Heresy and Inquisition in the Middle Ages
Volume 5

Late Medieval Heresy: New Perspectives

YORK MEDIEVAL PRESS

York Medieval Press is published by the University of York's Centre for Medieval Studies in association with Boydell h& Brewer Limited. Our objective is the promotion of innovative scholarship and fresh criticism on medieval culture. We have a special commitment to interdisciplinary study, in line with the Centre's belief that the future of Medieval Studies lies in those areas in which its major constituent disciplines at once inform and challenge each other.

All enquiries of an editorial kind, including suggestions for monographs and essay collections, should be addressed to: The Academic Editor, York Medieval Press, University of York, Centre for Medieval Studies, The King's Manor, York, YO1 7EP (E-mail: gmg501@york.ac.uk).

Heresy and Inquisition in the Middle Ages

ISSN 2046–8938

Heresy had social, cultural and political implications in the Middle Ages, and countering heresy was often a central component in the development of orthodoxy. This series publishes work on heresy, and the repression of heresy, from late antiquity to the Reformation, including monographs, collections of essays and editions of texts.

Publications of York Medieval Press in this series are listed at the back of this volume.

Late Medieval Heresy: New Perspectives

Studies in Honor of Robert E. Lerner

Edited by
Michael D. Bailey
and Sean L. Field

THE UNIVERSITY of York

YORK MEDIEVAL PRESS

First published 2018

A York Medieval Press publication
in association with The Boydell Press
an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620–2731, USA
website: www.boydellandbrewer.com
and with the
Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York
www.york.ac.uk/medieval-studies

ISBN 978-1-903153-82-6

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

Contents

Preface
Robert E. Lerner: A Portrait

Richard Kieckhefer

In 1977, several medievalists at Northwestern University joined together in teaching an undergraduate Introduction to the Middle Ages. Planning and teaching of this course was collaborative, but Robert Lerner, then in his thirties and recently promoted to full professor, played a crucial role at all stages. His lectures set a dauntingly high standard for the other faculty, myself included, who followed him in lecturing and did so while he and other colleagues sat in the auditorium alongside the students. Every one of his lectures was a work of art whose crafting was accentuated by a carefully practiced delivery that radiated deep and powerful intellectual energy. One day he lectured on the English monarchy, focusing in particular on Henry II, whose innovations, Lerner explained, were major landmarks in the development of English government and of Anglo-American public life. We might have heard from friends or relatives who had been called for jury duty and had seen this as a valuable opportunity for engagement in the life of the community – and in testifying to the importance of jury duty such people were bearing witness to the long-range impact of Henry II's innovations, which represented a step forward in the development of civil institutions. When class was over, I asked Robert whether he was committed to some version of a teleological view of history, and he immediately disclaimed any such view. A few days later, however, he returned to my question and gave a more nuanced answer. In his research he had no commitment to teleology, but in his teaching he remained under the influence of his own mentor, Joseph Strayer, whose work on the medieval origins of the modern state did rest on a firm conviction that the broad arc of institutional development was one of long-range progress.

This exchange points toward several aspects of Robert Lerner and his work. His returning to my question and giving a different answer is in itself significant: always open to fuller reflection, he often revisits and revises what he has said, orally or in writing. He revealed on this occasion a typically profound sense of indebtedness to his *Doktorvater*. It might seem perplexing that he allowed himself a kind of teleological perspective in teaching that he would not embrace in his research, but on this point too he might be open

to further nuance. His research may not be grounded in a sense that history has a goal or that it manifests inevitable progress, but the medieval writers to whom he has devoted his career did hold such beliefs. His prophets and visionaries often turned to apocalyptic themes and could incline at times toward violence, but among his own main interests has been the millenarian vision most fully articulated by Joachim of Fiore, and the origin of a concept of historical progress has been a dominant concern in his work.

In medieval Europe, as in any other setting, a belief in progress might be hard to sustain in the face of empirical evidence and critique that could escalate into persecution. A man like Robert, whose commitment to progressive politics has always been uncompromising even in desperate times (during the war in Iraq he continued to participate in public protests long after most of us had lost hope of making any impact, and when George W. Bush was re-elected he wore a black armband), will not be tempted by uncritical optimism. That said, it remains clear that an interest in both the idea of progress and the hope of progress has been a foundational principle for Robert's research, his teaching, and his life.

For years, visitors to Robert's office in Harris Hall would find framed portraits of distinguished historians on the wall. (Rumor has it that on one occasion a graduate student sneaked into his office and replaced one of those portraits with one of herself.) Robert has always had a strong sense of academic lineage, and his lineage included the greatest of American medievalists. Having Joseph Strayer as his own *Doktorvater* meant that the first eminent medievalist in the country, Charles Homer Haskins, was his grandfather, and Herbert Baxter Adams, founder of the history seminar at Johns Hopkins, was his great-grandfather. He imparted this sense of lineage to his own graduate students, wanting them to know that they were Strayer's intellectual grandchildren, and so on back to the founding of American medievalism. Once when he had lectured to undergraduates on Henry II, he spoke afterward with his teaching assistants and emphasized to them (as he had to me) his indebtedness to Strayer. One of those former teaching assistants describes the scene: 'To bring home the point, he spread his arms out wide in a characteristically Robertian gesture, palms upward, head cocked a little to the side. He looked dramatically heavenward, and asked, "How did I do, Joe?"'

Robert's forebears had been involved in public roles at a high level: Charles Homer Haskins had been an adviser to Woodrow Wilson, and Joseph Strayer did intelligence work under Eisenhower. Robert's own opportunity for public service seemed to present itself when George McGovern, who held a doctorate from Northwestern's History Department, ran for president, and Robert eagerly anticipated being appointed ambassador to the Holy Roman Empire. For better or for worse, that dream remained unfulfilled.

Students do not always follow directly in their mentors' footsteps. Herbert Baxter Adams was not even specifically a medievalist, but his student Charles

Homer Haskins turned to medieval cultural history, and in the next generation Joseph Strayer's interests moved decidedly toward government and institutions. Even while working under Strayer's eye, Robert turned back to cultural history with a strong interest in the religious life that Strayer had not found alluring. Like all of us in the academic world, Robert was formed by living mentors and also by books. Like many of us, he was influenced not only by the books he agreed with but by those he reacted against. When I first met him in the early 1970s, he told me that he had begun his career responding to one side of Norman Cohn's *Pursuit of the Millennium* and was now turning to the other side. He had already shown that the 'heresy of the Free Spirit' was more deeply grounded and more widely diffused in mainstream mysticism than Cohn had realized, and much the same could be said of millenarianism. The heretics and the prophets were certainly not isolated, nor even particularly exceptional. They could only be understood in the far broader cultural world that they represented.

The historian whose work had stronger positive influence was Herbert Grundmann, whom Robert once described as 'a toweringly great scholar and man'. Grundmann had recognized the fundamental significance of Joachim of Fiore and had anticipated the generation of scholars that would come after him – Alexander Patschovsky, Robert, and many others – who would place the study of Joachim on solid footing. But the *magnum opus* for which Grundmann was known was his *Religiöse Bewegungen in Mittelalter*, his *Habilitationsschrift*, published in 1935, which presented a magisterial synthesis of religious culture in the high Middle Ages, laid out the forking paths of heresy and orthodoxy, clarified the position of religious women, and with all this laid the foundations for later work such as Robert's. If Robert could trace his lineage back to the founding fathers of the historical profession in America, through Grundmann he now could claim an alternative but more complex lineage extending back into an earlier generation of German cultural historians, that of Grundmann's own *Doktorvater* Walter Goetz. But that lineage became problematized as the complexities of the Nazi era came ever more to light, and it became clear that between the genial Grundmann with his broad and sympathetic historical vision in the 1930s and the warmly hospitable Grundmann of the 1960s stood the Grundmann of the 1940s who had been more complicit with the Nazi cause than a young secular Jew from New York would have had any reason to suspect.

Was there any figure who could bring these lines of influence into focus – the world of German cultural history in the Weimar period, the world of Princeton with its inspired historical scholarship and public engagement, the world of the secular Jew confronted with and confronting the anti-Semitism of mid-century? It was perhaps inevitable that Robert would sooner or later become fascinated by Ernst Kantorowicz, the one figure who, straddling the Atlantic and also the war years, most strikingly synthesizes these diverse strands in his own life and career. Robert's long and painstaking work on

Kantorowicz, researching both his published and unpublished writings and pursuing contacts with every manner of individual who knew him, provided a fitting capstone for Robert's own career as he moved into retirement. Other books that Robert has produced can justly be called seminal, judicious, path-breaking, and richly nuanced, but the biography of Kantorowicz can best be called simply monumental. It is devoted to 'a life', that of 'EKa', but it is far more than that, because the subject lived in many worlds, each diversely populated, and they all receive their due. It is also a book filled with anecdote, including Kantorowicz's complaint about articles written for *Pestschriften*.

In any case, it was when Robert went to Germany for postdoctoral research that he fell under the spell of the manuscript libraries and began a decades-long fascination with the thrill of discovery in manuscripts. Once he was bitten by the bug, it seemed he would travel deep into the backwoods in search of manuscripts. He tells a story of going to some remote Italian monastery to consult the manuscripts in its library, but the monk who came to the door said the library was closed. When would it be reopened? *Forse domani. Forse dopodomani*. *Forse mai.* But Robert was persistent, and surely few of the manuscripts he set his sights on escaped him.

His filing cabinets, filled with photocopies of manuscripts, were legendary, and with them as with everything else he was always generous, sharing especially with students in need of research projects. One of those students speaks of Robert's 'magical file cabinet', perhaps as tall as he was, which he would approach, coming out from behind his desk to find the right material: 'After just a moment's thought, he would confidently open a drawer and reach back further than the old metal drawers could possibly allow, returning with precisely the manuscript photocopy (of some obscure text) that he sought'.

The work habits of American academics vary widely; some rarely appear on campus, and some show up unpredictably. Not Robert. One could count on him being in his office, always at work but always interruptible, from early morning until the end of the day. He called himself the Wolfenbüttel-man, claiming to arrive before sunrise and remain until after sunset so he would not be caught outdoors in daylight. One student happened to spot him coming out of the History building early on a summer afternoon, and the student was so startled to see him in sunlight that he ducked for cover, and Robert never noticed him.

He has always relished the thrill of discovery, whether his own or someone else's. He reportedly wants it to be inscribed on his tombstone that he discovered a sermon by Bonaventure. When he gives a paper it is often based on some discovery he has made in the manuscript libraries, and he can poke fun at himself, fantasizing about a newspaper headline that announced the discovery of some recondite triviality, but the self-deprecation soon turns to the point that even small chunks of gold are still golden. If a graduate student discovered a lost Merlin prophecy that had been hiding in plain sight, hidden

within another text, that student could count on him for an enthusiastic response. But he has a soft spot for babies and young children as well, and if a student brought her ten-month-old daughter along for a discussion of her dissertation, the entire appointment might be taken up with Robert and the baby making faces at each other, also sharing the thrill of discovery.

David Hume famously advised his reader to be a philosopher but still a man, which had something to do with taking time off to play backgammon. Robert might easily adapt this maxim for himself and other historians. Very little in the world of culture seems beyond his interest. When someone was going abroad, he might advise imitating his own custom of attending a concert once or twice a week. To be sure, his cultural tastes do not stretch in all directions: when he hears medieval music he will switch it off as quickly as a DDR citizen hearing a speech by Walter Ulbricht (within an *Ulb*). Still, in a room full of medievalists he will be the one to catch the difference between an authentic bit of medieval chant and a neomedieval fabrication. There are fields in which he knows more than he lets on.

There are some medievalists around who were brought up on the Latin liturgy, plainchant, scholastic theology, and the rich diversity of late medieval devotionalism, whether it be high culture or kitsch. Robert has never claimed to be among the last of the medieval Christians. The history of medieval culture is not his personal history, and he is not drawn to it as to his own past. How does one come to be particularly interested in this or any other field of the humanities other than by personal connection? In many ways, and the motives are probably always overdetermined. My theory is that someone like Robert takes a special interest in medieval history not because he must but because he can. It is in many ways a difficult area of history. It requires several languages, and paleography. Medieval historians are known for being able to draw conclusions from limited evidence, which is said to be a reason they can be good at intelligence work, like Strayer. Granted, for the last medieval centuries we have a wealth of material that can be intimidating, but finding the right material in the manuscript libraries or archives can be equally daunting. There is an embarrassment of riches, but they are often buried treasure. Many years ago Robert urged me forward with my research, saying I could expect to find abundant relevant manuscripts – then a few months later he wrote to say no, the undiscovered materials were rare and hard to locate – but again after a few months he wrote to say that he was right the first time, that people like Patschovsky were turning up exciting new discoveries and one could reasonably expect to succeed in the hunt. Now that the search is easier with the aid of the Internet, Robert has more than a tinge of regret. Manuscripts should not be like fish swimming in the barrel of the World Wide Web. In any case, he himself is someone who has always been consummately good at this sort of history and relishes it in no small part because of its challenges.

His work habits and his fondness for the cell of his office might lead some to wonder if he is a hermit at heart, but that illusion is quickly corrected.

He is one of the most social of scholars. His students tell of following him around at conventions like so many *Entchen*, becoming professionalized in both sparring and schmoozing as they follow their mother duck. His home is among the great centers of academic socializing in the Chicago area, swarming with colleagues, visitors, and (in imitation of Grundmann) graduate students, with food often harvested from Robert's own garden and prepared either by him or by his wife Erdmut, his partner in a life rich in culture, society, and political engagement, to whom he and his friends all owe so much. He gladly shares his connections with friends and students, so that he has become not just a *Doktorvater* to many but a kind of paterfamilias, linking members of a broad academic family. Alexander Patschovsky holds a special place in this extended family, not only as a fellow explorer in the lands of heresy and prophecy but as a scholar singularly generous with his time and aid to all within Robert's circle, myself very much included.

Robert is known for forthrightness in expressing his views, which may be softened or sharpened by his equally famous wit. Once when he was working at the Vatican Library he deduced from the sign-in sheet that an English visitor was someone whose errors he had brought to light, and he was reasonably sure that the Englishman had figured out who he was. When they happened to be leaving the men's room at the same time, Robert held the door for him and was met with *grazie* in a broad English accent, to which he said *prego*. 'Not one of your great scholarly interchanges'. Graduate students thought of him as 'demanding and more than a bit terrifying', as one says, and a first round of suggestions did not at all preclude a later message that might begin with 'I've been thinking…' and proceed to more radical critique. Of course it was not just graduate students who were subject to this treatment but colleagues and friends. Once when he was abroad I sent a chapter draft for his reading, and he promptly sent valuable comments, leading up to a serious complaint about my organization of the chapter. He ended the letter, 'Of course I recognize that a host of very smart people have read this MS before me and apparently haven't found the same problem so maybe I am wrong.' Then, after the signature: 'P.S. But I don't really think so.' On another occasion he expressed admiration for what I had written, made numerous suggestions, then added, 'In any event, remember that according to Voltaire (or was it Oscar Wilde?) the secret of being a bore is to tell everything'. But he is fully open to reciprocation, and his friends do at times point out slips he has made. He lamented once to Erdmut that he 'would love some day to write something completely perfect', and 'her wise answer was, "You'd better keep it short."'

One advantage that Robert's graduate students always had was the opportunity for a rite of passage. When they passed their qualifying exams, he would tell them they could now call him Robert. At least one former graduate student, now himself a distinguished heir to Robert's tradition, recalls that this was *all* he said in congratulation. But this was an effective rite of passage

that led many of them on to careers in which they could repay their mentor by continuing to labor in the field, and now to signal their gratitude by presenting him with a *Pestschrift* of his own.

List of Contributors

Michael D. Bailey is Professor of History at Iowa State University.

Louisa A. Burnham is Associate Professor of History at Middlebury College.

Elizabeth Casteen is Associate Professor of History at Binghamton University.

Jörg Feuchter is Head of the Department 'Regesta Imperii – Regesten Kaiser Friedrichs III.' at the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Sean L. Field is Professor of History at the University of Vermont.

Samantha Kelly is Professor of History at Rutgers University.

Richard Kieckhefer is Sarah Rebecca Roland Professor of Religious Studies and Professor of History at Northwestern University.

Deeana Copeland Klepper is Associate Professor of Religion and History at Boston University.

Frances Kneupper is Associate Professor of History at the University of Mississippi.

Georg Modestin is Gastforscher at the Mediävistisches Institut, Universität Freiburg (Switzerland), and teaches history at the Kantonsschule Freudenberg (Zurich).

Barbara Newman is John Evans Professor of Latin and Professor of English, Religious Studies, and Classics at Northwestern University.

Sylvain Piron is Directeur d'études at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales.

Justine L. Trombley is a Leverhulme Early Career Fellow at the University of Nottingham.

Introduction
Historiography, Methodology, and Manuscripts: Robert E. Lerner and the Study of Late Medieval Heresy*

Michael D. Bailey and Sean L. Field

For a millennium heresy has been central to 'the making of European culture'.[1] Indeed, claims for its centrality could be pushed back to well before the year 1000, to the Nicene Council and even earlier debates around the nature of Christian orthodoxy.[2] But the formative battles of the Roman period were long past by the eleventh century when western Europe began its economic, demographic, and intellectual 'leap' forward toward the modern world.[3] From the Gregorian reforms to the Protestant Reformation and beyond, heresies and heretics helped to shape the religious, political, and institutional structures that medieval Europe would bequeath to the modern West. Within this sweeping history, the late medieval period, traditionally understood as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, presents a particularly diverse array of heterodox movements and modes of thought. Yet despite this richness, or perhaps because of it, some of the most intriguing heresies and heretics from this era of 'paradox, tension, and unpredictability' have been undervalued in wider studies,[4] treated either as epilogues to the better-studied twelfth and thirteenth centuries or as preludes to the epoch-making religious revolutions of the sixteenth.

This introduction first addresses the historiographic landscape of medieval heresy, focusing in particular on periodization and its consequences. Then,

* We thank Peter Biller, Jennifer Kolpacoff Deane, Richard Kieckhefer, and Justine Trombley for suggestions and corrections to this introduction.

1 *Heresy and the Making of European Culture: Medieval and Modern Perspectives*, ed. A. P. Roach and J. R. Simpson (Farnham, 2013).

2 Recently encapsulated in D. E. Wilhite, *The Gospel According to Heretics: Discovering Orthodoxy through Early Christological Conflicts* (Grand Rapids MI, 2015).

3 Robert Lerner was accustomed to beginning his introductory course at Northwestern University, 'European Civilization *c*. 1050–*c*. 1750', with a lecture on 'Western Europe's Leap' (as shown in one of the editor's notes, taken when a graduate teaching assistant in 1998).

4 The quotation is from J. D. Mixson, 'Bernardino's Rotting Corpse? A Skeptic's Tale of Capestrano's Preaching North of the Alps', *Franciscan Studies* 75 (2017), 73–88 (p. 73).

as befitting a collection honoring the pioneering work of Robert E. Lerner, it outlines the elements of a 'Lernerian' approach to late medieval heresy and suggests ways in which this approach informs the new perspectives presented here.

The Historiographic Landscape

The work of the German historian Herbert Grundmann (1902–70) has profoundly influenced scholars of medieval religious history, including – as Richard Kieckhefer's preface notes – Robert Lerner. For the field as a whole, Grundmann's most influential work was undoubtedly his brilliant 1935 study of *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, which analyzed ways in which groups that cohered around spiritual, intellectual, and cultural ideals shared by broad swathes of European society could still end up forced into dissent or at least labeled as dissidents.[5] In this analysis, a figure such as Valdes of Lyon partook in the apostolic impulses that animated many twelfth-century figures, but when his refusal to abandon lay preaching led to condemnation, he and his followers were labeled as heretics, and many ultimately came to understand themselves as opponents of the organized Church.[6] In other words the ardent spiritual impulses driving such figures were hardly imagined by hostile churchmen, yet the move into 'heresy' was the result of degenerating relations with the ecclesiastical hierarchy and not of an initial intention to rebel. Grundmann thus pointed the way to a methodology capable of studying men and women labeled as heretics as well as the forces that imposed that label.[7]

Grundmann's work also exemplifies a periodization that traces the rise of such 'popular' heresies after the turn of the millennium and follows their fortunes through the end of the thirteenth century. The logic to such a periodization is clear, since by 1300 the paradigmatic heresies spawned by the twelfth century, such as Waldensianism, had indeed passed their peak of visibility.[8] Although Waldensian groups survived in pockets across Europe, and excellent studies by Peter Biller and Euan Cameron have pursued their

5 Available in English (at Robert Lerner's instigation) as H. Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages: The Historical Links between Heresy, the Mendicant Orders, and the Women's Religious Movement in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Century, with the Historical Foundations of German Mysticism*, trans. S. Rowan, intro. R. E. Lerner (Notre Dame IN, 1995); see Lerner, 'Introduction', pp. xxii–xxiii, on Grundmann's pervasive influence.

6 Grundmann, *Religious Movements*, pp. 25–30.

7 For assessment of Grundmann's continuing relevance, see *Between Orders and Heresy: Rethinking Medieval Religious Movements*, ed. J. Kolpacoff Deane and A. E. Lester, (forthcoming).

8 Thus the chronological coverage of a survey such as A. P. Roach, *The Devil's World: Heresy and Society, 1100–1300* (Harlow, 2005).

history up through the Reformation,[9] these dissidents had largely been forced into a clandestine existence in the course of the thirteenth century, following the first appointments of papally-commissioned inquisitors of heretical depravity in the 1230s.[10]

Recently, the view of the thirteenth century as a period of straightforward ecclesiastical response to forces unleashed in the twelfth has become hotly contested. The field's most impassioned debate has been over the extent to which an organized dualist heresy existed in any real sense in twelfth-century Languedoc, before the Albigensian Crusade (1209–29) and the inquisitors who arrived in its wake shattered and reshaped pre-crusade society.[11] This challenge goes well beyond considering how the Church's rejection of certain elements within broader spiritual currents could produce heresies, to argue that crusaders and inquisitors actually conjured into existence, retrospectively, the twelfth-century origins of the very heresies they claimed to be combatting in the mid-thirteenth. Still, wherever one falls on the 'Cathar question', there is little doubt that the twelfth-century existence of the good men and women of the Midi was substantially transformed by the later thirteenth century, and that their 'heresy' was eventually wiped out in renewed campaigns during the first decades of the fourteenth. Thus even in this revisionist view, the years between 1300 and 1330 still mark an end point to a narrative that begins in the twelfth century.

This basic periodization is evident in many forms of scholarship, from source collections to broad syntheses and more specialized studies. In the Anglophone world, the classic 1969 collection by Wakefield and Evans, for example, was well stocked with twelfth- and thirteenth-century sources, but from the fourteenth century admitted only the French inquisitor Bernard Gui's *Practica inquisitionis heretice pravitatis* as a culmination of thirteenth-century trends.[12] R. I. Moore's more focused 1975 collection of sources on *The Birth of Popular Heresy* understandably included mostly texts from the twelfth century and only a few from the thirteenth.[13] Moore further solidified this trend with his influential survey of the *Origins of European Dissent* (1977), and continued it through a string of important publications, down to his *War on Heresy* (2012), where treatment of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century heresies is

9 P. Biller, *The Waldenses, 1170–1530: Between a Religious Order and a Church* (Aldershot, 2001); E. Cameron, *Waldenses: Rejection of Holy Church in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2000).

10 For a perspective on 'Waldensianisms' that has sometimes been compared to Robert Lerner's work on Free Spirits, see G. G. Merlo, *Valdesi e valdismi medievali: itinerari e proposte di ricerca* (Turin, 1984).

11 See *Cathars in Question*, ed. A. Sennis (York, 2016) for both sides of the debate and for extensive bibliography.

12 *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, ed. and trans. W. L. Wakefield and A. P. Evans (New York, 1969).

13 R. I. Moore, *The Birth of Popular Heresy* (1975; reprint Toronto, 1995).

limited to a brief epilogue.[14] Although Edward Peters's collection on *Heresy and Authority* and certainly his expansive survey of *Inquisition* both took a broader approach,[15] the most influential recent studies of mechanisms of power deployed against heretics – such as James Given's *Inquisition and Medieval Society*, John Arnold's *Inquisition and Power*, and Christine Caldwell Ames's *Righteous Persecution* – are all grounded firmly in the thirteenth century and only venture briefly into the early fourteenth.[16] Similarly, two important new translation projects spearheaded by Peter Biller and John Arnold focus on the thirteenth century.[17] By contrast, the only broad overview that attempts to address multiple forms of heresy and ecclesiastical response specifically in the late medieval period remains Gordon Leff's 1967 synthesis,[18] though in 1979 Richard Kieckhefer produced an insightful study of primarily late medieval heresies in Germany,[19] and more recently several important essay collections have stretched from the high medieval to the early modern period.[20]

When the analysis of major heretical groups picks up on the other side of the post-1300 divide, it is above all with the Lollards in England and the Hussites in Bohemia. For instance, what has long been the most influential synthesis of medieval heresy as a whole in Anglophone scholarship, that of Malcolm Lambert, rushes past Free Spirits, heretical mystics, Joachites, and Spiritual Franciscans in just under thirty pages before devoting six full chapters to Wyclif, Hus, and their followers.[21] There is no doubt that Lollards

14 Idem, *The Origins of European Dissent* (1977; reprint Toronto, 1985); idem, *The War on Heresy* (Cambridge MA, 2012).

15 E. Peters, *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia, 1980); idem, *Inquisition* (New York, 1988). Peters is preparing a new edition of *Heresy and Authority* in collaboration with Christine Caldwell Ames.

16 J. B. Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline, and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca NY, 1997); J. H. Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia, 2001); C. Caldwell Ames, *Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2009).

17 *Heresy and Inquisition in France, 1200–1300*, ed. and trans. J. H. Arnold and P. Biller (Manchester, 2016); *Inquisition and Heretics in Thirteenth-Century Languedoc: Edition and Translation of Toulouse Inquisition Depositions, 1273-1282*, ed. and trans. P. Biller, C. Bruschi, and S. Sneddon (Leiden, 2011). Also important is *The Cathars and the Albigensian Crusade: A Sourcebook*, ed. and trans. C. Léglu, R. Rist, and C. Taylor (London, 2014).

18 G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages: The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent*, c. *1250*–c. *1450* (Manchester, 1967).

19 R. Kieckhefer, *The Repression of Heresy in Medieval Germany* (Philadelphia, 1979).

20 *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530*, ed. P. Biller and A. Hudson (Cambridge, 1994); *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy*, ed. C. Bruschi and P. Biller (York, 2002); *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. J. C. Laursen, C. J. Nederman, and I. Hunter (Aldershot, 2004); *Heresy and the Making of European Culture*, ed. Roach and Simpson; *Religion, Power, and Resistance from the Eleventh to the Sixteenth Centuries: Playing the Heresy Card*, ed. K. Bollerman, T. M. Izbicki, and C. J. Nederman (New York, 2014).

21 M. Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the*

and Hussites deserve their share of scholarly attention.[22] Yet it is notable just how much later in the late Middle Ages these heresies emerged. While some of Wyclif's theological propositions were condemned in 1382, he was only posthumously declared a heretic in 1414 at the Council of Constance. The following year the Council would execute Jan Hus, which drove his Bohemian followers into religious rebellion and political revolution. To some extent these movements are viewed as the heirs, after a pause, of the major high medieval popular heresies, but even more so they are often seen as forerunners of the Reformation to come.[23] A focus on their 'reforming' impulses is certainly valid, but runs the risk of positioning them in an overtly teleological framework.

