenth Century Peace Movement." *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum Periodica Publicatio Trimestris Cura PP. Collegii D. Bonaventure* 81(1988): 1-16.
- Brown, Peter. *Augustine of Hippo*. London: Faber, 1967.
- Burr, David. *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989.
- _____. *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century after Saint Francis*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?" In *Jesus as Mother; Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*, 82-109. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

- Cohn, Norman. *The Pursuit of the Millennium*. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Coleman, Edward. "Cities and Communes." In *Italy in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. David Abulafia, 27-57. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Coleman, Janet. "The Two Jurisdictions: Theological and Legal Justifications of Church Property in the Thirteenth Century." In *The Church and Wealth: Papers Read at the 1986 Summer Meeting and the 1987 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. W.J. Shiels and Diana Wood 75-110. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Cusato, Michael, OFM. "Whence the Community." *Franciscan Studies* 60 (2002): 39-92.
- _____. "The Renunciation of Power as a Foundational Theme in Early Franciscan History." In *The Propagation of Power in the Medieval West: Selected Proceedings of the International Conference Groningen 20-23 November 1996*, ed. Martin Gosman, Arjo Vanderjagt, and Jan Veenstra, 265-286. Groningina: Mediaevalia Groningana, 1997.
- Dameron, George. *Florence and Its Church in the Age of Dante*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.
- Daniel, E. Randolph. "A Re-Examination of the Origins of Franciscan Joachitism." *Speculum* 43:4 (October 1968): 671-676.
- Dickson, Gary. "Encounters in Medieval Revivalism: Monks, Friars and Popular Enthusiasts." *Church History*. 68:2 (June, 1999): 265-293.
- _____. "The Flagellants of 1260 and the Crusades." *Journal of Medieval History* 15(1989) : 227-267.
- Diehl, Peter D. "Overcoming Reluctance to Prosecute Heresy in Thirteenth Century Italy." In *Christendom and Its Discontents: Exclusion, Persecution and Rebellion, 1000-1500*. ed. Scott L. Waugh and Peter D. Diehl, 47-66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Emerton, Ephraim. "Fra Salimbene and the Franciscan Ideal." *Harvard Theological Review* VIII (1915): 480-503.
- Emery, Richard W. "A Note on the Friars of the Sack." *Speculum* 35:4 (October, 1960): 591-595.
- _____. "The Friars of the Sack." *Speculum* 18:3 (July, 1943): 323-334.

- Ferris, I.M. "Excavations at Grey Friars Gloucester in 1967 and 1974-5." *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 119 for 2001(2002) : 95-146.
- Flood, David. "The Domestication of the Franciscan Movement." *Franziskanische Studien* 60:4 (1978): 311-327.
- _____. "Gospel Poverty and the Poor." *Concilium* 187 (1986): 63-69.
- _____. "The Grundmann Approach to Early Franciscan History." *Franziskanische Studien* 59:4 (1977): 311-319.
- _____. "Poverty as Virtue, Poverty as Warning and Peter of John Olivi." *Etudes de philosophie medievale* 79 (1999): 157-172.
- _____. "Franciscans at Work." *Franciscan Studies* 59 (2001): 21-62.
- Foot, Sarah. "Finding the Meaning of Form: Narrative in Annals and Chronicles." In *Writing Medieval History*, ed. Nancy Partner, 88-108. London: Hodder Arnold, 2005.
- Foot, Rob. "The Poverty of Francis of Assisi: Historical Actions and Mythologized Meanings." In *No Gods Except Me: Orthodoxy and Religious Practice in Europe 1200-1600*, ed. Charles Zika, 37-58. Melbourne: University of Melbourne, 1991.
- Franklin, James. *The Science of Conjecture*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins Press, 2002.
- Ginami, Luigi. *Il Beato Alberto di Villa d'Ogna*. Milano: Paoline Editoriale Libri, 2000.
- Gougaud, Louis. "Mulerum Consortia: Etude sur le syneisaktisme chez les ascetes celtiques." *Eriu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 9(1923) :147-156.
- Gow, Andrew. "Popular Persuasions: Flagellants and the Construction of Sanctity in Latin and Orthodox Christendom." In *Fonction Sociales et Politiques du Culte des Saints dans les Socites de Rite Grec et Latin au Moyen Age et a l'Epoque Modern. Approche Comparative* ed. Mark Derwich and Michel Dmitrev, 457-468. Wroclaw: Pracownia Baden and Dziejami Zakonow i Kongregacji Kosielnych, 1999.
- Grundman. *Religious Movements in the Middle Age*. Translated by Steven Rowan. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.
- Hay, Dennis. *Annalists and Historians: Western Historiography from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century*. London: Methuen and Company Ltd., 1977.

Head, Thomas and Richard Landes, ed. *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Heers, Jacques. *Parties and Political Influence in the Medieval West*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1977.

Henderson, John. "The Flagellant Movement and Flagellant Confraternities in Central Italy, 1260-1400." In *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian: Papers Read at the Sixteenth Summer Meeting and Seventeenth Winter meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. Derek Baker, 147-160. Oxford: The Ecclesiastical History Society, 1978.

Hyde, J.K.. *Society and Politics in Medieval Italy: The Evolution of the Civil Life 1000-1350*. London: Macmillan, 1973.

Iogna-Prat, Dominique. "La femme dans la perspective penitentielle der ermites du Bas-Maine (fin XI^{ème} debut XII^{ème} siecle)." *Revue d'Histoire de la Spiritualite* 53(1977) :47-64.