Late Medieval Heresy in Lernerian Perspective

If we take the late medieval period on its own terms, seeing it neither as an appendage to the thirteenth century nor as a precursor to the sixteenth, we encounter a contentious but vibrant world of beguines and beghards, of Joachites and Spiritual Franciscans, of mystics and prophets, indeed of alchemists and magicians. Robert Lerner has not been alone in bringing attention to these late medieval groups; one thinks of (among others) Alexander Patschovsky and Dietrich Kurze in Germany, Peter Biller in the United Kingdom, Grado Merlo and Gian Luca Potestà in Italy, and David Burr and Richard Kieckhefer in the United States. But no scholar has done more than Lerner over the past half-century to shed light on late medieval heresy by

Reformation, 3rd edn (Oxford, 2002). J. Kolpacoff Deane, *A History of Medieval Heresy and Inquisition* (Lanham MD, 2011), gives a more balanced account of late medieval heresies. So does C. Caldwell Ames, *Medieval Heresies: Christianity, Judaism, and Islam* (Cambridge, 2015), although her perspective across three religions necessarily entails less coverage of different varieties of Christian heresy.

22 Literature on these two movements is vast. Classic studies include M. Aston, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London, 1984); A. Hudson, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988); H. Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley, 1967); F. M. Bartoš, *The Hussite Revolution 1424–1437*, ed. J. M. Klassen (New York, 1986). Important more recent works include K. Ghosh, *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and the Interpretation of Texts* (Cambridge, 2002); I. Forrest, *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 2005); F. Somerset, *Feeling Like Saints: Lollard Writings after Wyclif* (Ithaca NY, 2014); F. Šmahel, *Die hussitische Revolution*, trans. T. Krzenck, ed. A. Patschovsky, 3 vols. (Hanover, 2002); T. A. Fudge, *Jan Hus: Religious Reform and Social Revolution in Bohemia* (London, 2010); idem, *Heresy and Hussites in Late Medieval Europe* (Farnham, 2014).

23 E.g. Aston, *Lollards*; Hudson, *Premature Reformation*; Fudge, *Jan Hus*; idem, *Heresy and Hussites*; several essays in *Häresie und vorzeitige Reformation im Spätmittelalter*, ed. F. Šmahel (Munich, 1998); Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, pp. 392–414.

modeling methodological rigor, refining chronological perspectives, and promoting scholarly progress through fresh manuscript findings.[24]

In recent years it has become increasingly common to find Robert Lerner's ground-breaking 1972 book *The Heresy of the Free Spirit* cited as a methodological milestone in the study of heresy. Based on a meticulous re-examination of the evidence, this study showed that what had previously been imagined to be a major movement, the 'heresy of the Free Spirit', simply did not exist, at least not in the way that hostile sources had claimed. Instead, Lerner uncovered a more complicated world of powerful religious impulses which were by no means patently heterodox in nature, yet which had raised grave concerns in the eyes of suspicious churchmen. As he noted in his conclusion, 'Free Spirit' mystics tried to adhere to the apostolic life and sought to achieve union with God, but these were in fact 'two goals that dominated the spirituality of the high and later Middle Ages'.[25] The impression in the documentary record of an organized sect was partly the effect of long-standing stereotypes about heretics, and more specifically of the way inquisitors across time and space had employed similar question-lists (*interrogatoria*) when interrogating suspected 'Free Spirits'. Confessions to these pre-drawn lists created the illusion of a coherent body of doctrine, which reinforced the sense that an elusive but insidious sect of heretics must have been fostering it, and hence (in wonderfully circular logic) that further campaigns were necessary in order to destroy this sect.

Lerner was following Grundmann's lead down this methodological path, particularly as exemplified in the latter's formative articles on 'The Profile of the Heretic' and 'The Interrogation of Heretics'.[26] Picking up on Grundmann, however, Lerner added the sharp attention to political and social realities that one would expect to find in an American medievalist trained by Joseph R. Strayer.[27] Beyond the technical issue of the distorting effects of *interrogatoria*,

24 For instance: P. Biller, 'Heresy and Literacy: Earlier History of the Theme', in *Heresy and Literacy*, ed. Biller and Hudson, pp. 1–18 (p. 16); C. Bruschi and P. Biller, 'Introduction' in *Texts and the Repression*, ed. Bruschi and Biller, pp. 3–19 (pp. 15–16); Kolpacoff Deane, *History of Medieval Heresy*, p. 7; L. J. Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century: The Textual Representations* (York, 2011), pp. 4–5; I. Bueno, *Defining Heresy: Inquisition, Theology, and Papal Policy in the Time of Jacques Fournier*, trans. I. Bolognese, T. Brophy, and S. R. Prodan (Leiden, 2014), p. 3.

25 R. E. Lerner, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit* (1972; rev. edn Notre Dame IN, 1991), p. 233.

26 H. Grundmann, 'Der Typus des Ketzers in mittelalterlicher Anschauung' (1927) and 'Ketzerverhöre des Spätmittelalters als quellenkritisches Problem' (1965) are translated as 'The Profile of the Heretic in Medieval Perception' and 'The Interrogation of Heretics in the Late Middle Ages as a Source-Critical Problem', in *Herbert Grundmann: Essays on Heresy, Inquisition, and Literacy*, ed. J. Kolpacoff Deane, trans. S. Rowan (forthcoming).

27 Lerner, *Heresy of the Free Spirit*, p. viii, notes that 'Strayer's reputation has been established in political and institutional history, although his students know him for the polymath that he is.' See further remarks in Richard Kieckhefer's preface to this volume.

Lerner demonstrated that a crucial factor behind fourteenth-century developments was a growing level of anxiety on the part of religious authorities in the face of the multiple crises – religious, social, and political – which manifested themselves soon after the year 1300. Indeed, already in 1968 Lerner had explored the fourteenth century as an *Age of Adversity*,[28] showing how, even before the great mid-century crises of plague and schism, the Church faced serious new intellectual and political challenges. Thus, as he concluded in *The Heresy of the Free Spirit*, 'the orthodox were becoming more conservative and many idealists more radical'.[29]

Lerner's insight about the fourteenth-century Church's tendency to create heresy by designating challenging but previously orthodox groups and individuals as heretical is widely illuminating for the late medieval period, since it can be extended to the attacks on the Knights Templar and the Spiritual branch of the Franciscan order, to the increased suspicion cast on mystical activity, especially women's mysticism, and to the increasingly dark view of demonic influence on learned magic visible in the same era. Several of the essays in this volume – including those by the editors – proceed along these lines, examining different manifestations of early fourteenth-century heresy accusations which helped shift the boundaries of what orthodoxy could entail. Indeed, much late medieval heresy intersected with political or social disobedience (actual or fabricated).[30] Thus the penetrating essays by Georg Modestin and Elizabeth Casteen focus on political leaders (Louis of Bavaria and Louis of Durazzo) labeled as heretics in the course of conflicts with the early fourteenth-century papacy, and Samantha Kelly's study of Church attitudes toward Ethiopian Christians shows the extent to which 'heresy' could be applied or withdrawn as a label in direct response to political exigencies.

It is a tribute to Lerner that scholars focusing on the period before 1300 have also drawn insights from his work when assessing the way broader intellectual and political dynamics, as well as the distorting effects of certain kinds of textual evidence, shaped medieval and modern perceptions of groups deemed heretical. Nevertheless, Lerner's methodological model stands at some distance from the most extreme conclusions of those scholars who see heresy as existing almost entirely in the eyes of medieval beholders. To the contrary, his rigorous methodology has frequently been employed to uncover elusive but real intellectual lineages connecting people and texts.

28 R. E. Lerner, *The Age of Adversity: The Fourteenth Century* (Ithaca NY, 1968).

29 Lerner, *Heresy of the Free Spirit*, p. 234.

30 See A. Patschovsky, 'Heresy and Society: On the Political Function of Heresy in the Medieval World', in *Texts and the Repression*, ed. Bruschi and Biller, pp. 23–41. R. Kieckhefer, 'Witchcraft, Necromancy, and Sorcery as Heresy', in *Chasses aux sorcières et démonologie: Entre discours et pratiques (XIV^{e}–XVII^{e} siècles)*, ed. M. Ostorero, G. Modestin, and K. Utz Tremp (Florence, 2010), pp. 133–53, extends this framework to certain forms of magical practice.

In tracing such lineages, Lerner treats the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as fertile ground in which many developments originating in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries came to fruition. Thus *The Heresy of the Free Spirit* begins with a consideration of heresy in the late thirteenth-century Swabian Ries, and of the writings of beguine mystics like Hadewijch of Brabant (d. *c*. 1250) and Mechtild of Magdeburg (d. 1282), before reaching its pivotal analysis of Marguerite Porete (d. 1310) and the Council of Vienne (1312), and culminating in the study of supposed Free Spirit heresy from the influential Dominican Meister Eckhart to the isolated Hans Becker, an inspired but solitary figure burned in Mainz in 1458. Similarly, Lerner's 1983 study of *The Powers of Prophecy* takes a single short prophetic text first recorded in Europe in the wake of the Mongol invasions of the 1240s and traces its uses and mutations right up to the 'dawn of the Enlightenment'.[31] His highly original 2001 *Feast of Saint Abraham* likewise pursues the influence of Joachim of Fiore (d. 1202) on later millenarian ideas about the Jews, touching on key thirteenth-century moments but moving rapidly to important but lesser-known fourteenth- and fifteenth-century figures such as Frederick of Brunswick, a Franciscan inspired by John of Rupescissa and sentenced to life imprisonment in Speyer in 1392, and Nicholas of Buldesdorf, a layman burned in 1446 by the rump Council of Basel.[32]

In each of these cases Lerner explicated how traditions that came to be highly contested in the late medieval period represented either steady development or startling transformation of earlier impulses. Indeed, one remarkable aspect of late medieval heresy is how often it appeared to emerge from orders or institutions established in the twelfth or thirteenth century as bastions of orthodoxy. The mendicants, for example, were supposed to model apostolic piety. Yet, even as the Orders of Preachers and Friars Minor provided many of the most diligent inquisitors of the Middle Ages, they also spawned controversial figures such as Meister Eckhart and Peter John Olivi. Likewise, universities, or at least their theological faculties, were meant to define and defend the faith, but they could also breed heterodoxy (for example, Eckhart, Wyclif, Hus).

In this volume, several essays treat dissident friars and the challenges they posed. Others focus in even more nuanced ways on how certain intellectual dynamics originating in the high medieval period changed in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as they interacted with different currents of heresy.

31 R. E. Lerner, *The Powers of Prophecy: The Cedar of Lebanon Vision from the Mongol Onslaught to the Dawn of the Enlightenment* (Berkeley, 1983). The study of similar prophecies is a major theme in Lerner's work, sometimes but not always linked to heresy.

32 R. E. Lerner, *The Feast of Saint Abraham: Medieval Millenarians and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 2001). Lerner has pursued different aspects of medieval millennialism in numerous articles, many of which have been collected in Italian translation in *Refrigerio dei santi: Gioacchino da Fiore e l'escatologia medievale* (Rome, 1995) and *Scrutare il futuro: l'eredità di Gioacchino da Fiore alla fine del medioevo* (Rome, 2008).

Deeana Klepper, for instance, offers a revealing evaluation of how the norms of thirteenth-century pastoral manuals were reworked to disentangle Jews from the larger idea of heresy in Albert of Diessen's fourteenth-century *Speculum clericorum*. Likewise Frances Kneupper presents an intriguing exposition of new anxieties surrounding eschatological challenges to elite intellectual authority in the context of late fifteenth-century academic debate.

If Lerner's work has been methodologically influential and chronologically suggestive, much of its explanatory power derives from his continual quest to identify new manuscript evidence, analyze its importance, and piece together the stories laid bare by lines of textual transmission. A powerful example in the context of late medieval heresy is his essay on 'Writing and Resistance among Beguins of Languedoc and Catalonia', which demonstrated the importance of 'vernacular propaganda' circulating among the early fourteenth-century followers of Peter John Olivi.[33] In this volume, the essay by Sylvain Piron picks up directly on both this approach and this subject, presenting previously unidentified manuscripts of the *Postilla super Danielem* by Barthélemy Sicard ('Olivi's best disciple') and revealing a new picture of the contexts in which they were copied. Similarly Justine Trombley follows the trail of another subject pioneered by Lerner, the dispersion and influence of Marguerite Porete's *Mirror of Simple Souls*. Although this text has become one of the best-studied examples of late medieval mysticism in recent decades, Trombley brings to light two new manuscript copies of the Latin version of the *Mirror*, and offers insightful suggestions about how they change our perception of where and why the *Mirror* was being read. Just as intriguingly, working in the Doat collection's transcripts of inquisitorial registers, Louisa Burnham has uncovered the fascinating story of Limoux Negre, a Menocchio-like figure burned at the stake in 1329, almost three centuries before that now-famous Italian miller.

Whether grounded in empirical discovery or methodological insight, the key question Lerner has always asked of every publication is, 'What's new here?' Scholarship, from a Lernerian perspective, is at heart a process of bringing forward new information in order to make new arguments and draw new conclusions. From a 'New Text by Saint Bonaventura on the Life of Saint Francis' to 'New Evidence for the Condemnation of Meister Eckhart' and 'New Light on the *Mirror of Simple Souls*' (and even, in a very different area of research, 'A Newly Discovered Letter by Georg Simmel'), Lerner's ground-breaking studies have demonstrated the power of this path.[34]

[33] In *Heresy and Literacy*, ed. Biller and Hudson, pp. 186–204.

[34] R. E. Lerner, 'A Collection of Sermons Given in Paris *c.* 1267, Including a New Text by Saint Bonaventura on the Life of Saint Francis', *Speculum* 49 (1974), 466–98; 'New Evidence for the Condemnation of Meister Eckhart', *Speculum* 72 (1997), 347–66; 'New Light on *The Mirror of Simple Souls*', *Speculum* 85 (2010), 91–116; 'A Newly Discovered Letter by Georg Simmel of May 1918', *Simmel Studies* 13 (2003), 425–38.

In this volume, the essays by Piron and Trombley are most explicit in making the presentation of 'new' manuscripts their focus. But each essay contributes something new to scholarship. Kelly provides a sweeping new assessment of changing perceptions of Ethiopian Christians by the western Church (which the editors feel certain will become known as the 'Kelly Thesis'); Klepper reveals a new aspect of the way late medieval authors could conceptualize the relationship between Jews and heretics; Kneupper provides a fresh view of an episode in late medieval prophetic thinking which, if not quite unstudied, remains little known; Modestin and Casteen shed new light on why the 'heretic' label was applied to powerful fourteenth-century political figures; Burnham presents a new 'heretical' voice, that of Limoux Negre, who seems destined to take his place alongside the best-known microhistorical case studies of medieval Europe; Bailey opens up new avenues of interpretation by linking two figures (Marguerite Porete and John of Morigny) never previously studied together; and Field makes a new observation about Philip IV's attempt to create a 'French inquisition' following his accusations of heresy against the Templars. Then, in a fitting finale which links Robert Lerner's work on late medieval heresy to his research on twentieth-century German historiography, Jörg Feuchter presents the unsettling implications of locating Renate Riemeck's 1943 doctoral dissertation on the Cryptoflagellants, long thought to have been lost.

How to sum up these new perspectives on late medieval heresy? Certainly several 'Lernerian' themes can be traced through various essays: the way political power and ecclesiastical fears shaped the use of heresy as a label; the transmission of condemned texts and ideas in manuscript; the power of prophetic thought. Yet our intention has not been to reduce late medieval heresy to a handful of key ideas. Indeed, several decades ago, in a review essay, Robert Lerner called attention to the 'rich complexity' of late medieval religion, including its heretical trends.[35] Accordingly, what may be most striking in the present volume, as Barbara Newman draws out so elegantly in her afterword, is the number and range of diverse threads that weave through late medieval heresy. In these essays individuals and groups, from an Occitan alchemist to a German emperor, from a solitary beguine to a Benedictine monk, from obscure laymen to an entire military order, and from a Franciscan exegete to an Angevin prince, contest orthodoxy with inquisitors, university masters, bishops, and popes. Thus the 'rich complexity' of these studies, linked by a methodology grounded in manuscript study and attuned to the nature of textual production, informed by political and social context, and attentive to conceptual connections, reflects Robert Lerner's own breadth

[35] The phrase is from F. Oakley, *The Western Church in the Late Middle Ages* (Ithaca NY, 1979), p. 314; see R. E. Lerner, 'The "Rich Complexity" of the Late-Medieval Church', *Medievalia et Humanistica* 12 (1984), 225–34.

of vision on the multiplicity of religious options that proliferated in the late medieval period.[36]

*****

The idea for this volume took shape, as so many good scholarly ideas do, over drinks. A half-dozen of Robert Lerner's students, including the two editors, met at the annual conference of the Medieval Academy of America at Boston in February 2016 and agreed that the time had come for a volume honoring his career. Upon Robert's retirement from active teaching in May 2008, a highly successful symposium had been held in his honor at Northwestern University. Participants included such distinguished senior scholars as Dyan Elliott, Richard Kieckhefer, Bernard McGinn, Barbara Newman, Alexander Patschovsky, Gian Luca Potestà, Miri Rubin, and John Van Engen. But at that time the decision was made not to publish a volume based on those talks, at least in part due to Robert's well-known aversion to sprawling *Festschriften*. Thus the current volume was envisioned along different lines, based on several collective decisions.

The first decision was to insist on the kind of sharp focus that would allow the volume to succeed on its own scholarly terms. This resolution, however, still left many potential avenues open, since Robert Lerner's research interests stretch from the Middle Ages to the modern world; his very first published article dealt with nineteenth-century historiography,[37] and his most recent book recounts the life of Ernst Kantorowicz, one of the twentieth century's most compelling medievalists.[38] In the course of some one hundred books and articles, Robert has dealt with all manner of galling problems and 'scratchy issues'.[39] He even trained one of his first doctoral students in Flemish notarial culture.[40] But a volume on late medieval heresy seemed best able to encapsulate the core of his interests while allowing a focused presentation.

The second decision was to build the volume around contributions from Robert's own doctoral students, augmented by essays from several of his international students-by-proxy. Thus the contributors to this volume are

36 See J. Van Engen, 'Multiple Options: The World of the Fifteenth-Century Church', *Church History* 77 (2008), 257–84, and subsequently idem, 'A World Astir: Europe and Religion in the Early Fifteenth Century', in *Europe after Wyclif*, ed. J. P. Hornbeck and M. Van Dussen (New York, 2017), pp. 11–45.

37 R. E. Lerner, 'Turner and the Revolt against E. A. Freeman', *Arizona and the West* 5 (1963), 101–8.

38 Idem, *Ernst Kantorowicz: A Life* (Princeton, 2017).

39 Idem, 'The Pope and the Doctor', *The Yale Review* 78 (1988–89), 62–79; idem, 'Fleas: Some Scratchy Issues Concerning the Black Death', *Journal of the Historical Society* 8 (2008), 205–28.

40 J. M. Murray, 'Notaries Public in Flanders in the Late Middle Ages' (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1985).

mid- (and some early-) career scholars whom Robert taught or profoundly influenced. The only exceptions made were for his long-time colleagues at Northwestern University, Richard Kieckhefer and Barbara Newman, who generously agreed to provide the preface and afterword to the volume. Of course some of Robert's doctoral students do not work in areas related to late medieval heresy, but this volume comes with the good wishes of them all. For their expressions of support we particularly thank James Murray, Theresa Gross-Diaz, Steven J. Williams, and Suzanne LaVere, as well as another of Robert's students-by-proxy, Jessalynn Bird, and his illustrious successor at Northwestern, Dyan Elliott. To our friend and colleague Jennifer Kolpacoff Deane we must express an even deeper debt of gratitude for enthusiastically helping to conceptualize the project and get it off the ground.

The editors are extremely grateful to John Arnold and Peter Biller, who welcomed us into their outstanding series on 'Heresy and Inquisition in the Middle Ages', and who have been sources of good advice, steady encouragement, and graceful tolerance throughout the entire process. We further thank Caroline Palmer and the entire team at Boydell and Brewer. And finally we are grateful to all the contributors, who were unfailingly diligent and responsive. The fear of meriting a frown of disapproval from Robert Lerner, and the hope of winning a few words of praise, are powerful motivating forces that remain with all his students no matter how far into their own careers they have progressed. In this case, these motivations meant that the editors needed to do very little to coax the best work from each author.

In closing, let us offer one more perspective on Lernerian scholarship. Among all the books, articles, chapters, and reviews Robert Lerner has published over more than a half-century, several vivid passages from the acknowledgements to *The Powers of Prophecy* seem particularly often to find their way into conversation between medievalists.[41] There, in 1983, Robert prophesied a future when research into medieval Europe would be done 'alas, mostly by pushing buttons'. His 'expression of dismay' was not meant to indicate fear about the quality of such research, once 'all surviving medieval manuscripts are exhaustively catalogued and computerized', but to lament that 'research will be infinitely less fun'. Who could have disagreed, upon learning that the author in the course of his research had 'traveled across Alps and fields of lavender, worked in libraries from Baroque to Bauhaus, and engaged in correspondence that has left my faculty letter box customarily resplendent with varicolored foreign commemorative stamps'?

Thirty-five years later, the letters and stamps have indeed largely been displaced by less colorful modes of electronic communication. And at times

[41] For example, more than fifteen years ago Lerner's remarks were already being cited to similar effect in the acknowledgements to S. D. Westrem, *Broader Horizons: A Study of Johannes Witte de Hese's* Itinerarius *and Medieval Travel Narratives*, Medieval Academy Books 105 (Cambridge MA, 2001).

the pervasive recourse to digital reproductions, in spite of their obvious utility, may leave the medievalist longing for the smell of seven-hundred-year-old parchment, the feel of its residue on the fingers, and the reassuring certainty that a hands-on examination has left no page unturned and no hastily scribbled prophecy undiscovered on a flyleaf. But whatever the future may hold (if the world endures), in 2018 the thrill of manuscript-based research into medieval history is still very much alive. Among Robert Lerner's greatest legacies is an inspiring model of medieval scholarship that thirsts for this excitement of discovery (a new manuscript catalog can be an 'I couldn't put it down' page turner), that relentlessly follows all the evidence wherever it may lead (even if not all paths are through fields of lavender), and that revels in the exhilarating moment when a painstakingly located manuscript gives up a long-guarded secret. For his students and disciples, well into the twenty-first century the Lernerian mode of history still entails haunting the reading rooms of the great libraries and obscure archives of Europe and the world, chasing down new manuscript discoveries, and searching for new perspectives.

1

The Heresy of the Templars and the Dream of a French Inquisition*

Sean L. Field

When Philip IV ordered the arrest of all Templars in France, he and his advisors set in motion a heresy inquisition of unprecedented ambition. Secret arrest orders accompanied by a set of vernacular instructions were sent to the king's secular agents across the kingdom on 14 September 1307. The inquisitor William of Paris followed with his own letter on 22 September, addressed to the Dominican inquisitors of Toulouse and Carcassonne, and to Dominican priors, subpriors, and lectors throughout the kingdom, asking them to stand ready to receive confessions. Arrests duly took place on 13 October. The plan was evidently to secure an overwhelming number of confessions as rapidly as possible and force Pope Clement V to condemn the Order of the Temple. The pope, however, first expressed his displeasure in a letter of 27 October, and on 22 November ordered that Templars across the rest of Europe be taken into custody for ecclesiastical trial. Clement then brought Philip IV and William of Paris up short in late January or early February 1308 by suspending the power of French inquisitors to act in this affair. When the pope finally agreed to restart the inquiries in July 1308, it was on his own terms, with such inquiries being entrusted to bishops working in concert with wider groups of churchmen.[1]

Because the 'Trial of the Templars' in France has most often been studied as a conflict between Church and state rather than as an episode in the history of heresy and inquisition, it has gone largely unremarked that the events of fall 1307 amounted to an audacious effort to create a proto-national heresy inquisition in France. As Julien Théry has argued, the attack on the Templars must be understood within the decade-long drive to build a 'royal theocracy' with

* I thank Michael Bailey, Peter Biller, and Andrea Nicolotti for critiquing this essay.

1 See M. Barber, *The Trial of the Templars*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 2006); *The Debate on the Trial of the Templars (1307–1314)*, ed. J. Burgtorf, P. F. Crawford, and H. J. Nicholson (Farnham, 2010); *La fin de l'ordre du Temple*, ed. M.-A. Chevalier (Paris, 2012); A. Demurger, *La persécution des Templiers. Journal (1307–1314)* (Paris, 2015).

Philip IV as 'pope in his kingdom'.[2] But within this process of 'pontificalizing' the French monarchy,[3] only in 1307 did the king and his men attempt to seize control of a crucial aspect of papal authority – the power to deploy heresy inquisition. Beginning in 1301, the attacks on Bishop Bernard Saisset, Pope Boniface VIII, the Templars, and Bishop Guichard of Troyes often used the language of heretical danger to represent the king as the defender of Christ against His enemies. But only the proceedings against the Templars invoked the authority of an inquisitor of heretical depravity. By turning the Templars into heretics, the king justified the attempted implementation of a radically new, kingdom-wide heresy inquisition.

This essay first assesses the functioning structure of heresy inquisition in France at the turn of the fourteenth century and highlights the respective roles assigned to secular and inquisitorial agents in securing and recording Templar confessions in 1307. It then analyzes the way William of Paris tried to knit together a network of inquisitorial lieutenants and asks how efficiently that network was able to carry out its assigned task. Ultimately, the attempt to implement a kingdom-wide inquisition ran up against a lack of pre-existing inquisitorial infrastructure, uneven responses by local Dominicans, cautious engagement on the part of existing heresy inquisitors, and firm opposition from Pope Clement V. At the time of the Templars' arrests, however, the king and his confessor/inquisitor dreamed of a centralized French inquisition.

Heresy Inquisition in France at the Turn of the Fourteenth Century

Inquisitors of heretical depravity had been active in France since the 1230s.[4] They were 'deputed by apostolic authority' but had enjoyed the support of French kings going back to Louis IX.[5] Since the mid-thirteenth century, inquisitors in France had been named by the Dominican provincial prior in Paris. Most recently, in 1290 Nicholas IV had renewed this prior's authority to appoint six of his brethren as inquisitors for the Dominican provinces of France and Provence (after 1303 the latter was split into the provinces

2 J. Théry-Astruc, 'The Pioneer of Royal Theocracy: Guillaume de Nogaret and the Conflict between Philip the Fair and the Papacy', in *The Capetian Century, 1214–1314*, ed. W. C. Jordan and J. R. Phillips (Turnhout, 2017), pp. 219–59; J. Théry, 'Philippe le Bel, pape en son royaume', *L'histoire* 289 (2004), 14–17.

3 J. Théry, 'A Heresy of State: Philip the Fair, the Trial of the "Perfidious Templars", and the Pontificalization of the French Monarchy', *Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures* 39 (2013), 117–48.

4 *Inquisitors and Heretics in Thirteenth-Century Languedoc: Edition and Translation of Toulouse Inquisition Depositions, 1273–1282*, ed. P. Biller, C. Bruschi, and S. Sneddon (Leiden, 2011), pp. 35–41.

5 For example, *Heresy and Inquisition in France, 1200–1300*, ed. and trans. J. H. Arnold and P. Biller (Manchester, 2016), pp. 170–3.

of Toulouse and Provence), and empowered him to appoint three more for Lorraine, the Franche-Comté, and Lausanne.[6] The latter three areas, however, lay almost entirely outside the kingdom of France, as did eastern parts of the Dominican province of Provence. In fact, the only firmly established sites of Dominican heresy inquisition within the kingdom were at Toulouse and Carcassonne. Although several inquisitors were active in the north in the 1280s and 1290s, only thin evidence survives for their activities.[7] Even in the Midi reinvigorated inquisition had only taken hold since the county of Toulouse had come under direct royal control in the 1270s,[8] and these renewed campaigns against heresy had actually mired southern inquisitors in controversy by the 1290s.[9]

It was probably as a result of their intervention in this controversy that Philip IV and his men began to look at heresy inquisition in a new light. As part of a longer and more complex string of events, the inflammatory Franciscan Bernard Délicieux had charged that corrupt Dominican inquisitors in the Midi were accusing innocent people of heresy, in some cases (he said) because they were too loyal to the king. In October 1301 Philip IV took Bernard's side and insisted that the Dominican inquisitor for Toulouse, Foulques of Saint-Georges, be removed from office. The Dominican leadership in Paris, however, refused to depose the inquisitor of Toulouse, and Philip wrote in fury to his loyal Dominican chaplain William of Paris seeking redress. Finally, in summer 1302, the Dominicans gave in and replaced Foulques.[10] But by the time the king soured on the troublesome Bernard Délicieux in 1304, he seems to have decided to harness inquisitors' powers to his own objectives. It was at just this time (*c*. 1304) that William of Paris, already royal chaplain and confessor to the royal princes, was named an inquisitor of heretical depravity

6 T. Ripoll, *Bullarium ordinis ff.* [i.e. *fratrum*] *prædicatorum*, 8 vols. (Rome, 1730), II, 29–30. For evidence of Dominican heresy inquisitors in Burgundy, the Franche–Comté, and Lyon in the early fourteenth century, see J.-M. Vidal, *Bullaire de l'inquisition française au XIV^e siècle jusqu'à la fin du grand schisme* (Paris, 1913), nos. 8–10, 26 [hereafter *Bullaire*].

7 For the north of France see S. L. Field, 'King/Confessor/Inquisitor: A Capetian–Dominican Convergence', in *Capetian Century*, ed. Jordan and Phillips, pp. 43–69. The Dominican Brother Laurent apparently served as inquisitor in Tours sometime between 1285 and 1298, and there was certainly a Dominican inquisitor there in the 1320s, for which see J.-M. Vidal, 'Le sire de Parthenay et l'Inquisition (1323–1325)', *Bulletin historique et philologique* (1903), pp. 414–34; and *Bullaire*, nos. 42–3, 45–8, 51–2, 55–7, 58–58bis, 60, 66. But if there was an inquisitor in Tours at the time of the Templar process, no extant evidence demonstrates his identity or activities.

8 *Inquisitors and Heretics*, ed. Biller, Bruschi, and Sneddon, pp. 41–8.

9 A. Friedlander, *The Hammer of the Inquisitors: Brother Bernard Délicieux and the Struggle Against the Inquisition in Fourteenth-Century France* (Boston, 2000); idem, 'Les agents du roi, l'hérésie et l'Inquisition, vers 1250–vers 1320', in *Inquisition et société en pays d'oc (XIII^e et XIV^e siècles)*, ed. J.-L. Biget (Toulouse, 2014), pp. 279–92.

10 Friedlander, *Hammer*, pp. 95–7; S. L. Field, *The Beguine, the Angel, and the Inquisitor: The Trials of Marguerite Porete and Guiard of Cressonessart* (Notre Dame IN, 2012), p. 293 n. 44.

for the kingdom of France, very likely at the king's behest.[11] Philip IV then made William his personal confessor in late 1305 or early 1306. This was the first time the offices of royal confessor and heresy inquisitor were held simultaneously by a single Dominican, creating a striking new confluence of authority.[12] Thus it was only on the eve of the Templar arrests that the appointment of a new Dominican heresy inquisitor in Paris, one who was a loyal member of the king's inner circle,[13] opened up the practical possibility of deploying heresy inquisition as a royal tool.

Still, William of Paris was not 'head' of 'The Inquisition' in France, as he is sometimes imagined to have been.[14] William was *an*, not *the*, 'inquisitor of heretical depravity deputed by apostolic authority in the kingdom of France'. As proof of this statement, one need only note that the inquisitors in Toulouse and Carcassonne both repeatedly used exactly this same title in documents of 1308 and beyond.[15] The inquisitor in Paris may have possessed informal authority thanks to his close relationship with the king, but he had no institutional position from which to issue orders to his fellow inquisitors in the Midi. In any case, the three inquisitors of Paris, Toulouse, and Carcassonne hardly constituted an adequate infrastructure for inquisitorial activity on a kingdom-wide scale. If the secular bureaucracy at Philip the Fair's disposal was demonstrably up to the challenge of carrying out mass arrests, as witnessed by the round-up and expulsion of tens of thousands of French Jews in 1306,[16] the inquisitor had nothing similar at his disposal.

The King's Orders

The king's secret arrest order of 14 September expressed outrage at the Templars' 'crimes'. According to the king, upon entering the order Templars

11 On his early career, see Field, *Beguine*, ch. 3.

12 Field, 'King/Confessor/Inquisitor'.

13 S. L. Field, 'Philippe le Bel et ses confesseurs dominicains: Une question de loyauté', in *Les Dominicains en France (XIII^e–XX^e siècle)*, ed. N. Bériou, A. Vauchez, and M. Zink (Paris, 2017), pp. 431–42.

14 For the larger context see R. Kieckhefer, 'The Office of Inquisition and Medieval History: The Transition from Personal to Institutional Jurisdiction', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1995), 36–61.

15 For Bernard Gui in Toulouse, *Le livre des sentences de l'inquisiteur Bernard Gui, 1308–1323*, ed. and trans. A. Pales-Gobilliard, 2 vols. (Paris, 2002), I, 180 (3 March 1308), 326 (23 October 1309). For Geoffrey of Ablis in Carcassonne, *L'inquisiteur Geoffroy d'Ablis et les cathares du comté de Foix (1308–1309)*, ed. and trans. A. Pales-Gobilliard (Paris, 1984), p. 106. On 4 and 9 April 1310 and 22–23 April 1312, the two inquisitors appeared together as 'inquisitores heretice pravitatis in regno Francie per sedem apostolicam deputatos'. See *Livre des sentences*, pp. 334, 538, 548, 560.

16 J. Sibon, *Chasser les juifs pour régner* (Paris, 2016); *Philippe le Bel et les juifs du royaume de France (1306)*, ed. D. Iancu-Agou and É. Nicolas (Paris, 2012); C. Balasse, *1306: L'expulsion des juifs du royaume de France* (Paris, 2008).

thrice denied Christ and thrice spat on his image. Then, naked, they kissed on the lower spine, the navel, and the mouth the one receiving them into the order. Moreover, they promised to commit sodomy if solicited by another brother. The king related that he had not wanted to believe these charges, but finally, based on *invalescente infamia*, with suspicion becoming 'violent presumption', and having discussed the matter with Pope Clement V and with his prelates and barons, he ordered a full inquiry. This was carried out by the inquisitor William of Paris, based on *infamia publica*, producing 'vehement suspicion'. Based on these results, the king agreed to the inquisitor's request that the secular arm aid in arresting these 'enemies of God, religion and nature'. The actual orders related at the end of the document were straightforward: royal agents were to arrest every Templar in the kingdom, hold them for ecclesiastical judgment, and seize their moveable and immovable goods.[17]

The French instructions that accompanied the Latin arrest order lay bare the real power dynamics behind this inquisition. Once the Templars were arrested and their goods inventoried, the secular 'commissioners' were ordered to interrogate them, with torture if necessary, *before* calling in 'the commissioners of the inquisitor', and to record their confessions in front of witnesses, 'if they confess the truth'. The Templars were to be told that the king and the pope already knew about their 'errors' and 'buggery', that they would be pardoned if they confessed the truth, and that otherwise they would be condemned to death. For Templars who confessed, especially concerning the denial of Christ, the agents of the king were to send a copy of these confessions to the king, under their own seals and the seals of the 'commissioners of the inquisitor'. These royal agents were thus instructed to act as *de facto* heresy inquisitors, insofar as they were told to carry out questioning, record confessions, and represent themselves as acting on behalf of the pope as well as the king.[18]

Taken together, the two documents of 14 September 1307 represented an unprecedented 'use of heterodoxy', as the French crown sought to make heresy inquisition a royal and even a proto-national affair.[19] Heresy inquisitors had always had to rely on secular authorities to arrest suspects, guard prisoners, and provide other forms of coercion. But the king's willingness to use the royal bureaucracy to carry out arrests and to secure initial confessions across the entire kingdom was new. The framework of these arrests

17 Philip IV's arrest order, the accompanying vernacular instructions, and William of Paris's letter to Dominicans are all best known from Paris, Archives nationales [hereafter AN], J 413, no. 22, edited in S. L. Field, 'Royal Agents and Templar Confessions in the *Bailliage* of Rouen', *French Historical Studies* 39 (2016), 35–71, digital image at http://www2.culture.gouv.fr/documentation/archim/proces-templiers.html.

18 Field, 'Royal Agents and Templar Confessions'.

19 R. E. Lerner, 'The Uses of Heterodoxy: The French Monarchy and Unbelief in the Thirteenth Century', *French Historical Studies* 4 (1965), 190–202.

and interrogations was necessarily 'national', in so far as *baillis* and *sénéchaux* could operate only within the limits of the kingdom of France (however fluid some of its borders might be). The logic of this heresy inquisition was based on the geography of secular, royal jurisdictions (*bailliages*, not dioceses), and assumed uniform application across, but not outside of, the kingdom of France. It was set in motion by the king, and its crucial first stages were carried out by secular agents of the crown. It was thus envisioned as neither more nor less than a 'French inquisition'.

Yet this inquisition could not be completed without the compliance of churchmen who would validate the Templars' admissions of guilt. As the French instructions made clear, at a certain point the 'commissioners of the inquisitor' were to be brought in to hear, record, and seal properly notarized confessions.

An Inquisitor's Plea

William of Paris could tackle the high-profile Parisian portion of the interrogations himself, but he obviously could not conduct inquisitions against Templars across the entire kingdom. How could he ensure that inquisitorial deputies stood ready to step in all over France? No French inquisitor had ever attempted to organize something on this kingdom-wide scale, and we have seen that there was relatively little pre-existing inquisitorial machinery to be set in motion. Thus William addressed his letter of 22 September to two groups. His bold innovation was to turn to a broad swathe of local Dominican leadership, the 'conventual priors, subpriors, and lectors of the Order of Preaching Brothers established in the kingdom of France'. The other group consisted of exactly two men, 'the religious and venerable brothers, the inquisitors of heretical depravity appointed by apostolic authority in Toulouse and Carcassonne'. William requested of all these Dominican brethren that when the king's men brought Templars before them, they should have confessions recorded by a notary, if possible, or by two suitable men. If the charges proved true, they should spread word to Franciscans and other religious men in order to create a good impression of the investigation and avoid scandal. The depositions should be sent back promptly to the king and to William under the seals of the inquisitor's deputies and the king's men.

Rhetorically, William did everything possible to convince his brethren to carry out his requests. He signed himself as papal chaplain, royal confessor, and papal inquisitor, emphasizing his unique blend of royal and papal authority, and he strongly (but falsely) insinuated that he was writing with full papal knowledge. What sort of compliance would he receive? We shall trace in turn the implementation of this scenario by William himself in Paris, by his Dominican 'commissioners' elsewhere, and by the two inquisitors in Toulouse and Carcassonne.

William in Paris

Between 19 October and 24 November, 138 Templars confessed in Paris. William of Paris probably had access to Dominican handbooks of inquisitorial practice,[20] and he may have solicited advice from other senior Dominicans. But he had never carried out a task like this, and in the most important sense no one else had either – no Dominican manual, for instance, advised on how to interrogate hundreds of members of an ecclesiastical order accused of renouncing Christ. Even in Paris, where he had the king's direct backing and could exercise immediate control, William would have to scramble to meet such a massive challenge.

For the first eight days (19–26 October) of questioning,[21] the inquisitor appeared in person, overseeing the depositions of thirty-seven Templars. For each session he was joined by at least two of his four notaries and by a shifting group of witnesses that always included at least one Dominican, most frequently Regnaud of Aubigny, the Dominican prior of Poissy and an ardent royal supporter (eventually William of Paris's successor as confessor to the king),[22] or Regnaud of Creil, apparently also trusted by the court.[23] Although these sessions generally took place at the Temple, exceptionally on 23 October two Templars confessed in William of Paris's own chambers at the Dominican house on the rue Saint-Jacques, where the four named witnesses were all Preachers, including not only Regnaud of Creil but also the master of theology Hervé Natalis,[24] Pierre de Conde,[25] and Jean of Saint-Vincent.[26] October 25 and 26 must have been particularly busy, because in addition to recording testimony, William and his notaries were present for the public confessions given by Jacques de Molay and other

20 For a recent overview, L. J. Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century: The Textual Representations* (York, 2011), pp. 135–53.

21 *Le Procès des Templiers*, ed. J. Michelet, 2 vols. (1841–51; reprint Paris, 1987), II, 277–317 [hereafter *Procès*], digital images of AN, J 413, no. 18 at http://www2.culture.gouv.fr/documentation/archim/proces-templiers.html.

22 X. de la Selle, *Le service des âmes à la cour. Confesseurs et aumôniers des rois de France du XIII^e^ au XV^e^ siècle* (Paris, 1995), p. 265; A. Dondaine, 'Documents pour servir à l'histoire de la province de France. L'appel au concile (1303)', *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 22 (1952), 381–439 (p. 403) [hereafter 'L'appel'].

23 Sent to Cologne by the king to obtain relics, paid 19 December 1314. See J. Viard, *Les journaux du trésor de Philip IV le Bel* (Paris, 1940), no. 6077.

24 T. Kaeppeli, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum medii aevi*, 4 vols. (Rome, 1970–73), II, 231–44 [hereafter *SoP*]; P. Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIII^e^ siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1933), no. 64 [hereafter *Répertoire*]; 'L'appel', p. 409; A. de Guimarães, 'Hervé Noël (d. 1323): Étude biographique', *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 8 (1938), 5–81. Regent master, 1307–08; provincial prior of France, 1309; master general of the order, 1318; d. 1323.

25 'L'appel', p. 404.

26 Ibid., p. 406.

leading Templars at the Temple before crowds of university masters and other dignitaries.[27] The Dominicans who witnessed these public confessions included the prior of Paris William of Saint-Euverte,[28] Hervé Natalis, the bachelor of theology Laurent of Nantes,[29] the advanced theology student Durand of Saint-Pourçain,[30] as well as Regnaud of Creil and Nicholas of Ennezat.[31]

In sum, to this point William had done just what he had asked his Dominican brethren to do in his letter of 22 September. He had secured confessions once the Templars had been brought before him by the king's men; he had had the confessions recorded by notaries; and he had brought in a wider public to make sure that the official version of events was propagated. From here on, however, William's personal involvement in the Paris interrogations declined. On Friday 27 October, William was for the first time absent when confessions were recorded at the Temple. How would the interrogations fare without him?

Far from slowing the pace of confessions, William's absence spurred the most efficient day of questioning in the entire process. On 27 October three Dominicans divided up the four apostolic notaries between them and acted as 'commissioners of the inquisitor' (as the notaries uniformly referred to them) to record twenty-one confessions at the Temple: William of Saint-Euverte heard thirteen, Nicholas of Ennezat five, and Durand of Saint-Pourçain three.[32] Why these three brothers in particular? William's letter of 22 September had deputized priors, subpriors, and lectors to act on his behalf, and thus it made sense that he would turn to William of Saint-Euverte, prior of Paris, when he needed a 'commissioner'. Durand of Saint-Pourçain was an advanced theology student, not yet a master but a choice in line with the idea of using lectors to carry out questioning.[33] Nicholas of Ennezat is not known to have held any formal office in the order, but seems to have enjoyed the inquisitor's particular trust. Still, the latter two friars were outside the formal parameters William had set in his letter.

27 H. Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens*, 2 vols. (Münster, 1907), II, 307–12 [hereafter Finke]; W. J. Courtenay, 'Marguerite's Judges: The University of Paris in 1310', in *Marguerite Porete et le* Miroir des simples âmes*: Perspectives historiques, philosophiques et littéraires*, ed. S. L. Field, R. E. Lerner and S. Piron (Paris, 2013), pp. 215–31 (pp. 217–19).

28 'L'appel', p. 405; sent as royal ambassador to Rome in 1298; Viard, *Journaux du trésor de Philip IV*, nos. 684, 912, 1095.

29 *SoP*, III, 65; *Répertoire*, no. 66; Courtenay, 'Marguerite's Judges', 218; licensed as master, 1310.

30 *SoP*, I, 339–50; *Répertoire*, no. 70; I. Iribarren, *Durandus of St. Pourçain: A Dominican Theologian in the Shadow of Aquinas* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 1–11; 'L'appel', p. 405. Master of theology 1312; lector at the papal curia 1313; bishop of Limoux 1317; bishop of Le-Puy-en-Velay 1318; bishop of Meaux 1326; d. 1334.

31 *SoP*, III, 141–3.

32 *Procès*, II, 317–35.

33 Courtenay, 'Marguerite's Judges', p. 219.

When confessions began to be heard again on 2–3 November, after the All Saints' holiday, William was still absent, with Nicholas of Ennezat taking over.[34] After another long weekend, on 7 November William returned to the Temple to hear four confessions, but at the same time Nicholas heard eight. Then on 9 November Nicholas began the day as the designated commissioner with the Dominican bachelor of theology Laurent of Nantes as one of his witnesses.[35] Evidently, however, Nicholas had other business to attend to, since Laurent stepped in to act as 'commissioner' of the inquisitor for five confessions, before Nicholas returned at the end of the day for one more. Apparently the Dominicans were now so confident in their charge that one commissioner could temporarily designate another in his place without the actual inquisitor's explicit approval.

William of Paris heard four confessions on 10 November before leaving Nicholas to hear one more. On 11 and 13–15 November Nicholas heard twenty-two confessions in all. On 17 November William returned to hear one confession, with Nicholas of Ennezat, Laurent of Nantes, Durand of Saint-Pourçain, Regnaud of Creil, Jean of Saint-Vincent, and Goswin of Brabant as a particularly large group of Dominican witnesses. On 19 November Laurent of Nantes took over for three confessions as 'commissioner'. On 20 November the inquisitor was present for two confessions before turning the work over to Nicholas for one more. Finally, on 21 and 24 November, Nicholas of Ennezat heard the final eight confessions.

Thus at Paris William had employed four leading Dominicans as his commissioners in recording 138 depositions, while some thirty-one additional Dominicans had acted as witnesses. William of Paris had demonstrated his vision of how an inquisition on this scale could take shape, with the single papally-commissioned inquisitor of heretical depravity exercising broad discretion to deputize his brother Dominicans to create an inquisitorial force adequate for the task at hand.

Dominicans in Action

What kind of response did the broad class of Dominican priors, subpriors, and lectors provide to William's letter? If the three named officials of every Dominican convent in France honored William's request, the inquisitor would have had nearly 300 lieutenants at his disposal,[36] each specifically 'deputized'

[34] For confessions of 2–24 November, *Procès*, II, 335–420.

[35] Courtenay, 'Marguerite's Judges', p. 218.

[36] 'L'appel', p. 393, tabulates sixty Dominican convents in the province of France in 1306, but in the east some lay outside the kingdom of France; Bernard Gui's *De fundatione et prioribus conventuum provinciarum Tolosanae et Provinciae ordinis Praedicatorum* listed twenty-seven convents for the province of Toulouse (after its 1303 split from the province

to aid him in the 'cause of faith'. Where the relevant documentation survives, Dominicans did attempt to fulfill the role William of Paris had assigned to them, but with varying success and with differing interpretations of exactly how to go about their charge. Three of the best-documented examples are given here.

In the *bailliage* of Troyes, at Isle-Aumont on 15 October, Jean of Isle, Dominican prior of Troyes, presented himself as William of Paris's representative in recording confessions from two Templars. Also present was another Dominican, along with the *prevôt* of Isle and several knights, clerics and a notary. Then on 18 October at Troyes the same two Templars had to confess again, this time questioned directly by the royal knight Gui of Villars-Montroyer in the presence of the *bailli* of Troyes, several clerics, and two notaries. A third Templar was then brought in to confess the same day, with the prior of Troyes and three Dominicans present along with the royal knight, clerics, and notaries.[37] Only the prior Jean of Isle was here presented as a commissioner of the inquisitor, and none of the other witnessing Dominicans are given any title such as lector or subprior. In this case, the inquisitor's sole Dominican deputy seems to have been so eager that he began recording confessions before the royal knight was able to be present; hence they had to be repeated. This lack of coordination may have resulted from the prior's zeal for the royal cause,[38] or Jean of Isle may have been trying to out-maneuver the royal knight and *bailli* in order to preserve the ecclesiastical nature of the inquisition. Jean of Isle was then present at Paris on 9 November when one of the Templars, brought from Troyes, again confessed. Perhaps his presence was requested in order to clear up any lingering confusion.[39]

In the seneschalsy of Nîmes-Beaucaire, Dominican deputies of the inquisitor were far less involved in the process than the prior of Troyes had been. Between 8 and 11 November initial confessions were obtained at Aigues-Mortes by the royal knight Oudard of Maubuisson, a lieutenant of the *sénéchal*, and several other secular officials, and recorded in a notarized instrument which explicitly stated that the confessions were made 'without the commissioners of the inquisitor of the lord pope'.[40] Only then were the

of Provence), and (by my count) fourteen in the section of the province of Provence that lay west of the Rhone.

37 AN, J 413, no. 16, edited (with color reproduction) in A. Baudin and G. Brunel, 'Les templiers en Champagne. Archives inédites, patrimoines et destins des hommes', in *Les templiers dans l'Aube* (Troyes, 2013), pp. 27–69 (pp. 62–9). Demurger, *Persécution*, p. 60 shows that additional Templars were certainly arrested in the *bailliage* of Troyes.

38 Jean had signed the royal letter of adhesion in 1303. 'L'appel', p. 407.

39 *Procès*, II, 365, 369.

40 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Baluze 396, ed. L. Ménard, *Histoire civile, ecclésiastique et littéraire de la ville de Nismes*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1744), I, preuves, 195 [hereafter Ménard]. For analysis, T. Krämer, 'Terror, Torture, and the Truth: The Testimonies of the Templars Revisted', in *Debate on the Trial*, ed. Burgtorf et al., pp. 71–86; V. Challet, 'Entre

Dominican prior and lector of Nîmes, Déodat Cathalan and Pierre Fabre, called in to hear them confirmed.[41] The scene was replayed with most of the same actors at Nîmes on 16-17 November.[42] The legally-minded notary also took the time to copy William of Paris's entire commissioning letter into the record.[43] Thus the record produced here stressed that the Dominican deputies of William of Paris played only the minimum role necessary to suggest a veneer of legitimacy.

If Troyes represents an eager Dominican presence and Nîmes-Beaucaire a minimal one, Caen presents a model of balanced cooperation between the secular and inquisitorial agents. Over the weekend of 28–29 October, the Dominican subprior of Caen, Robert 'called Herichon', the lector Michel Chouquet, and two other brothers presented themselves to a notary as 'commissioners' on behalf of William of Paris, and carried out questioning in tandem with two royal knights. The notarized instrument that records (in Latin) the confession of thirteen Templars begins with a long quotation from William's commission in the 22 September letter.[44] Here the Dominican prior was not present, but, as requested in William's letter, the subprior and lector stepped in. The two additional Dominicans also appeared not just as witnesses (as in Troyes) but as active members of the questioning, even though William's letter had not mentioned any power to extend the role of 'commissioner' beyond prior, subprior, and lector. Thus the Dominicans of Caen interpreted William's delegation of powers broadly, in line with the way William himself in Paris felt able to depute any Dominican necessary to act in his stead. More importantly, these Dominicans did not wait for Templars to be brought before them by the king's men; rather they participated in the initial process of securing confessions through promises, threats, and torture (mentioned overtly in a French version of the proceedings).[45]

These three examples reveal the choices the inquisitor's agents had to make. How many and which Dominicans should come forward? How early should they enter the process? Should they lead, participate equally,

expansionnisme capétien et relents d'hérésie: Le procès des templiers du Midi', in *Les ordres religieux militaires dans le Midi (XII^e–XIV^e siècle)*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 41 (Toulouse, 2006), pp. 139–68; D. Carraz, *L'Ordre du Temple dans la basse vallée du Rhône (1124–1312)* (Lyon, 2005), pp. 524–5; Demurger, *Persécution*, pp. 64–7.

41 Ménard, I, preuves, 205.

42 Ibid., 208–9.

43 Ibid., 206.

44 AN, J 413, no. 17, ed. S. L. Field, 'Torture and Confession in the Templar Interrogations at Caen, 28–29 October 1307', *Speculum* 91 (2016), 297–307.

45 AN, J 413, no. 20, ed. Field, 'Torture and Confession'; A. Gilbert-Dony, 'Les derniers Templiers du bailliage de Caen: Étude des documents relatant leurs tribulations (1307–1311)', *Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de Normandie* 62 (1994–97), 175–96. Digital image at http://www2.culture.gouv.fr/documentation/archim/proces-templiers.html. See also Demurger, *Persécution,* pp. 46–9, 70–1.

or follow the royal agents? The extant evidence allows only glimpses of the decision-making required of these Preachers, nearly all of whom must have been inexperienced in heresy inquisition. Yet it is clear that in spite of a general willingness to comply with William of Paris's requests, the results were uneven. Would the inquisitors of heretical depravity in Toulouse and Carcassonne provide a more forceful response?

Invisible Inquisitors?

In Carcassonne, the Dominican inquisitor in 1307 was Geoffrey of Ablis, a northerner educated at Chartres, whose ties to the royal court included having acted as a royal ambassador to England in 1298.[46] He had been sent to Carcassonne at the beginning of 1303, during the controversy stirred up by Bernard Délicieux.[47] Geoffrey imposed a certain amount of control over the local situation, yet continued to be embroiled in controversy due to his excommunication of a royal *enquêteur* and the state of inquisitorial prisons in Carcassonne. In November 1305 he delegated inquisitorial powers to his fellow Dominicans Jean of Faugoux and Géraud of Blomac, and in 1306 set off to plead his case at the papal curia in Poitiers. He remained there through the first half of 1308,[48] and thus was not present in Carcassonne when six Templars confessed in November 1307. How did events transpire in his absence?

On 8 November, in the castle of Carcassonne, the first Templar was presented (*exhibitus*) by the *sénéchal* of Carcassonne and Béziers to Géraud of Blomac and Jean of Faugoux, referred to as 'locum tenentibus inquisitoris heretice pravitatis in regno Francie auctoritate apostolica deputati' ('lieutenants of the inquisitor of heretical depravity, deputed by apostolic authority in the kingdom of France').[49] These two Dominicans had been named as Geoffrey of Ablis's lieutenants well before the Templar arrests and were thus already prepared to handle inquisitorial business even without the special authority delegated by William of Paris.[50] Nothing is known of Jean of

46 Viard, *Journaux du trésor de Philip IV*, no. 1023.

47 C. Peytavie, 'Geoffroy d'Ablis, le Mal contre le mal', in *Les Inquisiteurs. Portraits de défenseurs de la foi en Languedoc (XIII^{e}–XIV^{e} siècles)*, ed. L. Albaret (Toulouse, 2001), pp. 89–100; *L'inquisiteur Geoffroy d'Ablis*, ed. and trans. Pales-Gobilliard, pp. 7–10.

48 *L'inquisiteur Geoffroy d'Ablis*, ed. and trans. Pales-Gobilliard, pp. 10–11; A. Nicolotti, 'L'interrogatorio dei Templari imprigionati a Carcassonne', *Studi medievali* 52 (2011), 697–729 (p. 713); Peytavie, 'Geoffroy d'Ablis', p. 94; Friedlander, *Hammer*, p. 143.