Kinsella, Sean. "The Poverty of Christ in the Medieval Debates Between the Papacy and the Franciscans." *Laurentianum* 36:3 (1995): 477-509.

Lambert, M. D. *Medieval Heresy; Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3d ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.

_____. *Franciscan Poverty*. London: Church Historical Society, 1961.

Landini, Lawrence C. O.F.M. *The Causes of the Clericalization of the Order of Friars Minor 1209-1260 in Light of Early Franciscan Sources*. Chicago: Pontifica Universitas Gregoriana Facultas Historiae Ecclesiasticae, 1968.

Lapansky, Duane V. *Evangelical Perfection*. New York: The Franciscan Institute, 1977.

Lawrence, C. H. *The Friars: The Impact of the Early Mendicant Movement on Western Society*. London and New York: Longman, 1994.

_____. "The Letters of Adam Marsh and the Franciscan School at Oxford." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 40.2 (April 1991): 218-238.

Leff, Gordon. "Heresy and the Decline of the Medieval Church." *Past and Present* 20 (November, 1961) : 36-51.

_____. *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages: The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent c1250- c.1450*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967.

Little, Lester K. "Evangelical Poverty, the New Money Economy and Violence." In *Poverty in the Middle Ages*, ed. David Flood, 11-26. Dietrich-Coelde-Verlag: Franziskanische Forschungen, 1975.

_____. *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Makinen, Virpa. "The Rights of the Poor: An Argument against Franciscans." In *Nordic Perspectives of Medieval Canon Law (Publications of Matthias Calonius Society)*, ed. Mia Korpiola, 41-49. Saarijarvi: Gummerus Kirjapaino Oy, 1999.

Millar, Maureen. *The Bishop's Palace*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

_____. "Religion Makes a Difference: Clerical and Lay Cultures in the Courts of Northern Italy, 1000-1300." *American Historical Review* 105:4 (October 2000): 1095-1130.

Moore, R.I. "Family, Community and Cult on the Eve of the Gregorian Reform." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 5th Series* 30 (1980): 49-69.

Moorman, John. *A History of the Franciscan Order from Its Origins to the Year 1517*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Mueller, Joan. "Poverty Legislation and Mutual Relations in the Early Franciscan Movement." *Collectanea Franciscana* 71:3-4 (2001): 389-419.

Murray, Alexander. "Piety and Impiety in Thirteenth-Century Italy." In *Popular Belief and Practice: Papers Read at the Ninth Summer Meeting and the Tenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. G.J. Cuming and Derek Baker, 83-106. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Nelson, Janet L. "Society, Theodicy and the Origins of Heresy: Towards a Reassessment of the Medieval Evidence." In *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest: Papers Read at the Tenth Summer Meeting and the Eleventh Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. Derek Baker, 65-77. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Partner, Nancy. "Hayden White: The Form of the Content." *History and Theory* 37:2 (May 1998): 162-172.

_____. "Making Up Lost Time: Writing on the Writing of History." *Speculum* 61:1 (Jan 1986): 90-117.

_____. "Medieval Histories and Modern Realism: Yet Another Origin of the Novel." *Modern Language Notes* 114:4 (September, 1999): 857-873.

- Paul, Jacques. "The signification sociale du Franciscanisme." In *Mouvements franciscains et societe francais XII^e-XX^e siecles*, ed. A. Vauches, 9-25. Paris, 1984.
- Peters, Edward. *Europe in the Middle Ages*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1997.
- Powell, James M. "The Papacy and the Early Franciscans." *Franciscan Studies* 36 (1976): 248-262.
- _____. "Religious Diversity and Communal Politics in Thirteenth-Century Italy." In *Portraits of Medieval and Renaissance Living: Essays in Memory of David Herlihy*, ed. Samuel K. Cohn and Stephen A. Epstein, 363-381. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Reeves, Marjorie. *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1969.
- _____. *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future*. London: SPCK, 1976.
- Renna, Thomas. "St Francis as Prophet in Celano and Bonaventure." *Michigan Academician: Papers of the Michigan Academy of Sciences Arts and Letters* 33:4 : 321-332.
- Reynolds, Roger E. "Virgines Subintroductae in Celtic Christianity." *The Harvard Theological Review* 61:4 (Oct. 1968): 547-566.
- Rubenstein, Jay. "Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages." In *Writing Medieval History*, ed. Nancy Partner, 22-41. London: Hodder Arnold, 2005).
- Stephens, John N. "Heresy in Medieval and Renaissance Florence." *Past and Present* 54 (February 1972): 25-60.
- Thompson, Augustine O.P. *Cities of God: The Religion of the Italian Communes 1125-1325*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.
- _____. *Revival Preachers and Politics in Thirteenth-Century Italy: The Great Devotion of 1233*. Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1992
- Trexler, Richard. "The Bishop's Portion: Generic Pious Legacies in the Late Middle Ages In Italy." *Traditio* 28 (1972): 397-449.
- West, Delno C. "Between Flesh and Spirit: Joachite Pattern and Meaning in the Cronica of Fra Salimbene." *Journal of Medieval History* 3:4 (1977): 339-352.

_____. "The Education of Fra Salimbene of Parma: The Joachite Influence." In *Prophecy and Millenarianism: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves*, ed. Ann Williams, 193-215. Burnt Hill: Longman, 1980.

_____. "The Re-formed Church and the Friars Minor: The Moderate Joachite Position of Fra Salimbene." *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum Periodica Publicatio Trimestris Cura PP. Collegii D. Bonaventure* 64 (1971): 273-284.

White, Hayden. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality." In *The Content of the Form*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.