49 Paris, Musée de l'Histoire de France, AE/II/311 (*olim* AN, J 413, no. 25), new edition in Nicolotti, 'L'interrogatorio dei Templari'. This first testimony is on fol. 1r–v and fol. 7r–v; the other confessions are on a quire of smaller paper inserted to form fols. 2–6. Digital images at http://www2.culture.gouv.fr/Wave/image/archim/Pages/03818.htm.

50 The *locum tenentibus* phrase refers to Geoffrey of Ablis, not William of Paris, since it is

Faugoux apart from his role as inquisitorial lieutenant, but Géraud of Blomac served as prior of several convents, including Carcassonne from 1305 to 1308. Present also for this 8 November confession were William Pierre, subprior of the Dominicans of Carcassonne, and Pierre Berangarius of the same house, along with the archdeacon and *camerarius* of the church of Carcassonne and the *juge-mage* of the seneschalsy. Thus the setting was very much as William of Paris had envisioned it: the king's men were bringing Templars, ready to confess, in front of four Dominicans, including two deputed as inquisitorial representatives, the local prior (who was also one of the inquisitorial lieutenants), and the subprior.

But if the scenario on 8 November might seem to suggest that inquisitorial lieutenants in Carcassonne were ready to play an efficient role in recording confessions, events of 9–13 November proceeded quite differently. The other five confessions refer to the *sénéchal*, additional secular officials, and several churchmen as present, but give no indication that the inquisitor's lieutenants or any other Dominicans participated.[51] Although many questions remain about the full sequence of events at Carcassonne,[52] the evidence suggests that the seneschal and other secular agents of the king brought out only a small group of the arrested Templars, showed only one of them to the inquisitor's representatives, and then proceeded to record and send to the king the rest of the confessions without inquisitorial involvement. Perhaps the Dominicans declined further participation, or perhaps the royal agents pushed them aside. In any case, far from representing a forceful inquisitorial response, the Dominicans of Carcassonne provided one of the weakest examples of ecclesiastical participation among surviving confessions from fall 1307.

At Toulouse, the new inquisitor was none other than Bernard Gui. Unlike Geoffrey of Ablis, Bernard was a man of the south. After having made his early career as prior or lector at Albi, Carcassonne, Castres, and Limoges between 1292 and 1306, he had just been named inquisitor of Toulouse in January 1307. Although it is certain that Templars were arrested and interrogated in Toulouse,[53] no confessions recorded there survive, and so it is impossible to know exactly what role the brand new inquisitor in Toulouse might have

used by these two men in other contexts with exactly the same wording throughout 1308 (see *L'inquisiteur Geoffroy d'Ablis*, ed. and trans. Pales-Gobilliard).

51 These confessions were copied out of chronological order in the manuscript, running 13, 12 and 9 November. For identifications of all involved, see Nicolotti, 'L'interrogatorio dei Templari'.

52 Demurger, *Persécution*, pp. 68–9, points out that twenty-eight Templars from Carcassonne were in Paris to defend the order in spring 1310.

53 See *Procès*, I, 74–5; K. Schottmüller, *Der Untergang des Templer-Ordens: Mit urkundlichen und kritischen Beiträgen*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1887), II, 31–2 (both cited by Demurger, *Persécution*); and M. A. du Bourg, *Histoire du grand-prieuré de Toulouse*, 2nd edn (Toulouse, 1883), pièces justificatives, pp. xv–xvii, no. xxiii.

played in securing them.[54] Circumstantial evidence, however, suggests that Bernard Gui may have kept the Templar proceedings at arm's length.

Certainly Bernard was busy with varied activities in 1307: on 31 March and again in July he was in Prouille; 22 July found him in Condom for the Dominican provincial chapter;[55] and he wrote his history of Prouille between 22 November and 26 December.[56] His first inquisitorial 'sermon', given on 3 March 1308, indicates that he had begun hearing inquisitorial confessions at Toulouse by 4 July 1307,[57] but his *Book of Sentences* does not betray any involvement with Templar questioning (not surprising since in this case he would not have issued 'sentences' even if he had conducted interrogations). Nor does Bernard's equally famous *Practica inquisitionis* reveal traces of personal involvement in the Templar process.[58]

More suggestive is the fact that Bernard's *Reges Francorum* and *Flores chronicorum* recount the arrest and confessions of the Templars without giving any indication of personal involvement or mentioning inquisitors or Dominicans. Bernard's tone here remains neutral, noting that many leading

54 Barbara Frale has hypothesized that confessions from twenty-five Templars found in Avignon Register 305 could represent part of an inquisition carried out by Bernard Gui. See B. Frale, 'L'interrogatorio ai Templari nella provincia di Bernardo Gui: Un'ipotesi per il frammento del registro avignonese 305', in *Dall'archivio segreto vaticano. Miscellanea di testi, saggi e inventari, I* (Vatican City, 2006), pp. 199–272. The confessions are numbered 64 to 88 and dated 24 April to 30 June, in a year that must be 1308 or 1310. The Templars in question came largely from the south of France, and Frale speculates that Bernard might have started questioning them at Toulouse as early as October 1307 and continued through April–June 1308. She admits several problems, however, with this hypothesis: French inquisitors were ordered to cease inquiries against Templars by February 1308; in June 1308 Bernard was in Padua for the Dominican chapter; the eleven articles used for these confessions do not match up with the accusations circulated in September 1307 (though they match even less closely the longer lists used for the episcopal inquiries of 1309/10). The hypothesis seems doubtful at best, particularly since Andrea Nicolotti (seconding Damien Carraz), has shown that most of the Templars were from Provence rather than the region of Toulouse. See Nicolotti, *I templari e la sindone. Storia di un falso* (Rome, 2011), pp. 39–43; Carraz, *L'Ordre du Temple,* pp. 529–30; as well as more generally Barber, *Trial*, pp. 206–8; Demurger, *Persécution*, p. 66.

55 See B. Guenée, *Between Church and State: The Lives of Four French Prelates in the Late Middle Ages*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago, 1991), ch. 1; P.-A. Amargier, 'Elements pour un portrait de Bernard Gui', in *Bernard Gui et son monde*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 16 (Toulouse, 1981), pp. 19–37; A. Dubreil-Arcin, 'Bernard Gui, un inquisiteur méthodique', in *Les Inquisiteurs*, ed. Albaret, pp. 105–14; and eadem, *Bernard Gui (1261–1331). Un historien et sa méthode* (Paris, 2000), pp. 37–55.

56 *Bernardus Guidonis, De fundatione et prioribus conventuum provinciarum Tolosanae et Provinciae ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. and trans. P.-A. Amargier (Rome, 1961), p. viii.

57 *Livre des sentences*, ed. and trans. Pales-Gobilliard, I, 182.

58 Part two concludes with forms relating to the Templars, but they are later documents from the reign of John XXII in which several cardinals issue decisions relating to former Templars. *Practica inquisitionis heretice pravitatis, auctore Bernardo Guidonis*, ed. C. Douais (Paris, 1886), pp. 71–82, nos. 54–6.

Templars confessed, but that others did not, and so all over the kingdom they were tortured. Similarly, when Bernard mentions the August 1308 decision to set up a papal commission on the order's guilt or innocence, the 1310 burnings in Paris, the 1312 dissolution of the order, and the 1314 execution of Jacques de Molay, his descriptions are impersonal and dispassionate. Indeed, without making an overt judgment, Bernard hints at doubt concerning the Templars' guilt.[59] This scanty evidence is hardly conclusive, but suggests that the inquisitor at Toulouse had reservations about the inquisition against the Templars. Bernard Gui was a loyal subject of the king, but not Philip IV's man in the way that William of Paris was.[60]

If Geoffrey of Ablis stayed clear of the Templar proceedings and Bernard of Gui may have done the same, one other inquisitor of heretical depravity besides William of Paris is definitely known to have questioned Templars in fall 1307. On 23 November Brother Ralph of Ligny, 'inquisitor of heretical depravity deputed by apostolic authority to the cities and dioceses of Toul, Metz and Verdun', wrote to Philip IV concerning two German Templars who had been arrested and questioned on 25 October in the *bailliage* of Chaumont.[61] These Templars indignantly denied wrongdoing. Ralph of Ligny preferred not to call for torture (as he states explicitly), and in the end they confessed to nothing. No notarized confessions were recorded, and Ralph seems only to have written at the insistence of the arresting royal knight, in order to excuse the lack of results. Thus this inquisitor, almost certainly a Dominican, was notably tentative in his approach to the Templar affair. The dioceses of Toul, Metz, and Verdun lay almost entirely outside the kingdom of France, and although Ralph of Ligny would have been appointed from Paris, he may have been unsure about whether he was bound by instructions that could apply only in France.

In sum, the inquisitor in Carcassonne played no direct role in questioning Templars, and his lieutenants were actually less involved than Dominicans elsewhere; the evidence for Toulouse is slim, but the inquisitor there later expressed at least ambivalence about Templar guilt; and the inquisitor in Lorraine, in any case outside the bounds of this 'French' inquisition, declined to apply the measures necessary to secure confessions. Dominican inquisitors of heretical depravity had not proved to be quite the effective agents that William of Paris had hoped.

59 *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. M. Bouquet et al., 24 vols. (Paris, 1738–1876), XXI, 716–23. Lamarrigue, *Bernard Gui*, pp. 429–33, concludes that 'he does not seem to have been convinced that the temple was guilty'. On Bernard's writings about Jacques de Molay see also E. A. R. Brown, 'Philip the Fair, Clement V, and the End of the Knights Templar: The Execution of Jacques de Molay and Geoffroi de Charny in March 1314', *Viator* 47 (2015), 229–92.

60 Note also that in 1303 the Dominicans of Bernard's home priory of Limoges refused to adhere to the king's call for a council. 'L'appel', pp. 401, 435–7.

61 AN, J 413, no. 15, ed. in S. L. Field, 'The Inquisitor Ralph of Ligny, Two German Templars, and Marguerite Porete', *Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures* 39 (2013), 1–22.

Answering Aragon

A largely-overlooked exchange of letters sheds further light on the actions of Geoffrey of Ablis and Bernard Gui, while highlighting the impasse this inquisition had reached by February 1308.[62] Like rulers throughout Europe, King Jaime II of Aragon had to react to Philip IV's sudden arrest of the French Templars. Philip had written on 16 October to announce the arrests and urge Jaime to take similar steps. The king of Aragon only received the letter in mid-November, and did not immediately come around to Philip's perspective. But after getting reports in late November of the confessions which Jacques de Molay and other leading Templars had made on 25–26 October, Jaime informed the Dominican inquisitor for Aragon, Juan of Lotger, of what he had heard from France. The inquisitor then (in principle) asked the king to arrest the Templars in Aragon, and Jaime began issuing arrest orders in the first weeks of December.[63] On 10 January 1308, King Jaime wrote to Bernard Gui and Geoffrey of Ablis, explaining that the Dominican inquisitor in Aragon was commencing an inquisition against the Templars. In order to be better informed, Juan of Lotger was asking, through the king, that Bernard and Geoffrey send him 'a copy or summary of your proceedings and full proof of authenticity'. Thus the king was dispatching the Dominican Bernard of Boxadors to France, carrying his letters and charged with bringing back the requested copies and clarifications.[64]

This envoy went first to Toulouse, where Bernard Gui received him on 5 February. But Bernard Gui did not provide what Jaime II had hoped. As the inquisitor of Toulouse wrote in his reply to the king, 'It seemed good and more prudent to me that [Bernard of Boxadors] should proceed on to Poitiers, where he would be made more certain about those things which the cause and reason of his journey demanded. And this was done, as he will be able to report orally to your royal majesty. I have also replied to Brother Juan, the inquisitor, by means of the same [Brother Bernard], relating to the content of your letter, with what seemed necessary to reply'.[65] In other words, Bernard Gui sent the king's ambassador on to the papal court at Poitiers, claiming it was there – not at Toulouse – that he would find useful answers

62 Barbara Frale drew attention to these letters in 'L'interrogatorio ai Templari nella provincia di Bernardo Gui', pp. 225–6, and 'Du catharisme à la sorcellerie: Les inquisiteurs du Midi dans le procès des templiers', in *Les ordres religieux militaires dans le Midi*, pp. 169–86, without analyzing their contents. I thank Larry F. Field and Elizabeth A. R. Brown for reviewing these texts with me.

63 I follow A. Forey, *The Fall of the Templars in the Crown of Aragon* (Farnham, 2001), ch. 1, esp. pp. 5–7.

64 Finke, II, 76.

65 Ibid., 92. The letter is dated 'die lune in carniprivio'. If that indicates the Monday preceding Shrove Tuesday, it would be 26 February 1308. Bernard evidently took his time in responding to the king of Aragon.

to his questions. As to what Bernard Gui may have responded directly to the inquisitor in Aragon, his evasive phrase 'quod visum est rescribendum' hardly suggests straightforward satisfaction of the king's request. In fact, Gui's entire response is noncommittal; he did not take the opportunity to vaunt French success against the Templars, to emphasize the horror of their crimes, or to confirm that he had carried out an inquisitorial process himself.

Bernard of Boxadors duly headed north to Poitiers. There he met with Geoffrey of Ablis, who wrote back to Jaime II on 17 February. This letter leaves little doubt about Geoffrey's belief in Templar guilt, contrasting with Bernard Gui's reserved tone. It commends the zeal that had caused the king of Aragon to avenge the injury done to Christ and take action 'against the crucifiers [who are] crucifying once more the same crucified One with their perverse and wicked acts, by capturing those same crucifying Templars at the request of Brother Juan, inquisitor of the mentioned crime, appointed by authority of the Apostolic See in your kingdoms and lands'.[66] But in response to the king's specific requests, Geoffrey states that other inquisitorial business has kept him at the curia, and so, he says, 'I have in no way proceeded in the business concerning the Templars, and thus I am not able to send a copy of proceedings to the inquisitor, since I have done nothing concerning the aforementioned business'. Geoffrey did go on to say that 'I have, however, revealed to the aforementioned brothers [Bernard of Boxadors and his *socius* Simon] some things by which some try to attack the proceedings which have been held, so that the inquisitor may avoid those things in his own proceedings. Moreover, I suppose that my most illustrious lord prince, the lord king of France, who, aflame with the zeal of orthodox faith, has transferred all these crucifiers of his kingdom to prison, will send or will have sent such things to you which will be able to sufficiently inform the inquisitor'.[67] Here is a clear statement that the inquisitor of Carcassonne had had no involvement with the interrogation of Templars in his jurisdiction. Even though Templar confessions had indeed been recorded in Carcassonne by Geoffrey's lieutenants, Geoffrey did not describe them or offer to have copies of those confessions sent to Aragon. He may have been unaware of what had been done in Carcassonne, or he may have preferred to feign ignorance. Geoffrey ended by saying that he saw no reason to keep Bernard and his *socius* at Poitiers any longer.

A third letter confirms the impression that Bernard of Boxadors received little concrete information from the inquisitors of the Midi. On the same date of 17 February the Dominican Peter of Biescasa also wrote to Jaime II from Poitiers. He reported that he had consulted with 'the inquisitor' (presumably Geoffrey) and also the master (Aymeric of Piacenza) and procurator of the Dominicans at Poitiers, and that they had decided that 'nothing should be

66 Ibid., 90.
67 Ibid., 90–1.

said' about these matters concerning the Templars, 'because of a certain danger which might threaten the order'. Therefore Brother Bernard should return to Aragon 'with the information which he had from Toulouse and Carcassonne, because he could not report anything fuller from here'.[68] The king's envoy had thus experienced a perfect circle of obfuscation: forwarded from Toulouse in order to find answers in Poitiers, he had been sent home from Poitiers with the statement that he should be content with what he had received in Toulouse (which had been nothing).

Dominicans in fact had very good reason to be circumspect at exactly this moment. Only a matter of days or weeks before, at the end of January or early February, Clement V had suspended the power of French inquisitors to inquire against Templars in France. None of the Dominicans mentions this fact, yet the moment is reflected in the cautious sense that 'nothing should be said' because of a 'certain danger' to the order. Moreover, during the night between 12 and 13 February, Giacomo of Montecucco, Templar commander of Lombardy and papal *cubicularius*, fled from the papal court where he had enjoyed Clement's protection.[69] The pope was furious. As he exclaimed, the king of France could now say that the pope could not guard even one Templar – how could he claim to guard two thousand? For French Dominicans, it would have been very difficult to know how things would turn out from this point; hence the obvious caution expressed in the letters of 17 February.

The End of a Dream

After months of royal pressure, on 5 July Clement V issued two letters reinstating the power of French prelates to carry out inquisitions against individual Templars. Two points must be made about these letters. First, they provide our only evidence for exactly what the pope had prohibited back in January or February. One letter, addressed to all the archbishops and bishops of the kingdom of France, 'and to the beloved son William and other inquisitors of heretical depravity generally deputed by apostolic authority in that kingdom', indicates that, due to his displeasure over the way he had been kept in the dark, Clement had suspended the power of all French prelates in the Templar matter and had 'recalled' to himself all power of proceeding in this affair. The second letter, addressed only to William, confirmed that the suspension had stemmed from the way William had 'presumptuously' proceeded without notifying Clement. Thus the suspension of power had applied to archbishops and bishops as well as to inquisitors, even though there is no evidence of

[68] Ibid., 91–2.

[69] J. Théry-Astruc, 'The Flight of the Master of Lombardy (13 February 1308) and Clement V's Strategy in the Templar Affair: A Slap in the Pope's Face', *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* 70 (2016), 35–44.

episcopal inquisitions having occurred in fall 1307. But this suspension affected only inquisitions against Templars; it was not, contrary to what is sometimes said, a blanket suspension of inquisitorial powers in France. The second point is that Clement's letters transferred authority over Templar inquisitions from Dominican inquisitors to bishops. Thus his first letter, while allowing inquisitors to again participate in the Templar affair, used the reluctant phrase 'if you want to interest yourselves along with the archbishops and bishops'. Similarly, when writing to William, Clement restored his authority in the Templar affair, but only to inquire 'together with prelates of the aforesaid kingdom and others associated with them by us, and not otherwise'.[70]

This shift was formalized on 13 July, when Clement ordered that all inquiries against individual Templars going forward were to be handled at the episcopal level, with the bishop joined by two members of his cathedral chapter, two Franciscans, and two Dominicans. The full importance of the pope's response is apparent. The king and the inquisitor in Paris had sought to implement a kingdom-wide inquisition by deputizing Dominicans from every convent in the kingdom to act as inquisitorial lieutenants directed from Paris. Clement had brought this structure crashing down before a firm foundation for 'French inquisition' could solidify.

Conclusion

In 1307, in the midst of his battles with the papacy, Philip IV turned to heresy inquisition as a means of expanding his authority throughout the kingdom. In instigating a kingdom-wide inquisition against the Order of the Temple, the king deployed his secular agents to handle arrests and obtain initial confessions through threats, promises, and torture. But no parallel network of heresy inquisitors existed to fulfill the necessary role of recording confessions. Just as the king had turned to William of Paris during the struggle to depose the inquisitor in Toulouse in 1301/02, he now directed this trusted Preacher to provide the inquisitorial manpower necessary to handle a kingdom-wide inquisition. William did his best to conjure into existence an army of inquisitorial deputies by appealing not only to the Dominican inquisitors in the Midi but also to the leadership of the Dominican order at the local level across (but not outside of) the kingdom of France.

William's own handling of the inquisition in Paris showed that a forceful inquisitor could work with royal agents to provide exactly what was demanded by the king. Elsewhere, however, the results were uneven. The improvised nature of this proto-national inquisition showed through as Dominicans all over France suddenly found themselves thrust into the role of inquisitorial

[70] See further Field, *Beguine*, pp. 79–81.

deputies. Some may have relished the opportunity; others may have been hesitant; all had to wrestle with an unaccustomed responsibility. Perhaps more tellingly, inquisitors of heretical depravity outside of Paris do not seem to have rushed to fill the role William of Paris envisioned. In Lorraine, the lack of compliance probably resulted from the 'French' nature of the inquisition – at the indistinct edges of the kingdom, what were the responsibilities of an inquisitor appointed from Paris but with a jurisdiction in dioceses largely outside the borders of France? In Carcassonne, without the direct involvement of the inquisitor, his lieutenants may have been uncertain how to proceed. They thought of themselves as Geoffrey of Ablis's *locum tenentes*, not William's, and would have been unaccustomed to implementing orders from Paris. The evidence from Toulouse is less clear, but there Bernard Gui may have hesitated to wade into politically dangerous waters. In fact, such caution proved wise. By February 1308 the pope had dissolved this nascent inquisitorial network before it could fully cohere. Clement could not interfere with orders given to royal officials, but he could shape the structure of ecclesiastical inquiry into the 'heresy' Philip IV had imputed to the Templars.

The dream of a centralized French inquisition proved short-lived. In the north, Dominican inquisitors failed to establish the kind of presence necessary to act as 'head inquisitors' for the kingdom. After William's death in 1313/14, the inquisitor in Paris from 1315 to at least 1323 was Imbert Louvel, confessor to Louis X and Charles IV. But his appointment to the office of inquisitor is known only because his wages are noted in royal accounts;[71] no evidence indicates that he was particularly active. Aubert of Châlons was more visible around 1330–32, but he was reprimanded by John XXII for several false accusations and hardly seems to have been an effective figure.[72] In the south, John XXII granted the Dominican provincial priors in the provinces of Toulouse and Provence the right to nominate candidates for inquisitor in 1324.[73] The provincial prior in Paris still had to approve their choices, but this regional autonomy worked against centralization from Paris. More broadly, the presence of the popes at Avignon probably helped to keep the inquisitors of Toulouse and Carcassonne from fully entering the orbit of Paris.[74]

Moreover, the decree *Multorum querela* issued by Clement V following the Council of Vienne insisted that henceforth inquisitors work together with bishops,[75] making it more difficult for Dominican inquisitors to act with

71 J. Viard, *Les journaux du trésor de Charles IV le Bel* (Paris, 1917), no. 3810.

72 *Bullaire*, nos. 89, 92, 94–5, 100–1, 104–5.

73 Ibid., no. 61.

74 In the present volume see the essays by Louisa Burnham and Sylvain Piron in relation to inquisitors in the Midi in the 1320s, and those by Michael Bailey and Georg Modestin for other aspects of the repression of heresy during the reign of John XXII.

75 I. Bueno, *Defining Heresy: Inquisition, Theology, and Papal Policy in the Time of Jacques Fournier*, trans. I. Bolognese, T. Brophy, and S. R. Prodan (Leiden, 2015), pp. 22–4.

uniform purpose across the kingdom. Thus, in an example highlighted by Robert E. Lerner, when the Dominican inquisitor Jacques of Morey proceeded against the 'sect, habit, and books of the *turlupins*' in 1372, it was necessarily in tandem with the bishop of Angers.[76] Pope Gregory XI commended Charles V the next year for acting against these heretics, but such action was through only loosely coordinated efforts by king, bishop, and inquisitor.[77] In any case, at the height of the Hundred Years War concerted kingdom-wide inquisition was hardly possible.

Efforts to suppress heresy in late medieval France never cohered into the kind of centralized network of inquisitors that would eventually emerge in Spain. One can only imagine how envious Philip IV would have been, had he known of the direct power to appoint and dismiss inquisitors of heretical depravity which Pope Sixtus IV would grant to the Spanish crown in 1478.[78]

[76] R. E. Lerner, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (1972; rev. edn Notre Dame IN, 1991), pp. 52–3. On Jacques, see *Bullaire*, no. 274 (p. 394 n. 1).

[77] *Bullaire*, no. 276.

[78] H. Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision* (New Haven CT, 1997), p. 44.

2

The Dissemination of Barthélemy Sicard's *Postilla super Danielem*

Sylvain Piron

The process through which a group of devout Franciscans and their lay followers in southern France gradually moved away from obedience to the Roman Church, were condemned as heretics in May 1318, and were then hunted down throughout lower Languedoc, is one of the best documented cases of collective heretication in medieval Europe.[1] The story of these Spiritual Franciscans and their Beguin followers could even serve as a model in helping historians to realize that heresy is neither just the projection of inquisitorial fantasies, nor the expression of a revolutionary will to break with ecclesiastical authority, but rather the result of a complex interaction between opposing forces whose conflicting views over what constitutes a legitimate Christian community gradually harden to the point of becoming entirely irreconcilable. Robert E. Lerner has made the crucial point that the Beguins are the first popular dissidents to make abundant use of writings.[2] These books or quires allowed them to engage in repeated collective readings of the key documents defining their beliefs and convictions, most of which were works by Peter John Olivi. Yet, as far as is known, none of the volumes that circulated in Languedoc at the time have been preserved. During the core of the repression period (1318–25), while about a hundred Beguins were burned at the stake, confiscated books and papers were probably also destroyed. The great mission that the Beguin Peire Trencavel set himself after his escape from the Wall (Carcassonne's inquisitorial prison) in 1323 was to save Olivi's written texts from destruction.[3] While entrusting a number of these books to Johan Adzorit and Johan Rotgier, both secular priests in

1 R. Manselli, *Spirituali e beghini in Provenza* (Rome, 1959); D. Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century after Saint Francis* (University Park PA, 2001); L. Burnham, *So Great a Light, So Great a Smoke: The Beguin Heretics of Languedoc* (Ithaca NY, 2008).

2 R. E. Lerner, 'Writing and Resistance among Beguins of Languedoc and Catalonia', in *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530*, ed. P. Biller and A. Hudson (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 186–204.

3 Burnham, *So Great a Light*, pp. 171–2.

Béziers, Trencavel was planning to meet up with another companion in the Auvergne.[4] Sadly, the probability of one day recovering a leather bag containing Olivian manuscripts from the cellar of an isolated farm in Corrèze or Cantal is extremely low.[5]

Historians must rely instead on documents produced or kept by the persecutors, in the first place by the inquisitors of Carcassonne and Toulouse.[6] The story of Olivi's doctrinal trials and eventual *post mortem* condemnation can be traced thanks to the annotations made by his censors in the books they studied, either at the time of the 1283 Paris commission that examined his controversial works, or when Bonagrazia of Bergamo wrote repeatedly in one volume from 1310 to 1325.[7] At first, the papal administration was not instrumental in preserving those books. On the contrary, in the final days of the Council of Vienne, in order to make peace between the two Franciscan groups that had bitterly fought for about three years and had generated mutual accusations of heresy, Clement V requested that all documentation produced by both parties during the debates be destroyed – not only the polemical tracts composed by Bonagrazia and Ubertino of Casale, but also the precious handwritten rolls of Brother Leo that Ubertino had presented as evidence of the early Franciscan observance.[8] In order to make up for such a loss, Raymond of Fronsac, procurator of the Franciscan order at the papal curia, presented John XXII with a summary of over a hundred documents tracing the long and complex history of this heresy, which he encouraged the pope to totally extirpate.[9] Although this long and detailed inventory survives, no more than a handful of the documents themselves were actually copied as part of this dossier. It is reasonable to understand this list as representing a chronological classification of the actual documents held at that time by the procurator's office in Avignon. When the Franciscan officials in turn broke with the pope and fled to imperial Pisa in April 1328, their archives were seized by papal agents. The best indication that this library was then made available to papal supporters is provided by the Carmelite Guido Terreni. It

4 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France [hereafter BNF], MS Doat 27, fols. 172v–175v.

5 I long fancied the notion that a group of Beguins who had emigrated to the Auvergne might have secretly preserved the books and Olivi's cult up to modern times. But the only such community of Beguins I could trace, near Saint-Étienne, derives from a much later Jansenist dissidence. See F. Regnault, 'Des béguins', *Bulletin de la Société d'anthropologie de Paris* 1 (1890), 662–80.

6 Paris, BNF, MSS Doat 27 and 28. These registers, which deserve a good annotated edition, are also discussed in the essay by Louisa Burnham in the present volume.

7 S. Piron, 'Censures et condamnation de Pierre de Jean Olivi: Enquête dans les marges du Vatican', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Age* 118 (2006), 313–73.

8 Ibid.

9 *Sol ortus*, edited in F. Ehrle, 'Des Ordensprocurator Raymund von Fronsac Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Spiritualen', *Archiv für Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* 3 (1887), 1–32 (pp. 7–32).

was certainly upon these shelves that he discovered a copy of his own treatise *De perfectione vitae* full of critical and insulting annotations by Bonagrazia, to which he promptly replied in an addition to his book.[10]

An inventory of the archives preserved at the papal palace under Innocent VI shows a number of boxes (*techae*) whose labels were connected to 'rebels and heretics', some of which gathered documents produced by the circle of Michele of Cesena in Pisa and later in Munich.[11] One of these boxes is described as containing 'some useless writings from Narbonne'. The most likely origin for such a set of documents appears to be the seizure of various papers and parchments from the local convent in May 1318, when Olivi's grave was destroyed and his ashes removed to Avignon. I have suggested elsewhere that at least a portion of this box was later taken to the Apostolic Library, bound together, and can now be identified with the codex Borghesianus 85, whose first quire contains the only preserved autograph by Peter John Olivi.[12] Yet many other manuscripts stemming from the intense scribal activity of the Spirituals were saved through another route.

The Beguins attributed a symbolic meaning to the number of the first four martyrs who were executed in Marseille in May 1318. Standing for the four directions of the cross, it was a sign that the poverty of Christ had been crucified again with them.[13] Although it cannot be proven, I strongly suspect that the friars who were summoned to Avignon in April, then detained and interrogated, first by the Minister General Michele of Cesena and then by the Franciscan inquisitor for Provence Michel Lemoine, had decided in advance that only four of them would eventually suffer martyrdom. The most crucial objective for the group was to survive the current tribulations in order to achieve the final conversion of the whole world after the downfall of the Antichrist. As the Carcassonne inquisitor Jean of Beaune reports, the apostates

10 Guido Terreni, *Contra fratrem Bonagraciam de Pergamo*, Avignon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 299, fols. 77v–180r, see fol. 79r: 'incidit in manus meas transcriptum dicti tractatus mei, quod repertum est inter libros apostatae, schismatici et utinam non sic, veri haeretici aut nimium suspecti, qui arrogantissime nomen Bonae gratiae sibi adscribit cum potius dici debeat Vana gratia atque fallax' ('there fell into my hands a copy of the said treatise of mine, which was found among the books of the apostate, schismatic and – would that this were not so! – real heretic or extremely suspect man, who most arrogantly ascribes to himself the name of Bonagrazia [Good Grace], while he should rather be called Vanagrazia [Vain Grace] and treacherous'). This addition to the *De perfectione vitae* is also found in Paris, BNF, lat. 4046, fols. 122ra–155ra. See *Guido Terreni, O. Carm. (†1342): Studies and Texts*, ed. A. Fidora (Turnhout, 2015).

11 Vatican, Archivio segreto vaticano, Instr. Misc. 5833, fol. 19v, edited in V. Theis, 'Le gouvernement pontifical du Comtat Venaissin (1270–1350)' (Ph.D. thesis, Université Lyon-II, 2005), pp. 999–1035.

12 S. Piron, 'Autour d'un autographe (Borgh. 85, fols. 1–11)', *Oliviana* 2 (2006), online at http://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/40.

13 Burnham, *So Great a Light*, p. 85. A fifth convict recanted at the last moment. This could be a sign that he was meant to be a substitute, in case one of the four had defected.

left a public statement, announcing that they would return after the death of John XXII to achieve a crushing victory over their adversaries.[14] While Christ's advice was to flee to the mountains, they found it wiser to set sail across the sea, most of them heading to the Kingdom of Naples. A chronicle produced by their distant successors in the last quarter of the fourteenth century in Tuscany traces the history of their group across the peninsula.[15] Following Christ's good advice, they survived the plague by fleeing to the mountains and hiding in caves, and later settled in the March of Ancona. Up to that point, they had carried with them a portable library, of which we can catch a glimpse thanks to a remarkable anthology mainly based on its contents, now kept in Pesaro.[16] Besides Olivi's complete works (distributed across perhaps twenty codices) and other rarities, this same library contained writings of a neglected, albeit crucial, author. By tracing their dissemination, I would like to provide new perspectives on the wider impact of the Spirituals in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Barthélemy Sicard, Olivi's Best Disciple

Although scholarship has not paid much attention to him up to now, Barthélemy Sicard was certainly the leading figure among the Languedoc Spirituals in the decade that followed Olivi's death in 1298.[17] The Tuscan chronicle, based on a long oral tradition, describes him as his master's 'main disciple'.[18] One of the manuscripts we shall study presents him more precisely as his 'companion and disciple' (*socius ac discipulus*), which could mean that he served as Olivi's teaching and editorial assistant in his final years in Narbonne.[19] Whatever the case, he certainly acted as his main intellectual

14 Paris, BNF, MS Doat 37, fol. 63, edition in É. Baluze, *Miscellanea*, ed. J. D. Mansi, 4 vols. (Lucca, 1761–64), II, 272. See S. Piron, 'Un cahier de travail de l'inquisiteur Jean de Beaune', *Oliviana* 2 (2006), online at http://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/26.

15 F. Tocco, *Studii Francescani* (Naples, 1909). On this chronicle, see S. Piron, 'Le mouvement clandestin des dissidents franciscains au milieu du XIV^e^ siècle', *Oliviana* 3 (2009), online at http://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/337.

16 S. Piron, 'La bibliothèque portative des fraticelles, 1. Le manuscrit de Pesaro', *Oliviana* 5 (2016), online at http://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/804. Another group, settled in the Greek islands, carried with them a separate and similar library that ended up at the Candia convent before 1448 (G. Hofmann, 'La biblioteca scientifica del monastero di San Francesco a Candia nel medio evo', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 8 [1942], 317–60).

17 Manselli, *Spirituali e beghini*, mentions him briefly, without discussing the *Postilla super Danielem*. I first introduced him in S. Piron, 'La critique de l'Église chez les Spirituels languedociens', in *L'Anticléricalisme en France méridionale, milieu XII^e^–début XIV^e^ siècle*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 38 (Toulouse, 2003), pp. 77–109.

18 Tocco, *Studii*, p. 515.

19 MS **O** (Sigla are explained below), fol. 88r: 'Bartholomeus Sycardi evangelice vite professor, socius ac discipulus quondam sanctissimi patris fratris P. Io.' ('Barthélemy

heir. By 1309, when the Spirituals felt both desperate and confident enough to launch an appeal to Clement V, asking the pope to lift the ban on Olivi's books, allow the celebration of his feast, and alleviate their own repression, Barthélemy had been elected as a representative (*definitor*) of the province at the next general chapter. This qualification is the strongest sign we possess that, by that time, the group was supported by a large portion of the local Franciscans. Barthélemy certainly owed this status to the teaching positions he had held earlier. The Pesaro manuscript contains fragments of his lectures on the *Sentences*,[20] which he probably delivered at some point as the principal lector at the Montpellier *studium generale*. While he played a prominent part at the time of the appeal, he soon disappeared from sight after the summer of 1310. The rumor that most of the Spirituals' leaders were poisoned by their enemies at that date would be hard to prove, yet this suggestion as to his fate does not appear wholly unlikely.[21]

One of the few sure facts we know about Barthélemy is that he was residing in Béziers in the summer of 1303, presumably serving as a lector at the school of the local convent. The document that mentions this fact is worth pondering. Following a dramatic speech by William of Nogaret calling for the deposition of Pope Boniface VIII and the convocation of a general council, Philip the Fair's agents were seeking support across the kingdom of France. Usually meetings held in religious houses would result in a single document listing the names of all the friars or monks supporting Nogaret's appeal. Barthélemy's case is highly unusual. He issued instead a personal statement in a separate document.[22] Giving his consent to the appeal, he was careful to state that he was acting despite the reverence and obedience he owed, by his

Sicard, professor of the evangelical life, companion and disciple of the late most holy father Peter John'). If my suggestion is correct, his could be the second hand that appears on Olivi's autograph in Borgh. 85, which Fabio Troncarelli considers as formed according to a more conservative tradition. This of course has no implication as to his possible birth date. See F. Troncarelli, 'La chiave di David. Profezia e ragione in un manoscritto pseudo-gioachimita della Biblioteca Nazionale di Roma', *Frate Francesco* 69 (2003), 5–55, corrected in Piron, 'Autour d'un autographe'.

20 Barthélemy Sicard, 'Extraits du commentaire des Sentences', *Oliviana* 5 (2016), online at http://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/895.

21 Angelo Clareno, *Historia septem tribulationum Ordinis minorem*, ed. O. Rossini (Rome, 1999), p. 269. The Spirituals had secured an exemption from obedience to their superiors because, 'timebant prædicti ad nos evocati, ut dicebant, ex verisimilibus coniecturis sibi magna pericula imminere a prælatis et subditis ordinis prædicti' ('the aforesaid <friars> summoned to us were afraid, so they said, on the basis of plausible conjectures, that great dangers threatened them, coming from the prelates and subordinate figures of the aforesaid order'). *Bullarium Franciscanum*, ed. G. G. Sbaraglia and C. Eubel, 7 vols. (Rome, 1759–1904; V–VII ed. Eubel, 1897–1904), V, 65–8, no. 158.

22 *Documents relatifs aux Etats généraux et assemblées réunis sous Philippe le Bel*, ed. G. Picot (Paris, 1901), p. 322, dated 22 August 1303. Unfortunately, Barthélemy's personal seal, once appended to the document (Paris, Archives nationales, J 481, no. 150), is now missing.

very Franciscan profession, to the Roman Church and any canonically elected pope. This subtle nuance does not imply that, by that time, and contrary to the position taken by Olivi in 1295, Barthélemy now considered Boniface's election to have been problematic. Instead, it rather suggests that he was awaiting some uncanonical election in the future. The theologian explained that he not only agreed with the arguments presented by the king, but also acted according to some other reasons that he would explain in due time (*ex aliis* [*causis*] *suo loco et tempore explicandis*). The same document also tells us that he was born in Montréal de l'Aude, twelve miles east of Carcassonne, just like Raymond Dejean, Olivi's nephew, who emerged as a crucial figure during the repression.[23]

It is very tempting to connect this statement to the contents of the *Postilla super Danielem*. This work is the only significant intellectual achievement produced among the Spirituals in the first decade of the fourteenth century. Rotgier admitted having read 'two or three quires of sermons and glosses on Daniel edited by friar Barthélemy Sicard', which certainly did not cover the totality of the work.[24] The author of the Tuscan chronicle was aware of 'l'aleghorie sopra Daniello', although it is not certain that he had a copy at hand.[25] Despite its fame within the movement, it is interesting to observe that the *Postilla* was scarcely known by the Spirituals' adversaries. Only Jacques Fournier shows awareness of it. Yet even he ascribes it to Olivi when quoting a crucial passage in his report against the *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, written while Fournier was still bishop of Pamiers.[26] This could be a sign that he had access at that time to a batch of confiscated texts, all of which he attributed to Olivi.

The *Postilla* is a massive work. Its length can be estimated at roughly 115,000 words, nearly two-thirds the length of the *Lectura super Apocalipsim*. Following the prescription of the General Chapter of Lyon (1299), the name of Olivi is never explicitly mentioned, and open references to his most controversial concepts are avoided. Likewise, Joachim of Fiore is not referred to, nor is any Joachite exegetical tool expressly used. Yet the exposition of Daniel's prophecies is clearly set within an Olivian framework. In a final dedication to the Virgin, Barthélemy explains that this was his first properly edited work. Besides his *Sentences* commentary, it is probably the only thing he wrote. The

23 Burr, *Spiritual Franciscans*, pp. 215–21.

24 Manselli, *Spirituali e beghini*, p. 308.

25 Tocco, *Studii*, p. 516: 'Anchora fu suo discepolo frate Bartolomeo Sichardi del qual se dice che fe' l'aleghorie sopra Daniello' ('Another of his disciples was friar Barthélemy Sicard, about whom it is said that he made the allegories on Daniel'). The uncertainty expressed ('se dice') may refer either to the authorship of the *Postilla*, or to its very existence.

26 Avignon, Bibliothèque municipale, 1087, fol. 221va–b. Cf. S. Piron, 'Un avis retrouvé de Jacques Fournier', *Médiévales* 54 (2008), 113–34, translated as "Recovering a Theological Advice by Jacques Fournier", in *Pope Benedict XII (1334–1342). The Guardian of Orthodoxy*, ed. I. Bueno (Amsterdam, 2018), pp. 57–9.

closing formula by which he submits the *Postilla* to the correction of the pope may not have been a purely rhetorical gesture, since Barthélemy had various opportunities to approach Clement V in 1309–10. Yet given the busy political agenda of those years, it is doubtful that the pontiff had even a cursory look at it or submitted it to any doctrinal control. Being itself an original text, it was relevant neither to the commission that studied the orthodoxy of Olivi's works, nor to the one that discussed the observance of the Franciscan rule within the order.

Barthélemy's approach follows the standard procedures of university exegesis. In each chapter, after a *divisio textus* that clarifies the structure of the chapter under review, a literal explanation is followed by a number of questions, meant to elucidate historical or doctrinal issues. A second hermeneutical level, often just as long as the literal comments, is presented as 'allegories'. As the testimonies mentioned above reveal, this level is what appealed most to the Beguins. Finally, a third level is devoted to 'moral' lessons that can be drawn from the stories of Daniel.

So far, medieval exegesis on the Book of Daniel has failed to spark much study,[27] but we can compare Sicard's work with a related endeavor. Jean Michel (*Johannes Michaelis*), another virtually forgotten Franciscan theologian, commented on the Book of Daniel in Montpellier around 1292–95.[28] In a cultural milieu imbued with Joachite expectations, Sicard's allegorical reading of a prophetical text necessarily implied entering into the discussion of contemporary and near-future events. By contrast, Jean Michel carefully avoided such an approach, being content with a historical and moral explanation.

As would be expected, Barthélemy 'applies' the text to the modern Church. Daniel is not only taken as a typological representation of Christ. He stands as well for Francis and his true followers in an allegorical prefiguration of the tribulations of the contemporary Church, held in a Babylonian captivity. Even more poignantly, Barthélemy offers a third level of application of the prophecies to 'any religious order', by which he means the internal conflicts of the Franciscan order. Reading his current situation into the biblical text, he presents Daniel and his companions as an archetype for 'spiritual

27 M. Zier, 'Nicholas of Lyra on the Book of Daniel', in *Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture*, ed. P. D. W. Krey and L. Smith (Leiden, 2000), pp. 173–93, fails to provide a wider overview. Yet the field is promising. See for example R. E. Lerner, '*Pertransibunt Plurimi*: Reading Daniel to Transgress Authority', in *Knowledge, Discipline and Power in the Middle Ages. Essays in Honour of David Luscombe*, ed. J. Canning, E. J. King, and M. Staub (Leiden, 2011), pp. 7–28.

28 S. Piron, 'Les *studia* franciscains de Provence et d'Aquitaine (1275–1335)', in *Philosophy and Theology in the* Studia *of the Religious Orders and at the Papal and Royal Courts*, ed. K. Emery, W. J. Courtenay, and S. M. Metzger (Leiden, 2012), pp. 303–58. Owing to a gross misattribution, Michel's commentary on Daniel has been printed in Thomas Aquinas, *Opera omnia, t. 23: Opuscula alia dubia* (Parma, 1869), pp. 134–94. This edition should be corrected, using Paris, BNF, lat. 366, fols. 66ra–89rb.

men' suffering at the hands of corrupted prelates.[29] Likewise, Susanna can stand for evangelical truth assaulted by depraved elders.[30] Barthélemy goes even further than Olivi in his criticism of the pernicious effect of Parisian philosophy, identifying the four beasts of chapter seven as Aristotle, Averroës, Peter Lombard, and Thomas Aquinas.[31] His most spectacular assertion features in the discussion of numbers provided in book XII. In a debate with Arnau of Vilanova, Barthélemy considers 1335, counting days to mean years, as marking the date of the future final conversion of the world to Christ's gospel, eleven years after the fall of the Antichrist. His views were crucial in helping the visionary Beguin Prous Boneta and her friends to decide that John XXII's bull *Cum inter nonnullos* of December 1323 marked the end of the Church of the second age.[32]

The Diffusion of the Postilla super Danielem

Although a detailed presentation of Barthélemy Sicard's neglected biblical commentary would be valuable, my purpose in the rest of this essay is

29 **F**, fol. 48rb: 'Allegorice Daniel tenet hic typum virorum spiritualium … captivos a spiritu libertatis et ligatos ac subiugatos multis miseriis ex spirituali et universali captivitate babylonica que communiter in ecclesia superhabundat' ('Allegorically here Daniel upholds the archetype of spiritual men … captives from the spirit of liberty and bound and subject to many miseries because of the spiritual and universal Babylonic captivity that generally abounds in the Church').

30 **F**, fol. 73vb: 'Allegorice autem factum hec mysteriando, in Babylonia huius confusionis in qua periclitamur et captivi tenemur, Susanna ista sancta fidelis et casta, nobilis et pulcra, tenet typum veritatis evangelice quam substinet viri perfecti simplices et puri Christo per votum professionis et alte sanctitatis afficti et desponsati. Senes vero dierum malorum inveterati sunt qui ea que carnis sunt sapientes, habentes tamen auctoritatem et exteriorem preminentiam senectutis' ('The matter <works> allegorically by explaining the mysteries of these things: in the Babylon of this confusion, in which we are jeopardized and held captive, this holy, faithful and chaste Susanna, noble and beautiful, upholds the archetype of the evangelical truth that perfect, simple, and pure men sustain, <men who are> attached and pledged to Christ through the vow of profession and of high holiness. "The elders, indeed, grown old in evil days" [Daniel 13. 52] are wise in those things that are of the flesh, men who have, however, the authority and exterior preeminence of old age').

31 **F**, fol. 37va: 'Quatuor autem capita huius bestie sunt Aristotelis paganus, Averrois sarracenus, et duo alii catholici, quorum unus inter magistros in theologia optinet principatum, et alius qui inter magistros illos qui scripserunt moderno tempore tam in expositione Aristotelis quam in multis theologicis apud quosdam summum habet primatum' ('The four heads of this beast, however, are Aristotle the pagan, Averroës the Saracen, and two others, Catholics, one of whom dominates among masters in theology, and the other of whom – according to some – holds the highest position among those who have written in modern times both in the exposition of Aristotle and on many theological <topics>').

32 Piron, 'Critique de l'Église', pp. 88–90.

rather to trace its wide diffusion, as part of a reflection on the circulation of prohibited texts within the Franciscan dissident movement. I am currently aware of six manuscripts containing all or large parts of the *Postilla*. This number is strikingly high for a lengthy scholastic work produced by an obscure character as the expression of a repressed group that was soon to be condemned and heavily persecuted. I shall present in turn these six witnesses and their historical contexts, following what I consider to be their chronological order of composition. I should make clear that I am offering here provisional results, based on the transcription of about one third of the *Postilla*. All six witnesses have been collated for one short portion of the text (the final sections of chapter two). This limited collation has been sufficient to establish some distinctive features, but certainly not to offer a definitive stemma of the textual tradition. Likewise, much more work would be needed in order to provide a full codicological description of all the manuscripts.[33] What follows therefore only lays the groundwork for future research.

1. The first witness is remarkably early. **A** is a tiny volume just four inches high (100x75 mm) comprising 140 parchment folios, now kept at the Ambrosiana Library in Milan, under the shelf mark M 20 Sup. The first quires of the codex contain the second book of Isidore of Seville's *De sapientia*, copied in two columns by a professional hand. After two blank pages filled in afterward with additional contents, on a new quire begins a substantial section of the *Postilla* (fols. 39r–63v) that has not been previously identified as such. It starts with the allegorical comments on chapter two and breaks off in the middle of a sentence within the moral interpretation of chapter six. This abrupt ending obviously follows the scribe's exemplar, since this copy stops on the third line of a page. Without any sign of separation, it is immediately followed by a long series of anonymous exegetical notes that runs until the end of the volume. Since the final page of the manuscript is totally filled in, it is difficult to judge whether the volume was intended to end at that point, or whether one or more further quires have been lost, in which an index of the contents might have been placed. The single hand responsible for the *Postilla* appears again in the following section (fols. 96v–99v), among three other hands that recur in turn. Within a one-column page layout, the size of the characters tends to vary. A distinctive paleographical fact is the use (by two of the four hands) of a transversal line across the tironian abbreviation for *et*, which excludes an Italian origin. Based on a comparison with dated manuscripts, it

[33] I wish to acknowledge the precious aid of Sara Bischetti, who provided expert paleographical advice based on reproductions of all the manuscript witnesses, and a first-hand examination of **V**. I should also make clear that I have no intention of producing a full critical edition of this work in the near future.

seems reasonable to suggest a composition within the first two decades of the fourteenth century, possibly in southern France.[34]

The long set of exegetical notes would itself require a much more detailed study. They mainly present brief expositions on numerous 'figures', based on biblical passages. They can discuss either metaphors (e.g. *figura de arbore*, 'figure about a tree'), or doctrinal or moral issues. Their organization does not appear to follow any clear order. Despite their placement directly after the *Postilla*, they bear no family resemblance to Sicard or Olivi, nor do they display a distinctive Franciscan tone. This could be an original work, putting to use or developing earlier exegetical materials. What seems clear is that these notes were prepared for the purpose of preaching. As a confirmation, the final pages present a few *exempla*. The production of this codex can therefore be located within the context of a theological school, witnessing the process by which biblical scholarship was turned into preaching material.

As far as the text of the *Postilla* is concerned, **A** can be singled out for its numerous original variants that are often simple scribal errors. The copyist was working from a strongly abbreviated model, as shown by a most telling example. He was unable to develop the initials 'b. f.' into the words 'beati Francisci', understanding them instead as 'beneficantur'. Yet this mistake is not sufficient to exclude a Franciscan origin. It is noticeable that the final pages of the Isidore section bear an invocation to 'Maria, Ihesus, Franciscus'. The most likely hypothesis is therefore that the codex was prepared within a Franciscan convent equipped with a middle- or high-level school.

We can therefore offer the following initial proposal: at a very early date, presumably before the break of 1317–18, the *Postilla* reached a group of friars who were both scholars and preachers. It is hard to deduce their 'political' orientation from the apparently mainstream style of their preaching materials. The bare facts of a manuscript description are not sufficient to prove that Barthélemy Sicard's allegories were used to expose the corruption of high clergy in this specific case. Yet it is clear, from Rotgier's description, that the 'glosses' were perceived by the Beguins as 'sermons', and must have been put to that use in some way. Thanks to this tiny codex, we can better appreciate the role played by Barthélemy in forming a tightly knit supporting group for the Spirituals among the lay audience of lower Languedoc. He not only provided a clearer timetable for the future than Olivi had ever proffered, but through his repeated critiques of corrupted prelates and ambitious friars and his defense of the true followers of evangelical poverty, he also helped to create a much wider public sphere, beyond the more restricted network

[34] C. Samaran, R. Marichal et al., *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date ou de copiste*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1959–84), VI, pl. 38 (Montpellier, 1311), seems the closest to the hand that copied the *Postilla*. The online Ambrosiana catalog offers a dating rage of '1296–1325'. See http://ambrosiana.comperio.it/opac/detail/view/ambro:catalog:77722.

of those who were attracted by spiritual teachings produced by Olivi for the laity in his final years in Narbonne.[35]

2. The second witness has long been known. While drawing up his remarkable catalog of the Laurenziana Library in Florence, Angelo Maria Bandini had no difficulty in identifying the author whose work occupies the Santa Croce codex Plut. 8 dext. 9 (**F**), since Barthélemy Sicard's name appears in full in the *explicit*. The colophon that follows shows that the copy was finished on 25 October 1358. The note of possession on the first page makes it clear that this volume was produced by Fra Tedaldo della Casa, who kept it in his cell for almost half a century and eventually transmitted it to his convent's library in 1406, together with about forty other books.[36] Barthélemy Hauréau took early note of this volume, but it otherwise attracted little attention.[37] This copy of the *Postilla*, the first to have been identified, will probably remain the central witness for any future edition. Produced by a highly competent scribe, it provides the most stable text among the three copies that convey the whole book.

Tedaldo della Casa is so interesting that he deserves a full monograph on his own. He has long been known by literary scholars as a remarkable copyist and corrector of Petrarch's autograph volumes, as well as of a number of works by Boccaccio and Benvenuto of Imola.[38] Immersed in the literary circles of Florence in the second half of the fourteenth century, he was a close friend of Filippo Villani, who entrusted to him many books, including his own autograph of the *Commedia*.[39] In his later years, Tedaldo took part in the humanist circle that gathered around Peter of Candia, soon to be the short-lived pope Alexander V. The latest date that features in any of Tedaldo's manuscripts is 1410, when he gave to the library a further volume containing some recent humanist translations, among which was a translation of the Letter of pseudo-Aristeas that Angelo Scarperia had dedicated to him.[40] Still very much alert and open to new cultural trends, Tedaldo must have been at least eighty by then, if we accept as a rough estimate that he began copying

35 A. Montefusco, 'Per l'edizione degli *opuscula* di Pierre de Jean Olivi: sul corpus e la cronologia', *Oliviana* 4 (2012), online at http://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/555.

36 In addition to those forty volumes, Tedaldo gave some books at earlier or later dates, and had a life-long use of others. All in all, he must have kept over fifty codices at a time in his cell.

37 B. Hauréau, 'Barthélemi Sicard, frère mineur', *Histoire littéraire de la France* 28 (1881), 469–70. F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, 8 vols. (Madrid, 1950–80), I, 31; VI, 487; VIII, 337, noted four of the codices, under various attributions.

38 F. Sarri, 'Frate Tedaldo della Casa e le sue trascrizioni petrarchesche', in *Convegno petrarchesco tenuto in Arezzo nei giorni 11–13 ottobre 1931. Supplemento agli 'Annali della Cattedra Petrarchesca'* (Arezzo, 1936), pp. 40–82.

39 Plut. 26 sin. 1, Plut. 30 sin. 3, and Plut. 23 dext. 7 were also given to him by Villani. Plut. 9 dext. 6, belonging to Villani, was indexed by Tedaldo and given to the library.

40 Plut. 25 sin. 9. See P. Hemeryck, 'Les traductions latines du Charon de Lucien au quinzième siècle', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome* 84 (1972), 129–200 (pp. 144–5).

theological volumes for his own use around the age of twenty-eight. His elegant writing, *textualis* with some cursive tendencies, as well as his habit of drawing elongated letters over the first line, suggest a professional formation in a grammar school, which comes as no surprise for the son of a notary from the Mugello valley.[41] For the time being, I can identify at least twenty-seven autograph volumes, among which Olivi is the second most represented author after Petrarch.[42]

This intense scribal activity is highly unusual among Franciscans. It results from both technical competence and a wide range of cultural interests. Besides his connection with Petrarch and Villani, from a young age Tedaldo displayed an interest in the classics and their modern commentators, such as Nicholas Trevet. Besides the codices that he totally or partially copied himself and those that were given to him, thirty-four more bear the indication *ad usum*, while he annotated or composed a table of contents for a further twenty-six, as far as one can judge from Bandini's catalog and subsequent research. A global view of these nearly one hundred volumes shows a distribution over most disciplines except logic and medicine. The many tables of contents that he drew up for patristic and exegetical volumes or collections of sermons suggest a professional approach to book indexing that went far beyond his personal interests. Although we have no explicit indication, it is probable that he served for some time, and maybe a long time, as the librarian of the convent.[43]

In his wonderful study of the Franciscans' presence in the Florentine *contado*, Charles de la Roncière showed that convents were distributed along major roads, every twenty or twenty-five kilometers, to serve as stopping-places for traveling friars.[44] In Mugello, a convent 'in the woods' (*Bosco ai frati*) was created as a stop on the road from Florence to Bologna. This is where, in October 1357, Tedaldo completed his first copy, which happens to be of Olivi's *Lectura super Johannem* and *Lectura super Lamentationes Ieremie*. The second volume he copied, in the following year, was none other than Sicard's

41 His possessor's note in Plut. 24 sin. 9 reveals the name of his father (Octaviano) and his birthplace (Pulicciano, near Borgo San Lorenzo), while Plut. 21 dext. 2 is said to have been returned after his death to the convent of Borgo, presumably because this was his initial attachment.

42 This figure excludes a number of codices that have been lost and would deserve further discussion. F. Mattesini, 'La biblioteca di S. Croce e Fra Tedaldo della Casa', *Studi Francescani* 57 (1960), 254–316, counted only eleven autographs. Besides those from Santa Croce, I also consider Cesena, Biblioteca Piana, 3. 163 (Olivi); Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Ashburnham 839 (Benvenuto of Imola); Paris, BNF, lat. 6342 (Cicero); Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 4519 (Petrarch).

43 We only know that he served once as a provincial minister in 1380. The claim that he also acted as an inquisitor remains unconfirmed.

44 C. de la Roncière, 'L'influence des franciscains dans la campagne de Florence au XIV^{e} siècle (1280–1360)', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome* 87 (1975), 27–103 (pp. 50–2).

Postilla. This choice was hardly random. Only three years after Innocent VI had launched a severe attack against Franciscan 'apostates' and a General Chapter had renewed the prohibition of Olivi's works within the order, Tedaldo was demonstrating a distinctive interest in these currents.[45] The very fact that he had access to this material is in itself of considerable historical significance.

At this point, it is necessary to look more broadly at the situation in the mid-fourteenth century. As Tognetti showed, the word *fraticelli* could convey many different meanings, ranging from an affectionate name given to any type of friar, to a pejorative designation applied by their enemies to different groups pursuing evangelical perfection outside of obedience to the order's prelates and the Avignon papacy.[46] This could be accomplished through a wide variety of means, including living under the habit of Augustinian Hermits. Yet one organized group displayed a clearer identity, shaped by the knowledge and memory of Olivi's actual teachings. It may be useful to retain in this case the designation of 'Spirituals', in order to stress their continuity with the Narbonne group, and the fact that they kept with them, as I claim, the actual library of the Narbonne convent. Thanks to John of Rupescissa, we know of a meeting held in 1352 near Sora, on the border between Latium and Campania, meant to bring together different groups.[47] Following the repression, some settled in Calabria, while others migrated north. Florence was a focal point for missionary activity and a friendly place for them while the city was at war with the papacy from 1375 until 1378, although the contacts made by Tedaldo would suggest that their activity in Tuscany had begun much earlier. It is crucial to consider the location of the convent 'in the woods' on the road going to and from Florence. The loan of books implies not just simple contact, but establishing trust and friendship with some vagrant dissidents who either regularly passed through the valley or may even have resided nearby.

This relationship was maintained for many years. In 1365, Tedaldo had an opportunity to obtain and copy the highly controversial and explicitly condemned *Lectura super Apocalipsim*. As Paolo Vian has remarked, the colophon conveys the date of Olivi's death following the calendar used in Languedoc, which certainly indicates that Tedaldo's copy was made from an exemplar brought from southern France.[48] This date appears in the same

[45] S. Piron, 'Le mouvement clandestin des dissidents franciscains au milieu du XIV^e^ siècle', *Oliviana* 3 (2009), online at http://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/337, §§ 19–28. M. B. Becker, 'Heresy in Medieval and Renaissance Florence: A Comment', *Past & Present* 62 (1974), 153–61 (p. 159), notes a Florentine document from 1354.

[46] G. Tognetti, 'I fraticelli, il principio di povertà e i secolari', *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo e Archivio muratoriano* 90 (1982–83), 77–145.

[47] Piron, 'Le mouvement clandestin'.

[48] P. Vian, 'I codici fiorentini e romano della "Lectura super Apocalipsim" di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi (con un codice di Tedaldo della Casa ritrovato)', *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 83 (1990), 463–89.

form in the narrative of Olivi's death, copied by Tedaldo's hand amidst a large collection of documents on Franciscan themes that are predominantly Olivian, and which includes a number of rarities, such as Ubertino's defenses of Olivi during the Council of Vienne.[49] This narrative, the *Transitus sancti Patris*, was considered by Bernard Gui as a central item of Olivi's veneration in Narbonne. It is not found in the Pesaro manuscript, but that compilation presents instead an even more explicit prayer addressed to the holy father.[50] These telling details can be considered as proof that Tedaldo had access in the 1360s to volumes that had been taken from Narbonne to Naples in 1318. Although the match is not perfect, it is worth noting that rare works by Joachim appear on both sides. The Pesaro anthology conveys the *Confessio fidei*, while Tedaldo obtained a copy of the *De articulis fidei*.[51] Ludovico of Nerli brought from Paris a partial copy of Ockham's *Dialogus* that he used while serving as inquisitor for Tuscany. Tedaldo was able to complete this copy, perhaps thanks to his clandestine connections.[52] His circle included not only the dissidents themselves, but also a ring of lay sympathizers. It is telling that they turned to Tedaldo in difficult times. In 1383, while the *fraticelli* had fallen out of favor in Florence, and again in 1390, one year after the execution of their leader Michele of Calci, two Florentine notaries made in turn the same gesture of donating their copies of Joachim's *Concordia* to the Franciscan librarian.[53] These donations demonstrate that for half a century Tedaldo's private library served as a repository of controversial texts. During most of this period, the librarian acted as an interface between the Franciscan order and the dissidents, as well as their lay audience and literary circles in the city.

Tedaldo's long-standing interest in Olivi is shown by a note he appended to the copy he obtained of the *Lectura super Mattheum* and *Lectura super Lucam*, providing in a 'senescent' handwriting a bibliographical list of his works.[54] His consistent attitude toward the Languedoc theologian is best understood by observing how he omitted from his autograph copies two passages that had been explicitly condemned.[55] The notion that the fifth wound of Christ

49 A. Heysse, 'Descriptio codicis Bibliothecae Laurentaniae Florentinae S. Crucis plut. 31 sin. cod. 3', *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 11 (1918), 251–69. Neither Bandini nor Heysse noticed that most of the volume is in Tedaldo's hand.

50 S. Piron, 'Oratio ad venerabilem patrem Petrum Iohannis', *Oliviana* 5 (2016), online at http://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/822.

51 Ioachim Abbas Florensis, *De articulis fidei ad fratrem Iohannem: Confessio fidei*, ed. V. De Fraja (Rome, 2012).

52 The Pesaro manuscript shows that the Spirituals had a copy of the *Dialogus*.

53 Plut. 8 dext. 10, given by Ser Domenico Allegri, and Plut. 28 dext. 11, donated by Ser Naddo de Lanciano.

54 A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, 8 vols. (1767–78), IV, 107, on Plut. 10 dext. 4: 'In fine legitur in manu fr. Thedaldi iam senescentis …' ('At the end it is read, in the hand of the now ageing friar Tedaldo …').

55 A. Forni and P. Vian, 'Ubertino da Casale, Tedaldo della Casa e Ambrogio Massari da Cori. A proposito di un brano omesso e tagliato nel prologo della "Lectura super

was inflicted before his death, suggested in the *Super Johannem*, had been rejected by the Council of Vienne. The reference to a 'commutation of pontificate' in the prologue to the *Lectura super Apocalipsim* was the first article of its condemnation by John XXII, maybe the only one Tedaldo was aware of. In both cases, the librarian acted according to what Ubertino had considered should result from any fair doctrinal examination: accepting Olivi's works as orthodox as a whole, while allowing that a few errors had to be corrected. In so doing, Tedaldo was anticipating what would become the predominant attitude among Observant Franciscans in the second half of the fifteenth century, following the advice of Pope Sixtus IV to read Olivi carefully, 'taking the thorns off the rose'.[56]

3. The third witness provides a later view into the Spirituals' movement. The codex Vat. lat. 11433 (**V**) entered the Vatican Library as a gift from Pius X and contains no possession mark that would allow us to trace its earlier history. This small volume (184x133 mm), made of paper with some parchment leaves on the inside or at the center of quires, was produced in the mid-fourteenth century, probably in Italy, by two professional scribes working in a Franciscan context, as the colophon reveals.[57] The *Postilla* is present in full. The text displays a number of original variants that are often additions of one or more words to what is found in **F**. The *Postilla* is supplemented by extracts from Olivi's three different biblical commentaries, presented as *Aliqua misteria P. Jo*.[58] In itself, this indication is proof that the copy was not made from an isolated exemplar, but rather produced in a milieu in which Olivi's writings were abundant. The presence of numerous editorial variants indicates that **V** may be one step away from the Narbonne original, but it still belongs to the same world.

Most important for a contextual approach to this codex is a series of remarkable glosses in red ink. A rubric placed in the right margin of the first page reports the name of the author in an abbreviated form.[59] As the

Apocalipsim" di Pietro Giovanni Olivi', in *La lettera e lo spirito. Studi di cultura e vita religiosa (secc. XII–XV) per Edith Pásztor*, ed. M. Bartoli, L. Pellegrini, and D. Solvi (Milan, 2016), pp. 129–56.

56 R. Rusconi, 'La tradizione manoscritta delle opere degli Spirituali nelle biblioteche dei predicatori e dei conventi dell'Osservanza', *Picenum Seraphicum* 12 (1975), 63–157.

57 **V**, fol. 101v: 'finito libro referatur Gratia Christo Yesu Maria Francisce' ('the book being finished, may thanks be given to Christ Jesus, Mary, and Francis').

58 The extract originates from the commentaries on Genesis, about the serpent (*Peter of John Olivi on Genesis*, ed. D. Flood [St Bonaventure NY, 2007], p. 170), Noah (ibid., p. 222), Abraham (ibid., p. 264), Enoch (ibid., pp. 199–203), on Isaiah (*Peter of John Olivi on the Bible: Principia quinque in Sacram Scripturam: Postilla in Isaiam et in I ad Corinthios*, ed. D. Flood and G. Gal [St Bonaventure NY, 1997], p. 211), and on the Lamentations of Jeremiah (*La caduta di Gerusalemme: Il commento al libro delle Lamentazioni di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi*, ed. M. Bartoli [Rome, 1991], p. 94).

59 **V**, fol. 2r: I understand it as 'B<artholomei> Si<cardi> / p<re>cl<ari> / d<octor>is / sac<re> / pa<gine>' ('of Barthélemy Sicard, distinguished doctor of the sacred page').

text continues, the reader shares Sicard's invitation to identify with Daniel and his friends. In addition to many occasions when the word *nota* draws attention to various issues, we find comments such as *Impugnator paupertatis non est verus et religiosus prelatus* (fol. 8v, 'An impugner of poverty is not a true and religious prelate'), *Nota pro isto tempore et dole* (fol. 54v, 'Note on account of this time and mourn'), or *Nota qui sunt veri filii ecclesie romane* (fol. 85v, 'Note who are the true sons of the Roman Church') placed alongside various evocations of the persecution of the true followers of evangelical poverty. The same sort of context elicits empathic lamentations such as *Heu spirituales* (fol. 52r, 'Alas for the Spirituals!') or *Heu fratres de observantia* (fol. 81v, 'Alas for the Friars of the Observance!'). The latter formulation is remarkable, since the Tuscan Chronicle was claiming this designation for the Spirituals themselves, rejecting its use by friars stemming from the Community (those who eventually colonized the word) as ridiculous.[60] The use of the first person clearly betrays a sense of belonging to that group: *Scismatici reputamur* (fol. 91r, 'We are reputed schismatics').

Two further notes provide more precise indications as to the dating of these interventions. In a discussion of Daniel 11. 41, Sicard remarks that in achieving a final victory in the apocalyptical wars, the Northern King will spare a number of people, such as Edom and Moab, who are not among the children of Israel, but are their relatives, descending from Esau or Lot. Applying this prophecy to the Church, Sicard explains that they stand for 'those saints who shall always remain with Christ, and will not flee from the tribulation',[61] in front of which statement the annotator writes: *Heu frater Pa. de Flo. affinis noster* (fol. 81v, 'Alas for friar Pa. of Florence our relative'). This reference is obviously to one Paul of Florence who was remembered during a trial in 1455 as having been a leader of the Spirituals in the early fifteenth century.[62] A number of contemporary events allow us to place his leadership between that of Francesco of Terni, in charge at the time of another trial in Lucca in 1411, and that of Gabriel, under whose leadership there are records of a bell being melted in 1419.[63] The lament (*heu*) may deplore Paul's recent

60 Tocco, *Studii*, p. 518.

61 **V**, fol. 81v: 'Notandum autem quod nullus filiorum Israel nominatur hic, sed affines eorum, qui scilicet ex Esau descendentur et ex Loth. Et ideo si infra ecclesiam hic accipias filii Israel, intelligendi sunt illi sancti qui semper manebunt cum Christo, qui utique non effugient tribulationem illius' ('It is to be noted that none of the sons of Israel is named here, but their relatives, those, that is, who are descended from Esau and Lot. And therefore if you accept "the sons of Israel" as being within the church, they are to be understood as those saints who will always remain with Christ, and will not flee from the tribulation').

62 M. D'Alatri, 'Il processo di Foligno contro quattro abitanti di Visso seguaci dei fraticelli', *Picenum Seraphicum* 12 (1975), 223–61. Another Paul of Florence was active in the 1350s according to the Chronicle, but it seems clear that he cannot be the same person.

63 On all this, see Piron, 'Le mouvement clandestin', §§ 44–8.

demise, while the relationship implied (*affinis noster*) is probably of a spiritual nature, simply echoing a word used by Sicard.

A further indication confirms that the annotations were produced during this interval. Commenting on Daniel 5. 29, Sicard explains why Daniel allows himself to be dressed in purple as a commander and receive a golden necklace after having successfully deciphered a mysterious inscription, even though he had stressed earlier that he would decline the reward. He eventually accepted it, writes Sicard, for God's glory and the solace of his people. The annotator comments in a combination of vernacular and Latin: *Nol faccia Clemente papa primo questo … ymo fec<it> de facto G<re>g<orius> 12us* ('Pope Clement I did not do it [on his own], but Gregory XII actually did it'). This reference is to Clement I, the first pope who was forced to renounce the papacy, setting a model for the abdication of Gregory XII in 1415 that ended the Great Schism. In the context of the story of Daniel, this note implies that Gregory had accepted the charge against his will. It is striking that the annotator makes a typological application of biblical prophecies to historical events, exactly along the lines of Sicard's hermeneutics. This justification of papal choices may suggest that the annotator was himself connected in some way to the pontiff who had settled back in Rome. Added on the first page by a contemporary hand, the letter of Lentulus to the Roman Senate is said to have been found 'in the Annals of Rome', which may be a sign that the action took place in Rome itself.

It is rare, and very gratifying, to come across such an expressive reader who is able to present openly his feelings toward a dissident movement that was almost destroyed at that time. The way in which he does this is even more remarkable. Using red ink and writing in large characters, he is in a sense using the margins of the *Postilla* to compose a funeral eulogy for the Spirituals. The openness with which he does so shows that he did not fear being discovered. This means that he owned the book personally and was not a member of a religious community. Step by step, a number of deductions have allowed us to sketch a fairly precise profile. Once a member or at least a very close supporter of the Spirituals, and perhaps personally acquainted with Paul of Florence, he had found a safe position within the papal curia under Gregory XII. His annotations to Sicard's *Postilla* during the interregnum of 1415–17 show that if the movement had by then been widely decimated, its ideals were not yet forgotten.

4. Bernardino of Siena's interest in the writings of the Spirituals has long been known. Besides compiling, or having his secretaries compile for him, anthologies of Olivian works, he cherished his own copy of Ubertino's *Arbor vitae Christi crucifixi*, which he kept close at hand until his final days at L'Aquila in 1440. Yet the presence of Sicard's *Postilla* among his books has been overlooked until now. When Dionisio Pacetti drew up the inventory of Bernardino's personal library, he had no way of identifying the item contained in Siena,

Biblioteca Comunale, U.V.6, fols. 345r–394r (**S**).[64] Bandini's catalog was of no use, since this copy lacks the prologue, the exposition of Jerome's prologue, and the literal comments of chapter one. It does not even bear a proper title. The rubric found on the facing page refers to the discussion of Susanna's story in chapter thirteen, which is altogether missing from this copy, and may have made up a now-lost quire.[65] The text found in **S** is an abbreviation that only includes the allegories and moral commentaries, except for parts of the literal explanation of the wars described in chapter eleven.

Bernardino was not very impressed by the *Postilla*. He corrected the first pages but left very few notes on it, mainly to signal some moral explanations. Yet this text cannot be said to have been included by mistake in this pocket volume. **S** is a famous codex whose first folios convey the alternative *reportatio* of Bonaventure's *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, edited by Ferdinand Delorme in 1934. It also contains Olivi's *De contractibus* and a substantial collection of his short spiritual treatises addressed to the laity. According to Dionisio Pacetti, this book is quite an early one in the constitution of Bernardino's library. Together with the autograph collection of mainly Olivian materials that now forms Siena U.V.5, **S** was composed before 1424, maybe even before 1417.[66] If both volumes are considered together, they raise the question of how and where Bernardino had access to so many prohibited documents. The unfolding of events that we have been following so far leads to a very simple suggestion. A group of Spirituals who had control of what was left of the Narbonne library, or at least one derived from it, must have been caught somewhere in Tuscany in the second decade of the fifteenth century, and their books confiscated. This event could be the one that caused the downfall of Paul of Florence, who is remembered as having led the movement for only a year. A much more detailed study of the Spirituals' works in Bernardino's library would be needed in order to substantiate this hypothesis. Yet it should be noted that it was usual for Observants who destroyed a nest of *fraticelli* to confiscate and preserve their books, as John of Capestrano did for a set of codices still preserved in his home convent. As the vicar of the Observant friars in Tuscany and Umbria, Bernardino would have been in a position to access the portable library of the Spirituals if it had been seized

64 D. Pacetti, 'I codici autografi di S. Bernardino da Siena della Vaticana e della Comunale di Siena', *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 27 (1934), 224–58, 565–84; 28 (1935), 253–72, 500–16; 29 (1936), 215–41, 501–38; R. De Pierro, 'Lo scriptorium di san Bernardino nel Convento dell'Osservanza a Siena', in *In margine al Progetto Codex. Aspetti di produzione e conservazione del patrimonio manoscritto in Toscana*, ed. G. Pomaro (Pisa, 2014), pp. 29–105.

65 Since the catchword 'queritur' ('it is asked') at the bottom of fol. 344v does not match the initial word of fol. 345r, the rubric found above, 'De prophetia Susanne et de capitulo' ('On the prophecy of Susanna and on the chapter'), may refer to the contents of a missing quire.

66 D. Pacetti, 'La libreria di San Bernardino da Siena e le sue vicende attraverso cinque secoli', *Studi Francescani* 62 (1965), 3–43.

by an inquisitor. Besides identifying exactly where and when such a seizure could have occurred, we would love to know what became of these volumes afterward.[67]

5. The most unexpected witness comes from Moravia. This codex **O**, currently in the possession of the Olomouc Metropolitan Archive (Knihovna Metropolitní Kapituly, 291), is written by a single hand, certainly that of a Czech active in the early fifteenth century.[68] The *Postilla* begins at the same point as **S** and also focuses mainly on allegories and morals. Yet it does not cover exactly the same portions and includes, for instance, the apocalyptic timetable and the story of Susanna.[69] Both copies must therefore share a common ancestor that conveyed the contents of both abbreviations. Here, the *Postilla* is presented in detail, introducing both its author and its ultimate source of inspiration: 'Frater Bartholomeus Sycardi evangelice vite professor, socius ac discipulus quondam sanctissimi patris fratris Petri Iohannis, eterne sapientie illuminatus, exponens Danielem prophetam super presens capitulum sic dicit' ('Friar Barthélemy Sicard, professor of the evangelical life and formerly companion and disciple of the most holy father, Brother Peter John, enlightened by eternal wisdom, expounding the prophet Daniel on the present chapter says thus'). Strangely, the copyist understood this rubric as an initial sentence introducing a quotation, since he concludes that the *Postilla* is the recent work of an anonymous Franciscan.[70] Yet, when reproducing the extracts of Olivi that follow, he does not fail to call him *sanctissimus Petrus Iohannes de Narbona*.[71] His confusion over the authorship reveals that the copyist was not himself a member of the movement. Yet the presence of Olivian texts indicates that the exemplar he used was conceived in such an environment.

It might seem startling to find Sicard in Moravia in the early fifteenth century, but the texts which surround the *Postilla* in this codex can explain its appearance there without the need to resort to exotic hypotheses. The

67 The five Olivian manuscripts present in the fifteenth-century inventory of the Franciscan convent in Siena (later destroyed by fire) were biblical commentaries that do not match the contents to which Bernardino had access. K. W. Humphreys, *The Library of the Franciscans of Siena in the Late Fifteenth Century* (Amsterdam, 1978), pp. 75, 156.

68 It bears striking resemblance, but is not identical, to the handwriting of Olomouc 280, written in 1426 by the ex-chanter of Kutna Hora, who took refuge in Olomouc fleeing the Hussite wars. I am grateful to Pavlína Cermanová for indicating to me that some texts in Czech found on the initial and final flyleaves of **O** pertain to pre-Hussite theology (such as Matthias of Janov or Jacobellus de Missa).

69 **O**, fols. 116rb–vb, 122rb–125ra.

70 **O**, fol. 127vb: 'Explicit exposicio Danielis prophete a quodam innominato fratre minore nove edita et conscripta' ('Here ends the exposition of the prophet Daniel by a certain unnamed friar minor, recently published and written').

71 **O**, fol. 128ra–vb. The extracts are taken from the *Tractatus de usu paupere*, *Lectura super Epistolas canonicas* and *Lectura super Epistolam ad Romanos*.

initial item in the volume is an anonymous contemporary lecture on the first book of the *Sentences*, delivered in Paris in 1420. The final item, following the *Postilla*, is the only extant copy of the French Franciscan Petrus ad Boves's (Pierre-aux-Boeufs's) lecture on Exodus, completed in 1419.[72] The combination of the three items may at first seem strange, but it makes perfect sense. A Czech Franciscan who studied in Paris in those years must have collected in this volume a fine copy of notes on the classes he attended, and inserted in between a remarkable document, the *Postilla*, that had somehow passed through his hands. The presence of Sicard's text in Paris in 1419 might also seem surprising, but it is much easier to account for than its reception in Moravia. The most relevant contextual element would be to note that, only a few years earlier, the French Observants were making use of Ubertino of Casale's defense of the strict observance.[73] Tedaldo had obtained both these tracts and Sicard's *Postilla* decades earlier through his connection with some clandestine Spirituals in Tuscany. It seems reasonable to suggest that when these groups were finally crushed, at least one member succeeded in escaping Italy, found refuge in Paris, and was able to circulate there some of the materials he had been able to bring with him. Far from the regions where *fraticelli* were actively pursued, the largest convent in the order was a clever and safe hiding place.

6. Our final trip takes us to Bavaria. Munich Clm. 3813, fols. 143ra–295va (**M**) presents the whole *Postilla,* under the mistaken name of 'Albertinus', following Aquinas's *Quodlibeta*.[74] On the basis of the sample studied, **M** is extremely close to **V**. Yet, owing to some omissions in **V**, it cannot have been directly copied from it. This misattribution to 'Albertinus' suggests that the copyist was confronted with an abbreviated form, much like what is found in **V**,[75] and could not develop it correctly. Why was this volume produced in 1467, perhaps in northern Italy, then kept in the Augsburg cathedral? This time, we have no clues as to an answer. This very fact shows that the *Postilla* could still be read and copied outside of the dissident movement, which by that time had truly died out. In the second half of the fifteenth century, Sicard's text could appeal to many different types of reader, eager to share an expression of discontent with the Church hierarchy and an assertion of the need for reform.

72 H. Martin, 'Un prédicateur franciscain du XV^e^ siècle, Pierre-aux-Bœufs, et les réalités de son temps', *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 70 (1984), 107–26.

73 L. Oliger, 'De relatione inter Observantium querimonias Constantienses (1415) et Ubertini Casalensis quoddam scriptum', *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 9 (1916), 3–41.

74 H. Hauke, 'München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Katalog der Handschriften aus dem Dominikanerkloster und Domstift in Augsburg Vorläufige Beschreibung', 2007, online at http://bilder.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/hs//projekt-Muenchen-Augsburg-pdfs/Clm%203813.pdf.

75 See n. 59 above.

Conclusion

In a time of intense tribulations, Peire Trencavel had been anxious in 1323 to save Peter John Olivi's manuscripts from destruction. Thanks to generations of diligent followers, acting out of varied motives, over 150 such codices have been preserved. Barthélemy Sicard's *Postilla super Danielem* was an important extension of the textual corpus through which the Spirituals and their followers understood their mission. Observing one by one the different occurrences of this work has offered a new way of probing into the complex history of this band of literate dissidents and their multiple ramifications. My goal in this essay has been to test the hypothesis that the rescue of the Narbonne convent's library by the Spirituals in 1318 and the preservation of this library in the Italian peninsula across the fourteenth century was the crucial action that allowed for such a wide diffusion of Sicard's *Postilla*. I suspected that this work, produced shortly before the pillage of the convent and the destruction of the movement in Languedoc, could hardly have survived without such an operation. The test has proven positive. Four of the six witnesses (**F**, **V**, **S** and **O**) bear direct or indirect traces of connections with a wider collection of Olivian texts. A later copy (**M**) derives from a copy produced in the same quarters. Without such a collective textual survival, the *Postilla* would only have been transmitted in a partial and anonymous copy (**A**) that might have languished for decades more before attracting any attention.

3

Magic, Mysticism, and Heresy in the Early Fourteenth Century*

Michael D. Bailey

The late medieval period began with one vast, imagined heretical conspiracy and ended with another. The Clementine decree *Ad nostrum*, drafted at the Council of Vienne in 1312 and finally promulgated by John XXII in 1317, was 'the birth certificate of the heresy of the Free Spirit'.[1] Almost two centuries later, the infamous *Malleus maleficarum* (1486) marked the culmination of medieval thought on diabolical witchcraft. At the level of pure stereotype, the similarity between the antinomian heretics for whom sex was not a sin and the malevolent sorcerers who would fornicate with demons at unholy sabbaths is evident. We now know, however, that the reality behind the supposed Free Spirit movement actually lay in the 'late medieval search for God and godliness' and was 'closely related to the orthodox mystical movement' of the period.[2] The reality of witchcraft, on the other hand, lay mostly in the mundane world of practical magical rites used by ordinary people or especially adept cunning-folk.[3] This may explain why the most recent connection drawn between the heresy of the Free Spirit and witchcraft has focused on mechanisms of prosecution rather than the essence of each heretical system.[4]

Here I will pursue a different tack. Instead of looking at inquisitorial structures or the often standardized cache of charges lodged against heretics, I will seek to expose more fundamental similarities between magical rites and

* I am grateful to Claire Fanger and Sean Field for their expert advice on John and Marguerite respectively.

1 R. E. Lerner, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (1972; rev. edn Notre Dame IN, 1991), p. 83.

2 Ibid., p. 3.

3 The classic account relating cunning-folk to witchcraft is K. Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (New York, 1971); more recently R. Briggs, *Witches and Neighbors: The Social and Cultural Context of European Witchcraft* (New York, 1996); O. Davies, *Cunning-Folk: Popular Magic in English History* (London, 2003).

4 K. Utz Tremp, *Von der Häresie zur Hexerei: 'Wirkliche' und imaginäre Sekten im Spätmittelalter* (Hanover, 2008), pp. 58, 354–82.

mystical reverie. In particular, I will argue that these seemingly disparate practices aroused essentially similar concerns among clerical authorities in the late Middle Ages. To do so, I will turn to the early fourteenth century and explore two specific examples, first of unorthodox mysticism and then of condemned magic. Both are idiosyncratic in many ways, but they also illustrate important trends. My mystic needs no introduction: Marguerite Porete, burned in Paris in 1310, and a formative figure, at least in the minds of clerical authorities, for the heresy of the Free Spirit. My magician is much less famous: John of Morigny, a Benedictine monk and author of a sprawling work of visionary rituals. His treatise was attacked by other clerics in 1315 and was burned in Paris in 1323.

In this essay, I will first illustrate some notable ways in which their lives converged. I will then develop a comparison focused on how each defended their unorthodox positions. Finally, I will draw together the threads of their remarkable careers, which never directly touched, through the figure of John XXII, the stern pontiff who condemned Free Spirit mystics and diabolical magicians alike, and whose rulings set the tone for much that followed in the late medieval period.

Convergences

As well known as one of my two central characters may be, we should still begin with brief sketches of their separate lives. They differed in some important ways. While both were French speakers, Marguerite was from Hainaut, an imperial territory perched on the border with France, while John spent his entire life in the French royal heartland south of Paris. While Marguerite was a laywoman of evident literacy, the level of her education remains uncertain. John was a Benedictine monk who studied canon law at Orléans. What unites them is their steadfast commitment to their personal religious visions, through whatever tribulations arose. Each wrote an extensive work expounding their particular visions. Each faced condemnation or at least rebuke for their writing, and each persevered, continuing to write when others might have retreated into more comfortable orthodoxies. It is mainly through these works that we now know both Marguerite and John. Yet in each case, this knowledge has emerged relatively recently. Only in the second half of the twentieth century did scholars fully rediscover these texts and re-associate them with their medieval authors.

In the case of Marguerite, 'called Porete', although scholarship on her remarkable *Mirror of Simple Souls* has flourished since the work was correctly attributed to her in 1946, we still know very little about the woman herself.[5]

[5] On authorship, see S. L. Field, R. E. Lerner, and S. Piron, 'A Return to the Evidence for Marguerite Porete's Authorship of the *Mirror of Simple Souls*', *Journal of Medieval History* 43 (2017), 153–73. On Marguerite herself, see S. L. Field, *The Beguine, the Angel, and the*

Given her literacy, her references to courtly literature, and the resources needed to copy and circulate her book, she was probably born into a reasonably wealthy gentry family in Hainaut. Her intense religiosity, however unorthodox, is beyond doubt. She is labeled a beguine at several points in her trial documents and contemporary chronicle accounts, but disagreement remains about what this slippery term might mean in her case. Since she probably lived in or around Valenciennes, there might be reason to assume that she resided in the beguinage of St Elisabeth's there.[6] In the *Mirror*, however, she asserts that 'the beguines' criticized her positions.[7] Some scholars conclude that, if she ever resided in a beguinage, she must have cut all ties to her former community at least by the time of her arrest in 1308.[8] Others argue that 'beguine' simply described an especially devout, unmarried laywoman at this time, which Marguerite certainly was.[9]

She wrote her book to instruct others, and she was condemned, in part, for trying to distribute it 'to many other simple people, beghards and others'.[10] This was after the *Mirror* had already been condemned and burned by Guido of Collemezzo, bishop of Cambrai, sometime between 1297 and 1305. He made Marguerite swear to abandon her book and refrain from spreading its message, or face execution as a contumacious heretic. She soon reneged on this promise, not only returning to her *Mirror*, but possibly expanding it by

Inquisitor: The Trials of Marguerite Porete and Guiard of Cressonessart (Notre Dame IN, 2012); also idem, 'Debating the Historical Marguerite Porete', in *A Companion to Marguerite Porete and* The Mirror of Simple Souls, ed. W. R. Terry and R. Stauffer (Leiden, 2017), pp. 9–37; J. Van Engen, 'Marguerite (Porete) of Hainaut and the Medieval Low Countries', in *Marguerite Porete et le* Miroir des simples âmes*: Perspectives historiques, philosophiques et littéraires*, ed. S. L. Field, R. E. Lerner and S. Piron (Paris, 2013), pp. 25–68.

6 R. E. Lerner, 'New Light on *The Mirror of Simple Souls*', *Speculum* 85 (2010), 91–116 (p. 93), although he also suggests that she might have resided at nearby Masny (p. 107).

7 Marguerite Porete, *Le mirouer des simples âmes / Speculum simplicium animarum*, ed. R. Guarnieri and P. Verdeyen, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 69 (Turnhout, 1986) [hereafter *Mirouer*], ch. 122, p. 344. For translations, I consulted Marguerite Porete, *The Mirror of Simple Souls*, trans. E. L. Babinsky (New York, 1993) but generally relied on Margaret Porette [*sic*], *The Mirror of Simple Souls*, trans. E. Colledge, J. C. Marler, and J. Grant (Notre Dame IN, 1999), making modifications where I have seen fit. On the problematic nature of this section of the *Mirror*, see Lerner, 'New Light', pp. 100–1.

8 W. Simons, *Cities of Ladies: Beguine Communities in the Medieval Low Countries, 1200–1565* (Philadelphia, 2001), p. 135.

9 Sean L. Field, 'On Being a Beguine in France, *c*. 1300', in *Labels and Libels: Naming Beguines in Northern Medieval Europe*, ed. L. Böhringer, J. Kolpacoff Deane, and H. van Engen (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 117–33, also idem, 'Debating the Historical Marguerite', pp. 24–5; idem, *Beguine*, pp. 30–3.

10 P. Verdeyen, 'Le procès d'inquisition contre Marguerite Porete et Guiard de Cressonessart (1309–1310)', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 81 (1986), 47–94 (p. 78); translation slightly modified from Field, *Beguine*, p. 225.

adding a final set of chapters meant as a defense of the work as a whole.[11] More audaciously, she may have circulated the work to several churchmen at this time, including the Parisian theologian Godfrey of Fontaines, seeking their approbation.[12] Eventually the book came to the attention of John of Châteauvillain, bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, sometime after 1306.[13] Realizing that it had already been condemned, he set the matter before the new bishop of Cambrai, Philip of Marigny, probably through the agency of an inquisitor of Lorraine. This was most likely the Dominican Ralph of Ligny, who, in 1307, had also been involved in the burgeoning trial of the Knights Templar.[14]

Thus Marguerite's case, hitherto entirely 'Netherlandish', began to be drawn toward Paris, and Philip of Marigny transferred her to the jurisdiction of the inquisitor William of Paris by autumn 1308 at the latest. William was intimately associated with the court of Philip IV and had been deeply involved in proceedings against the Templars.[15] The most incisive scholarly interpretation of his career is that, having somewhat botched those trials and having suffered a papal rebuke, he now sought to recoup his reputation.[16] Although Marguerite's case would seem to have been open-and-shut – she had pledged not to circulate a condemned book that then ended up in the hands of a bishop – William proceeded with painstaking slowness, exacerbated by Marguerite's refusal to swear an oath and testify on her own behalf.[17]

Only in April 1310 did William obtain a judgment from canon lawyers at the University of Paris that Marguerite was guilty of heresy as a result of her contumacy. Separately, he presented at least fifteen passages from the *Mirror* to a panel of theologians, although without identifying the author or stating that the work had already been condemned, and he obtained a new judgment from them declaring the book to be heretical. Then in May he obtained another ruling from the canon lawyers that, in light of the *Mirror*'s previous condemnation by Guido of Cambrai and his order that Marguerite should not 'again attempt by word or in writing any things like those contained in the book',

11 Field, *Beguine*, p. 47. The order in which Marguerite composed the *Mirror* is, however, much debated. See n. 42 below.

12 Field, *Beguine*, pp. 49–54, although this point is also much debated, with other scholars arguing that any formal approbation must have preceded the work's condemnation: see Lerner, 'New Light', p. 99; and S. Piron, 'Marguerite in Champagne', *Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures* 43 (2017), 135–56 (pp. 142–3).

13 Piron, 'Marguerite in Champagne', offers a new interpretation of this event.

14 Field, *Beguine*, p. 58; more fully S. L. Field, 'The Inquisitor Ralph of Ligny, Two German Templars, and Marguerite Porete', *Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures* 39 (2013), 1–22.

15 See S. L. Field, 'King/Confessor/Inquisitor: A Capetian–Dominican Convergence', in *The Capetian Century, 1214–1314*, ed. W. C. Jordan and J. R. Phillips (Turnhout, 2017), pp. 43–69 (pp. 56–62); and more fully Field's essay in this volume.

16 Field, *Beguine*, pp. 73–84.

17 On procedure and oath, see H. A. Kelly, 'Inquisitorial Deviations and Cover-Ups: The Prosecutions of Margaret Porete and Guiard of Cressonessart, 1308–1310', *Speculum* 89 (2014), 936–73.

she was a relapsed heretic who should be turned over to the secular authorities for punishment.[18] Thus the stage was finally set for what Henry Charles Lea described as 'the first formal *auto de fé* of which we have cognizance at Paris'.[19] Of course, Marguerite's remarkable book lived on. It quickly reached England, where a Middle English translation was made before the end of the century. One Latin translation was also produced in southern France or Italy in the fourteenth century, and another in England in the fifteenth.[20]

While Marguerite's highly poetic *Mirror*, featuring the voices of many characters but rarely her own, offers little direct insight into her life, we are fortunate that John of Morigny filled his voluminous visionary and magical text, *The Flowers of Heavenly Teaching*, with extensive autobiographical digressions.[21] He was born in Autruy-sur-Juine, about forty-five miles south of Paris, likely in the late 1270s. As a child, he sang for some time in the cathedral choir at Chartres. He became a Benedictine monk at the abbey of Morigny, outside Étampes, in the mid-1290s, perhaps as Marguerite began work on her *Mirror*. From around 1300, he studied canon law for several years at Orléans, but he returned to Morigny, apparently for good, in the fall of 1308. By his own account, he had conjured a vision of the Virgin Mary and asked her if she wanted him to continue as a scholar. She replied, 'You will be a monk.'[22]

Already, however, John's schooling had been his undoing. While at Orléans, he had been drawn into what Richard Kieckhefer has called the 'clerical underworld' of demonic magic.[23] Soon after arriving in Orléans, he received 'a certain book from a certain cleric containing many nefarious things of necromantic art'.[24] He eagerly copied all he could, after which he was consumed by a desire to master this form of magic. He then fell even deeper

18 Documents in Verdeyen, 'Procès d'inquisition', pp. 50–1, 60–1, 78–9, quote at p. 78; translations in Field, *Beguine*, pp. 217–18, 223–6, quote at p. 225.

19 H. C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (New York, 1887), II, 122–3; quoted in Field, *Beguine*, p. 154.

20 Lerner, 'New Light', pp. 103–7; J. L. Trombley, 'The Latin Manuscripts of the *Mirror of Simple Souls*', in *Companion to Marguerite Porete*, ed. Terry and Stauffer, pp. 186–217 (pp. 186–8); eadem, 'New Evidence on the Origins of the Latin *Mirror of Simple Souls* from a Forgotten Paduan Manuscript', *Journal of Medieval History* 43 (2017), 137–52; and Trombley's essay in this volume.

21 Almost all that we know about John comes from the groundbreaking research of Claire Fanger and Nicholas Watson: primarily C. Fanger, *Rewriting Magic: An Exegesis of the Visionary Autobiography of a Fourteenth-Century French Monk* (University Park PA, 2015); John of Morigny, *Liber florum celestis doctrine* / *The Flowers of Heavenly Teaching*, ed. C. Fanger and N. Watson (Toronto, 2015) [hereafter *Liber florum*].

22 *Liber florum*, p. 157.

23 R. Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 154–6.

24 *Liber florum*, p. 158; translation modified from 'The Prologue to John of Morigny's *Liber visionum*: Text and Translation', ed. and trans. C. Fanger and N. Watson, *Esoterica* 3 (2001), 108–217 (p. 173). Fanger and Watson are preparing a translation of the complete *Liber florum*, but at present only this partial translation has been published.

into the devil's snares when a Lombard physician, Jacob of Bologna, advised him to seek a copy of the *Ars notoria*, a ritual system for invoking spirits in order to gain knowledge.[25] Although it appeared to be a 'most beautiful, and most useful, and even most holy' book, it was, in fact, worse than any necromantic text, precisely because it disguised its true nature. Indeed, John describes the *Ars notoria* in the same language of deceptive hypocrisy often used to characterize heretics: 'outwardly a mild lamb but inwardly a ravening wolf'.[26] Nevertheless, it took some time for John to realize this. He initiated a friend, the Cistercian monk John of Fontainejean, into the notory art, and he even taught it to his own younger sister, Bridget. Like John of Morigny himself, both John the Cistercian and Bridget were eventually saved by the grace of the Virgin Mary.

In the meantime, however, John mastered the art of necromancy. In fact, he continued to practice necromancy even after he had rejected the *Ars notoria*. He worked with a known necromantic text, the *Four Rings of Solomon*, and also wrote a 'new necromancy' himself.[27] He appears to have had books of necromancy still in his possession after he returned to Morigny, for he worried that if these were discovered, his fellow monks would dismiss his Marian visions as demonic conjurations.[28] Yet part of his own devotional text could appear to be indebted to necromantic rites, although John denied such influence.[29] To accompany his prayer-conjurations, he composed a Book of Figures, and in 1315 these came under attack by a group of clerics to whom John refers only as 'certain ones not of the stock of Judah but of Canaan, growling with rabid bite in the manner of barking dogs'. They were growling at him because the figures in his book 'had been composed in the manner of necromantic figures', containing circles, crosses, and astrological images.[30]

John bristled with indignation. He had received explicit sanction for his composition from Mary herself. Still, he was fully cognizant of the dangerous similarity between the two kinds of art. Taking counsel with the Virgin, he abandoned his initial composition and began what his modern exegetes call the New Compilation, including a new Book of Figures. It is not clear if the 'barking dogs' were satisfied, but eventually the New Compilation would also fail to pass ecclesiastical muster. According to the *Grandes chroniques de*

25 J. Véronèse, *L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge. Introduction et édition critique* (Florence, 2007).

26 *Liber florum*, pp. 158, 159.

27 Ibid., p. 166.

28 Ibid., p. 168.

29 On John's view of necromancy, see Fanger, *Rewriting Magic*, pp. 109–31; or C. Fanger, '*Libri Nigromantici*: The Good, the Bad, and the Ambiguous in John of Morigny's *Flowers of Heavenly Teaching*', *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 7 (2012), 164–89.

30 *Liber florum*, p. 299. Barking dogs (*canes latrantes*) was 'an old and generic term for troublemakers' and indeed sometimes for heretics. John may have drawn on the image as used in the *Somniale Danielis*, which deals with the interpretation of dreams. See Fanger, *Rewriting Magic*, pp. 88, 184 n. 9.

France, in 1323 an unnamed book of 'feigned' prayers to the Virgin, written by an equally unnamed monk of Morigny, was 'justly condemned in Paris as false and evil, against Christian faith, and condemned to be burned and put in the fire'.[31] A briefer account had previously been given in the continuation of the Chronicle of William of Nangis.[32] Since John was likely born in the late 1270s, he could easily still have been alive to witness, or at least hear reports about, the fate of his book. There is no record, however, that he was ever brought to judgment himself.[33] The rest of his life is obscure to history.

His *Flowers*, however, had an afterlife every bit as amazing as Marguerite's *Mirror*. Like Marguerite, John wanted to share his inspiration, first with his sister and his friend John the Cistercian, and then with wider circles of readers. He must have spoken openly about his visions within his own monastery, because he feared that his fellow monks would dismiss his visionary claims if they discovered the books of necromancy he still possessed. As for the 'barking dogs' who attacked the necromantic 'manner' of his book, they almost certainly came from outside of Morigny, so the full text of the *Flowers*, including the Book of Figures, must have been circulating already by 1315.[34] In fact, manuscript evidence shows that John circulated his work at various stages of composition, including at least two separate versions of the earlier, and rather less objectionable, Book of Prayers.[35] Likewise the condemnation and 'execution' of the book in 1323 was probably intended to warn a circle of Parisian readers away from this dangerous text.[36]

The *Flowers* continued to circulate for the remainder of the Middle Ages, from England to Austria and from Germany to Spain, sometimes attracting condemnation as a work of ritual magic, and sometimes garnering approbation as a handbook of Marian devotions. Yet until a brief mention in 1987 and then manuscript discoveries starting in the 1990s, the work was known to modern scholars only through the cryptic reference to its Parisian burning.[37] A full edition was only published in 2015.

31 Translation from N. Watson, 'John the Monk's *Book of Visions of the Blessed and Undefiled Virgin Mary, Mother of God*: Two Versions of a Newly Discovered Ritual Magic Text', in *Conjuring Spirits: Texts and Traditions of Medieval Ritual Magic*, ed. C. Fanger (University Park PA, 1998), pp. 163–215 (p. 164); original French supplied in ibid., p. 181 n. 5.

32 Cited in Watson, 'John the Monk', but original text only provided in Fanger, *Rewriting Magic*, p. 170 n. 7.

33 *Pace* Lea, *History of the Inquisition*, III, 437, that 'a monk was seized in Paris in 1323 for possessing a book on the subject [the notory art]'; Fanger and Watson correct this error at several points.

34 Fanger, *Rewriting Magic*, pp. 89–90.

35 C. Fanger, 'Introduction B: The Manuscripts and Their Users', in *Liber florum*, pp. 90–137 (p. 121).

36 Ibid., p. 122.

37 Fanger, *Rewriting Magic*, pp. 3–4.

Comparisons

There are obvious differences between the *beguine clergesse*, as one source calls her, from Valenciennes and the educated clergyman from Morigny. Yet their careers share some clear parallels. John was as much a visionary and inspired mystic as he was a ritual magician. The Virgin spoke to him almost his entire life, both when he conjured her and at her own initiative. He was also plagued by frightful demonic visions, as many mystics were (although we have no indication that Marguerite suffered in this way).[38] The two scholars who have mainly studied John so far stress that he should be understood in the context of such early fourteenth-century mystics as Marguerite and Meister Eckhart, although his was obviously a much more active rather than quietist visionary program.[39]

It is hard to imagine how Marguerite would have known about a Benedictine monk from Morigny, but it seems likely that John knew something about her. His abbey was barely thirty miles from Paris, and reports of her trial and execution would almost certainly have reached his ears.[40] Of course, such reports would probably not have included many details about her mystical thought. Perhaps he knew only that she had been burned for writing 'a certain pestiferous book containing heresy and error', as the formal condemnation read publicly at her execution declared.[41] Given the questionable texts with which he worked, and the one he was composing, that reference alone should have piqued his interest.

Intriguing as a comparison of the quite different mystical systems developed by these two figures would be, my focus here will be on another convergence that connects them. Specifically, they both made some effort to justify their works and defend them from critics. Neither did so in a formal legal setting. John, so far as we know, never stood trial when his book was condemned, and Marguerite remained famously silent during the course of her trial. Yet this is not entirely to the detriment of historical analysis. While direct responses to specific charges can be valuable, scholars who work with inquisitorial or other trial records are all too aware of the distortions they may produce. Instead, both Marguerite and John wrote their defenses into the texts they composed.

38 For a French case nearly a century later, see R. Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *The Strange Case of Ermine de Reims: A Medieval Woman between Demons and Saints* (Philadelphia, 2015).

39 Fanger, *Rewriting Magic*, pp. 46–7; N. Watson, 'Introduction A: John of Morigny and his Book', in *Liber florum*, pp. 3–89 (p. 88).

40 Watson, 'Introduction A', p. 79.

41 Field, *Beguine*, p. 228; his translation, based on the manuscript, slightly corrects the edition of Verdeyen, 'Procès d'inquisition', p. 81. References to her book also featured in several chronicle accounts of her execution; see Field, *Beguine*, pp. 234–5, 238. On differences between these accounts, see E. A. R. Brown, 'Marguerite Porete, John Baconthorpe, and the Chroniclers of Saint-Denis', *Mediaeval Studies* 75 (2013), 307–44.

Each book faced an initial condemnation of some kind – in Marguerite's case a formal condemnation from Guido of Collemezzo, and in John's case the less official but still biting critique of the 'barking dogs'. Neither author abandoned their work. Instead, Marguerite may have expanded hers. While there is some debate, as there is about almost every aspect of her career, many experts think that she wrote the final seventeen chapters of the *Mirror* after its initial condemnation, intending them as a defense of the book as a whole.[42] In John's case, while he disdained the criticism of his work, 'since it arose from dogs, not from faithful men', he nevertheless revised his *Flowers* considerably, in part to avoid 'scandal' but also, he asserts, because he decided that his initial figures were too complex to be used along with the prescribed prayers.[43] He included many explicit justifications for his 'holy and wondrous science' throughout his new Book of Figures.[44] In addition, the long autobiographical account of his early visions of the Virgin and her sanction for his work, written well before any attacks were lodged against it, ultimately served as a 'sustained defense' for the entire book.[45]

It may seem paradoxical to build a comparison out of the defenses raised for two such different forms of devotional practice. Marguerite's system of mystical annihilation was grounded in radical non-action, in which the slightest trace of human will became anathema. How she 'negotiated' the inherent conflict between this imperative for complete self-destruction and her deep commitment to, and evident pride in, her work as an author is a complex matter, but such conflict characterized the work of other mystics as well.[46] John's process was more straightforward. He sought knowledge through visionary experiences, which he actively pursued through the rites he developed and performed. Yet in each case there is a recognition that the author's system could be misunderstood and fundamentally misperceived. For Marguerite, this was because her system was built on absence and interior annihilation. There was simply nothing there to perceive. For John, problems arose because the rites he developed could appear so similar to demonic invocations. Both systems ran foreseeably afoul of a Church determined to discern and monitor the interior spirituality of its flock.

Marguerite began the concluding defense of her *Mirror* by recounting seven 'considerations' that demonstrated the value of her extraordinarily

42 Field, *Beguine*, pp. 47–8; B. Newman, *Medieval Crossover: Reading the Secular against the Sacred* (Notre Dame IN, 2013), pp. 142–3. As Field notes (*Beguine*, p. 276 n. 25), the strongest recent objection to this reading is Lerner, 'New Light', p. 100; and Field softens his own position in 'Debating the Historical Marguerite', pp. 26–7. Piron, 'Marguerite in Champagne', pp. 137–8, also argues for a more complex pattern of composition.

43 *Liber florum*, pp. 299–300.

44 Ibid., pp. 303–5, 325–30. On this defense, see Fanger, *Rewriting Magic*, pp. 136–44.

45 'Prologue', ed. and trans. Fanger and Watson, p. 111.

46 B. Newman, 'Annihilation and Authorship: Three Women Mystics of the 1290s', *Speculum* 91 (2016), 591–630.

inactive spirituality, starting with the example of Christ withdrawing from his apostles so that they could receive the Holy Spirit, and concluding with the nature of the Seraphim, existing in complete union with God.[47] Her most extended example was, understandably, that of Martha and Mary, the classic scriptural account of active versus passive devotion. Marguerite had already touched on the superiority of the inactive Mary earlier in the *Mirror*.[48] Now she greatly expanded the point, but she also noted that Mary (here conflated with the Magdalene) had been active at one point. Like a peasant farmer, she had first 'tilled the earth of her lord, which he had given her', but ultimately it was the Lord who 'made it then bear fruit', working 'in Mary, [and] for Mary', but very decidedly 'without Mary'.[49] For Marguerite, this image of preparing a field but relying on divine favor for a good harvest illustrated how the soul seeking God should take certain preparatory steps but then abandon itself to the divine will.[50] She then described her own journey from her 'forlorn life, in the days when I did not know how to endure or compose myself', until she finally 'martyred' both her love and her will, and was shown the 'Land of Freedom', where 'I began to emerge from my childhood, and my spirit began to grow old, when my will was dead, and my works were finished'.[51]

At this point the text returns from this first-person account to its more usual format of a conversation between multiple characters. It is thus not Marguerite herself but 'Divine Love' who perceives the main problem she will confront. Having moved beyond active works through which she might demonstrate the quality of her faith, she will become an impenetrable mystery to 'Holy Church'. 'Such a Soul, says Love, is in the greatest perfection of being, and closer to the Far-Near [*Loingprés*], when Holy Church takes no example in her life'. The Soul was not, of course, the amoral monster that clerical authorities imagined heretics of the Free Spirit would become. Although she was 'so far from the work of the Virtues that she cannot understand their language', still the work of the Virtues remained enclosed within her. It was precisely 'because of this enclosure [that] Holy Church cannot recognize her'.[52]

Textual problems caused by the *Mirror's* many variants raise their head here, and it is not entirely safe to assume that Marguerite meant this statement as a final verdict on the preceding explanation of her mystical progress.[53] Passages throughout the *Mirror* show, however, that she recognized how inscrutable the essential nature of the truly freed soul would be to agents of the Church. Early in the work, when the major virtues of Faith, Hope, and

47 *Mirouer*, chs. 123–9.
48 Ibid., ch. 86, p. 246.
49 Ibid., ch. 124, p. 352.
50 Ibid., pp. 352–8.
51 Ibid., chs. 130–2, pp. 372, 388, 390.
52 Ibid., ch. 134, p. 394.
53 Newman, *Medieval Crossover*, p. 143.

Charity ask Love about the freed souls she has been describing, Love replies that the Virtues themselves are with these souls at every moment, 'but who they are – to speak of their worth and their dignity – neither you nor they know that, and thus Holy Church cannot know it'.[54] Later, the character of Reason proclaims that she wants to serve the Soul, but she does not know what to do about those she governs – clerics and other authorities who are dedicated to, and limited by, rational understanding. These, she worries, 'will never see any order in this Soul's outward customs and actions'.[55]

Several chapters later, when Holy Church herself wants to know about the nature of the Soul, she admits that 'this word surpasses our scriptures, and we cannot understand through Reason what it says'. The Church goes on to admit that she is filled with confusion when confronted by such a Soul and dares not oppose her.[56] Unfortunately for Marguerite, the human agents of the Church who would later confront her were quite certain that they understood her message, which they had no trouble opposing.

Like Marguerite in her concluding chapters, John of Morigny, in his prologue, clearly thought that an effective defense of his visionary system would be to recount how he had progressed toward it. As we have seen, the autobiography he presented in the *Flowers of Heavenly Teaching* was one of movement away from necromancy and the notory art toward his own divinely inspired rites. At one point, he compared himself explicitly to Theophilus, the legendary early Christian figure who renounced his faith through a blood-pact with the devil but ultimately was saved by the Virgin Mary.[57] John's story, however, was not so simple a tale of deliberate sin and redemption. Rather, he made clear how difficult it was even for him, an educated cleric, to perceive the demonic evil into which both necromancy and the notory art led.

Necromantia, or *nigromancia* as it regularly appears in medieval manuscripts, is usually understood as explicitly demonic ritual magic. In its Greek roots, it literally means divination by summoning spirits of the dead. The medieval Church, however, did not accept that human souls could be conjured back from their divinely appointed place in the afterlife. Hence the official interpretation became that any spirits contacted in this way were actually demons, and thus necromancy came to mean demonic invocation of any sort.[58] At one point, John indicated that, with the aid of the notory art, he had learned

54 *Mirouer*, ch. 19, p. 74.
55 Ibid., ch. 39, p. 124.
56 Ibid., ch. 41, p. 130.
57 *Liber florum*, p. 154.
58 Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, pp. 151–75; R. Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites: A Necromancer's Manual from the Fifteenth Century* (University Park PA, 1998); J.-P. Boudet, *Entre science et* nigromance*: Astrologie, divination et magie dans l'Occident médiéval (XII^e–XV^e siècle)* (Paris, 2006), pp. 351–93.

'both kinds of necromancy'.[59] Most likely he meant to distinguish between rites that explicitly invoked demons and those that involved mysterious signs or figures, which suspicious churchmen could interpret at tacitly calling on demons.[60] This distinction had been central to Thomas Aquinas's condemnation of image magic that claimed to invoke astral powers, in the mid-thirteenth century.[61]

As for the *Ars notoria*, it was even more deceptive than necromancy, 'insofar as it is more subtle'.[62] This was because it presented itself as explicitly non-demonic, indeed theurgic: 'it is a very short book, and through it omnipotent God promises and imparts to operators attainment, in a brief time, of all knowledge of scriptures and arts'.[63] At this point in his account, John, having finally discerned the true nature of the *Ars notoria*, exploded into a rant against it: 'For I, John, in point of fact have charged, by myself and through many other witnesses, that this book, this *Ars notoria*, is without doubt the height of malice, origin of deviation, teacher of error, vessel of deceit, font of malice, stream of wickedness, and false grace'.[64] But he admits that he had been very slow in coming to this recognition. Throughout the time he used the notory art, he was plagued by demonic visions, as were his sister Bridget and his friend John the Cistercian. Only gradually, however, did he begin 'to have doubts concerning this science, that there might be something evil in it'.[65]

Even after John understood that the *Ars notoria* was evil 'to its core', he renounced it only 'a little bit, but not entirely'.[66] And even after he had rejected the notory art completely, he continued to practice necromancy for some time.[67] In the prologue to his new Book of Figures, composed after the original Book of Figures had been castigated by the 'barking dogs' as necromantic, he asserted that his rites were completely different, because they achieved their effects through the power of the Virgin, not the devil. Nevertheless, he admitted that they still appeared to be quite similar to those of the *Ars notoria*.[68] He subsequently defended this practice of reworking elements of nefarious rites into beneficent rituals by citing the ancient Christian trope of plundering the Egyptians.[69]

John was also careful to stress at several points the standard ecclesiastical position that any effects achieved through prayers, blessings, or other rites

59 *Liber florum*, p. 163.
60 Fanger, *Rewriting Magic*, pp. 112–13.
61 Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles* 3.105–6; *Summa theologiae* 2.2.96.2.
62 *Liber florum*, p. 159.
63 Ibid., pp. 158–9.
64 Ibid., p. 159.
65 Ibid., p. 161.
66 Ibid., p. 165.
67 Ibid., p. 166.
68 Ibid., p. 320.
69 Ibid., p. 347.

depended on divine grace and the state of the practitioner (except for sacraments), not on any power inherent in the rite itself. 'On the authority of the blessed and pure Virgin Mary, the mother of God', he wrote, 'if the heart is not held toward the glorious blessed Virgin Mary, then prayer, figure, and imagination will have no value. If, however, the operator's whole heart is directed and set toward her, then prayer, figure, and imagination obtain the desired effect as a gift from God'.[70] Later he declared, rather more succinctly, that 'faith should prevail among the operators, for where it is wanting, truly the work will lose its effect'.[71] Still later he concluded that 'the prayers of this book, the figures, and the ring do not have any virtue or efficacy', and achieved their effects only through the ministry of God and the Virgin.[72]

In John's own mind, one important defense of the legitimacy of his rituals was that the Virgin Mary had revealed and sanctioned them.[73] He had to admit, however, that visions could sometimes be deceptive. The devil could take the form of an angel of light, and a 'malign spirit' could even appear as the Virgin herself.[74] During one vision, he admitted, 'a malign and phantasmic spirit mixed itself into the words and statements of the Virgin so subtly that I could not perceive it'.[75] He therefore offered some basic rules for discernment. First, one should pay attention to the context of a vision. No matter what form he took, John assured his readers, the devil could never appear alone in a church or other holy place, but usually manifested in dark and unclean places, like a tavern or a brothel. More important, though, was the content of a vision. No matter how fair his form, the devil always sought to tempt people into sin.[76] John had absolute faith in his visionary experiences because they served to turn him toward God, not toward greater evil, and he insisted that he had only experienced a couple of questionable visions in the whole time during which the Virgin had revealed the rites of his new 'science' to him.[77] Nevertheless, he concluded his *Flowers* on a cautious note, formulaically denying any heresy: 'it was not our intention to say, teach, or instruct anything … that would be contrary to divine scripture, or Catholic or Christian theology, discipline, or faith'.[78]

70 Ibid., p. 177.
71 Ibid., p. 182.
72 Ibid., p. 336. A major rite in the Book of Figures involves crafting a ring.
73 Mentioned, inter alia, in ibid., pp. 153, 171, 181, 304.
74 Ibid., pp. 178, 313, 328.
75 Ibid., p. 332.
76 Ibid., p. 178. These somewhat prefigure more elaborate criteria posited by later authors: Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Strange Case*, pp. 129–32, 136; N. Caciola, *Discerning Spirits: Divine and Demonic Possession in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca NY, 2003), pp. 291–8; D. Elliott, *Proving Woman: Female Spirituality and Inquisitional Culture in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton, 2004), pp. 250–63.
77 *Liber florum*, pp. 329, 333.
78 Ibid., p. 350.

I have stressed problems of discernment and the struggle for correct understanding because both Marguerite and John stressed these points, and also because they were central to the Church's response to heresies of this nature. In inquisitorial theory, all heretics dissembled as a matter of course, and it was part of the inquisitor's job to break down their hypocrisy. Even more profoundly, proper *inquisitio* should help heretics understand the true nature of their own error.[79] Those accused of heresy could, however, turn this dynamic back on their prosecutors, alleging that inquisitors failed to understand the truly devout nature of their esoteric beliefs and practices. This is what Marguerite's and John's famous contemporary Meister Eckhart did when he was accused of heresy in 1326. Noting that many of his mystical teachings were 'uncommon and subtle', he asserted of his opponents that 'they err first when they think that everything they do not understand is an error, and furthermore that every error is heresy'.[80]

Marguerite, as we have seen, also disparaged the capacity of clerical authorities, governed solely by reason, to understand her positions properly. Yet she made no attempt to defend herself along these lines during her long imprisonment in Paris, probably assuming that it would be a lost cause. Indeed, from a practical inquisitorial perspective, her case was quite straightforward. As William of Paris stressed in the formal condemnation read at her execution, her *Mirror* had already been judged heretical by Bishop Guido of Cambrai, and she had been ordered never to 'attempt again by word or in writing those things that were contained in it'.[81] Assuming these points were true, her status as a relapsed heretic could not have been more blatant.

Given this situation, one of the most remarkable aspects of Marguerite's trial was how cautiously William of Paris proceeded against her. He was careful to obtain two separate rulings from a panel of canon lawyers at the University of Paris: one justifying his proceeding against her, in spite of her refusal to swear an oath and respond to questions, and the second certifying that, in light of Guido of Cambrai's previous ruling, she was indeed a relapsed heretic. He also submitted excerpts from her *Mirror* to a separate panel of theologians in order to reconfirm that the work was heretical.[82] It

[79] C. Caldwell Ames, 'Dominican Inquisitors as "Doctors of Souls": The Spiritual Discipline of Inquisition, 1231–1331', *Heresis* 40 (2004), 23–40; eadem, *Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2009), pp. 137–81.

[80] Meister Eckhart, *Die lateinischen Werke*, ed. K. Weiß et al., 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1965–2015), V, 276, 353.

[81] Verdeyen, 'Procès d'inquisition', p. 82; translation from Field, *Beguine*, p. 228.

[82] See above, n. 18. Although note that W. J. Courtney, 'Marguerite's Judges: The University of Paris in 1310', in *Marguerite Porete et le* Miroir, ed. Field, Lerner, and Piron, pp. 215–31, argues that William carefully controlled the small group of canonists he consulted. The

would strain credulity to suggest that an inquisition carried out in the orbit of Philip IV was a pristine search for truth untainted by politics. Nevertheless, William clearly wanted to give at least the appearance of searching diligently for the truth, not rushing to judgment.[83]

With some caution, we might extrapolate how this desire for at least a patina of careful discernment extended from Marguerite's trial into some of the larger ecclesiastical policies that it influenced, mainly through the decrees against beguines and Free Spirit heretics that emerged from the Council of Vienne. Obviously, we must observe several caveats here. *Ad nostrum* and *Cum de quibusdam* were not in any way directed at the already-executed 'beguine' of Hainaut. Furthermore, there is some evidence that the decrees were not even closely connected to each other in their origin and early composition.[84] Yet we also know that many Parisian clergy with direct knowledge of Marguerite's trial participated in the Council of Vienne, which convened only one year later, and it seems clear that condemned articles from her *Mirror* were the source of several of the Free Spirit errors attributed to 'an abominable sect of wicked men, commonly called beghards, and of faithless women, commonly called beguines' in *Ad nostrum*.[85]

Marguerite may also have served as a tacit model for those beguines 'who seem to be led by a particular insanity', mentioned in *Cum de quibusdam*.[86] These troublesome women 'argue and preach about the holy Trinity and the divine essence, and they maintain opinions contrary to the Catholic faith about articles of faith and the sacraments of the Church, and, thus ensnaring many simple people, they lead them into diverse errors'. This certainly sounds like a description of Marguerite Porete, at least as Church officials would have seen her. The decree then declared that 'the status of these women' was 'perpetually prohibited and abolished from God's Church'. Fatally, it did not clarify whether 'these women', in this context, meant all beguines or only those who behaved in the particular 'insane' manner it described. Any Church official who wanted to take the simplest path could assume that all women called beguines were now condemned by papal edict without inquiring further into the particulars of their behavior.

same cannot be said of the more diffuse group of theologians (Field, *Beguine*, p. 143), although William did control what excerpts of the book he asked them to judge.

83 S. L. Field, 'William of Paris's Inquisitions against Marguerite Porete and her Book', in *Marguerite Porete et le* Miroir, ed. Field, Lerner, and Piron, pp. 233–47.

84 J. Tarrant, 'The Clementine Decrees on the Beguines: Conciliar and Papal Versions', *Archivum historiae pontificiae* 12 (1974), 300–8 (pp. 302–3).

85 Field, *Beguine*, pp. 194, 198; *Ad nostrum*, Clem. 5.3.3, in *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. E Friedberg, 2 vols. (1879–81; reprint Graz, 1959), II, cols. 1183–4; with English translation in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. N. P. Tanner et al., 2 vols. (London, 1990), I, 383–4.

86 Field, *Beguine*, p. 199; *Cum de quibusdam*, Clem. 3.11.1, in *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. Friedberg, II, col. 1169; with English translation in *Decrees*, ed. Tanner et al., I, 374. Translations below are modified from Tanner.

Famously, *Cum de quibusdam* concluded by declaring: 'Of course, by the aforesaid we in no way intend to prohibit, if there should be any faithful women, either vowed to chastity or not, living together respectably in their lodgings, wishing to live in penance and virtue and to be devoted to the Lord in humility of spirit, that this should be allowed to them, for the Lord shall have inspired them'. Yet here, too, it failed to clarify whether this 'escape clause' applied to 'non-insane' beguines or only to *other* women living in this manner but not under that title. John XXII had to rectify this omission in yet another proclamation, *Ratio recta*, issued a year after *Cum de quibusdam* was finally promulgated. Here he stated explicitly that 'in many parts of the world there are numerous women, who are also commonly called beguines', who nevertheless led entirely respectable lives, and that these 'blameless beguines' were exempt from *Cum de quibusdam*'s prohibitions.[87] This may seem a trifling sort of discernment: looking past the label to see how the women in question actually behaved. But at least John was concerned enough to stipulate that such minimal attention should be paid.

Unfortunately for many women 'commonly called beguines', *Ratio recta* was less well known than *Cum de quibusdam*. It entered canon law, but only in the late and somewhat haphazard *Extravagantes communes*, and it did not feature in the canon law curriculum of medieval universities.[88] Also, insofar as it recommended some moderate discernment in the case of beguines, it concerned itself only with external behaviors, not with their internal, spiritual status. We can gain further insight into the dilemmas the Church might have encountered in that regard, however, by turning to contemporary deliberations about the heretical status of magic.

Throughout his papacy, John XXII was gravely concerned about demonic magic. Most significantly, in 1326 he produced a fundamental statement about the heretical nature of such magic in the proclamation *Super illius specula*. 'Grievingly we observe', he wrote, 'that many are Christian in name only … for they offer sacrifices to demons, worship them, make and cause to be made images, a ring, a mirror, a phial, or some other thing to bind demons by magic'.[89] All such magicians were automatically excommunicated and were to be treated as heretics. Like several other decrees by John, *Super illius specula* was not initially well known, and it may not even have been issued in his lifetime. It found no place in canon law or even in the papal registers.[90]

87 Extrav. comm. 3.9.1; in *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. Friedberg, II, cols. 1279–80; translation modified from E. Makowski, 'When is a Beguine not a Beguine? Names, Norms, and Nuance in Canonical Literature', in *Labels and Libels*, ed. Böhringer, Kolpacoff Deane, and van Engen, pp. 83–98 (pp. 97–8).

88 Makowski, 'When is a Beguine not a Beguine?', p. 89.

89 *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Hexenwahns und der Hexenverfolgung im Mittelalter*, ed. J. Hansen (1901; reprint Hildesheim, 1963), p. 5.

90 A. Boureau, *Satan the Heretic: The Birth of Demonology in the Medieval West*, trans. T. L. Fagan (Chicago, 2006), pp. 13–14.

Fifty years later, however, the inquisitor Nicholas Eymeric included it in his *Directorium inquisitorum*, and thereafter it became a standard component of the legal argument granting papal inquisitors jurisdiction over cases involving demonic magic.[91]

Whatever its convoluted path toward publication, *Super illius specula* clearly expressed issues that concerned John deeply. Already in 1320, he had written to the inquisitors of Carcassonne and Toulouse, instructing them to investigate cases involving people who 'sacrifice to demons or worship them or do homage to them' and who invoked demons by means of certain images, including baptized wax figures.[92] Such magic struck a very personal nerve with John because at the outset of his papacy a plot had been uncovered in which Bishop Hugues Géraud of Cahors, then under investigation for simony and other abuses, supposedly planned to use baptized wax images in a magical rite to kill the pope himself.[93] Similar charges were soon directed at other clergy and some of John's political opponents.[94] This magic was clearly criminal, but its status as a heresy remained open to debate.

John sought to resolve this issue by assembling a ten-member commission in Avignon, probably in fall 1320, after he had issued his letter to Carcassonne and Toulouse.[95] The responses that this group of high-ranking clergymen produced reveal just how tortuous legal and theological thought about the true nature of demonic magic could become, because it hinged on discerning the magicians' internal state and their own comprehension of their actions. To a question about using the Eucharist to perform harmful magic (*maleficium*), for example, Augustin Kažotić, bishop of Zagreb, responded that if the operator believed that the consecrated Host would confer power directly for this evil act, it was heresy. If, however, the operator only employed the sacrament to gratify some demon, which he believed would then perform harmful magic on his behalf, this was sacrilege, since it defamed the sacrament, but not heresy, since it did not violate any doctrine. Demons had considerable power and were entirely evil, so they might well be motivated to offer service in exchange for seeing the Eucharist degraded.[96] Bishop John of Brixen made similar points, noting that 'someone can believe properly and nevertheless be a sorcerer'.[97]

91 Nicholas Eymeric, *Directorium inquisitorum* 2.43.9, ed. F. Peña (Rome, 1587), pp. 341–2.

92 *Quellen*, ed. Hansen, pp. 4–5.

93 R. Decker, *Witchcraft and the Papacy: An Account Drawing on the Formerly Secret Records of the Roman Inquisition*, trans. H. C. E. Midelfort (Charlottesville VA, 2008), pp. 24–8.

94 Boureau, *Satan the Heretic*, pp. 22–5; see also the essay by Georg Modestin in the present volume.

95 Boureau, *Satan the Heretic*, pp. 43–67; edited in A. Boureau, *Le pape et les sorciers: Une consultation de Jean XXII sur la magie en 1320 (Manuscrit B.A.V. Borghese 348)* (Rome, 2004) [hereafter *Consultation*].

96 *Consultation*, pp. 6–7.

97 Ibid., p. 9.

Enrico del Carretto, the bishop of Lucca, issued a long response drawing numerous narrow distinctions. Regarding the Eucharist, for example, to degrade or debase it in some way in a magical rite, believing that this might motivate a demon to act on the magician's behalf, would be sacrilege and sorcery, but not heresy. One could even imagine the possibility that the Host might be used in a rite in such a way as would motivate a demon to act but would not actually degrade or damage the Host itself, in which case even the charge of sacrilege would fall away and the crime would be sorcery alone. If, however, the magician intended to show reverence to the demon by using the sacrament in a magical rite, or believed that this constituted some kind of pact that then compelled the demon to perform magic on his behalf, this would be heresy.[98] Earlier in his response, Enrico had already argued that believing a demon would always respond reliably to displays of reverence or a pact denied Church teachings about the inherently duplicitous nature of the devil and his minions, and so was heretical.[99]

Images used in magical rites played an especially important role in Enrico's judgment, for it seemed to him patently clear that to craft and especially to consecrate an image, as by baptism, for use in a demonic rite was a display of reverence to the demon, and thus expressed a heretical belief.[100] Yet others argued that even such a blatant act of idolatry might still only be idolatrous in appearance, not in fact. If an operator did not *intend* to worship a demon rather than God, even if he performed an action that *signified* worship to a demon, then the act was not heretical *in rei veritate*, in point of fact.[101] As the Church had taught since the time of Augustine, the essence of heresy lay in an intentional choice, an act of will. Meister Eckhart would reference this point only a few years after John's commission concluded its work, when he declared in his defense, 'I can err, but I cannot be a heretic. For the first pertains to understanding, the second to will'.[102]

This distinction, however, would not stand in the way of John's commission. James of Concotz, the bishop of Lodève, who recognized that an act that appeared idolatrous but did not intend idolatry would not be heretical 'in point of fact', nevertheless argued that it should still be considered heretical in the 'judicial presumption' of the Church.[103] It was, however, Guido Terreni, the prior general of the Carmelites, who expanded his response into a veritable treatise on this point.[104] His detailed arguments can be boiled

98 Ibid., pp. 32–3.
99 Ibid., p. 18.
100 Ibid., p. 27.
101 Ibid., p. 39.
102 Eckhart, *Lateinische Werke*, ed. Weiß et al., V, 277.
103 *Consultation*, pp. 34–5.
104 Boureau, *Satan the Heretic*, p. 53. Boureau focuses mainly on Enrico del Carretto, however. On Terreni, see I. Iribarren, 'From Black Magic to Heresy: A Doctrinal Leap in the Pontificate of John XXII', *Church History* 76 (2007), 32–60.

down to this: 'interior actions cannot be known to us [the Church] except through exterior [actions] which are the signs of interior ones'.[105] He imposed a number of conditions to control how a judge should use external actions to discern internal ones. In an obvious exemption, statements made by an actor who deliberately dissembled in order to entertain should not be taken as evidence of his true interior state.[106] In the end, though, rather chillingly, Guido admitted that no extrapolation from exterior action to interior could ever be 'infallible'. It was simply the best that the Church could do in this world.[107] The Augustinian John of Rome agreed, particularly in cases of demonic magic and other such inherently 'occult' matters.[108] So did the Cistercian Jacques Fournier, future Pope Benedict XII, who declared that 'the Church cannot judge except concerning manifest things'.[109]

Conclusion

Marguerite Porete declared that ecclesiastical officials governed entirely by reason would never understand the innermost mysteries of her mystical teachings. In terms of discernment, she was also clear that they would never reliably recognize truly liberated souls, whom only God would ever know.[110] In private discourse about the heretical nature of magical practices, ecclesiastical officials came to something like a similar conclusion, admitting their inability to perceive or cast judgment on interior intent. Again, only God possessed perfect discernment, and so it was inevitable, according to Guido Terreni, that some whom the Church condemned would be redeemed in the afterlife.[111] This fatalistic determination echoed a far more brutal statement about heretics attributed to the papal legate Arnau Amalric during the Albigensian Crusade more than a century earlier. When crusaders captured the town of Béziers and needed to decide the fate of its inhabitants, they supposedly asked him, 'What shall we do, lord? We cannot discern between

105 *Consultation*, p. 59.

106 Ibid., p. 63.

107 Ibid., pp. 64–5. For insight into a long tradition of classifying heresy as action, see R. Kieckhefer, 'Witchcraft, Necromancy, and Sorcery as Heresy', in *Chasses aux sorcières et démonologie: Entre discours et pratiques (XIV^{e}–XVII^{e} siècles)*, ed. M. Ostorero, G. Modestin, and K. Utz Tremp (Florence, 2010), pp. 133–53, reference to Terreni at p. 144.

108 *Consultation*, p. 107.

109 Ibid., pp. 132–3. On Fournier's later treatment of discernment, see I. Bueno, *Defining Heresy: Inquisition, Theology, and Papal Policy in the Time of Jacques Fournier*, trans. I. Bolognese, T. Brophy, and S. R. Prodan (Leiden, 2015), pp. 203–26; and eadem, 'False Prophets and Ravening Wolves: Biblical Exegesis as a Tool against Heretics in Jacques Fournier's *Postilla* on Matthew', *Speculum* 89 (2014), 35–66, where she draws a direct connection to the larger issue of discernment of spirits (p. 56).

110 *Mirouer*, ch. 19, p. 76.

111 *Consultation*, p. 65.

the good and the bad'. To which he replied, 'Kill them. For the Lord will know who are his own'.[112]

Most likely, the Cistercian abbot never uttered those infamous words, but they nevertheless capture the dilemma faced by a Church determined to monitor belief and mete out judgment in this world. How to discern between the good and the bad, especially when faithful Christians might so easily become confused about their beliefs and heretics could so easily dissemble, was a perennial problem for ecclesiastical authorities and had been debated intensely in moral literature since at least the twelfth century.[113] The problem became even more acute in the late Middle Ages, when aspects of Christian spirituality became even more thoroughly interiorized, and when individual Christians began to have more options for expressing their faith.[114]

Of those numerous options, I have drawn connections here between mysticism, which is self-evidently among the most inscrutable forms of religious practice, and ritual magic, which some may not think of as a religious practice at all. As we are increasingly coming to understand, however, at least some magicians very much saw their rites as a way to approach the divine.[115] And for the discerning Church, systems of mysticism and ritual magic raised similar problems, whether that magic was the truly visionary sort developed by John of Morigny or the more blatantly necromantic kind to which John's rites bore such perilous resemblance.

To alleviate these ambiguities, the Church relied on broad stereotypes and invented categories. Throughout the fourteenth century, mystics who could be associated with the standardized doctrines of the imagined Free Spirit heresy were marked for prosecution, as were beguines, in some cases simply because they bore that name. It took much longer for similar dynamics to develop fully in relation to magic, but by the fifteenth century, women accused of practicing various kinds of magic – perhaps harmful *maleficium*, but also healing rites and forms of divination – could be plugged into the clarifying stereotype of diabolical, heretical witchcraft. These were complex and convoluted processes, driven by many different historical factors. But they drew much of their initial impetus from new concerns and new energies unleashed in the early fourteenth century.

[112] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* 5.21, ed. J. Strange, 2 vols. (Cologne, 1851), I, 302. For context, see M. G. Pegg, *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom* (Oxford, 2008), p. 77.

[113] S. R. Kramer, *Sin, Interiority, and Selfhood in the Twelfth-Century West* (Toronto, 2015).

[114] J. Van Engen, 'Multiple Options: The World of the Fifteenth-Century Church', *Church History* 77 (2008), 257–84.

[115] In addition to Fanger, *Rewriting Magic*, see also *Invoking Angels: Theurgic Ideas and Practices, Thirteenth to Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. C. Fanger (University Park PA, 2012); S. Page, *Magic in the Cloister: Pious Motives, Illicit Interests, and Occult Approaches to the Medieval Universe* (University Park PA, 2013); F. Klaassen, *The Transformations of Magic: Illicit Learned Magic in the Later Middle Ages and Renaissance* (University Park PA, 2013).

4

The Making of a Heretic: Pope John XXII's Campaign against Louis of Bavaria*

Georg Modestin

On 23 October 1327, Pope John XXII condemned as a heretic Louis of Bavaria, who had been elected in 1314 to the German throne. This act has traditionally been considered within the framework of the protracted political struggle between this monarch and three consecutive popes – John XXII, Benedict XII, and Clement VI – which spanned more than two decades. While the political dimension of this clash cannot be denied, this essay will re-focus attention on the heresiological dimension of Louis's condemnation in order to show how John's political and doctrinal concerns fused into a papal discourse that contained a whole array of heresy charges. These were not employed indiscriminately, but according to specific circumstances.

Political Inquisition, Demonic Magic, and the Matteo Visconti Affair

Open tensions between John XXII and Louis of Bavaria began about one year after the latter's victory against his Habsburg rival the 'anti-king' Frederick the Fair at the battle of Mühldorf on the river Inn (present day Bavaria) on 28 September 1322, as the pope still refused to recognize the kingship of the victor. Louis's troubles with the papacy did not end until his death on 11 October 1347, almost a quarter-century later. Despite numerous attempts to reconcile himself with the Church since the early 1330s,[1] Louis died a heretic, without receiving absolution from the Church, a condition in which 'he would have to appear in the moment of resurrection' ('Nec fuit absolutus per ecclesiam, et qualis fuerit,

* I am indebted to the editors for their insightful comments and for their checking of the language of my text.

1 The seminal study on the fruitless negotiations between Louis of Bavaria and the papacy is H. O. Schwöbel, *Der diplomatische Kampf zwischen Ludwig dem Bayern und der römischen Kurie im Rahmen des kanonischen Absolutionsprozesses 1330–1346*, Quellen und Studien zur Verfassungsgeschichte des Deutschen Reiches in Mittelalter und Neuzeit 10 (Weimar, 1968). An excellent biograpical sketch of Louis of Bavaria is A. Schütz, 'Ludwig der Bayer', in *Neue deutsche Biographie* 15 (Berlin, 1987), pp. 334–47.

apparebit in resurrectione communi'), to quote the words of a contemporary chronicler, the Constance canon Henry of Diessenhofen.[2] In modern historiography the condemnation of Louis of Bavaria as a heretic has been seen as an important moment in the political conflict between the German king (who after January 1328 also held the even more contested title of emperor) and the papacy. It is not by accident that Friedrich Bock coined the phrase 'political inquisitorial process' in a pioneering study of John XXII and his political foes. In Bock's words, Pope John turned 'the weapons of the inquisitorial court against his political opponents, the Italian Ghibellines', and also, 'almost automatically, against the German king whose natural allies the Ghibellines had become'.[3]

The condemnation of a German king was far from unique, even though Louis's contemporaries would have had to look back several generations for a precedent, to 1239, when the emperor Frederick II was once again and definitively excommunicated by Pope Gregory IX. Ecclesiastical courts were in fact commonly used by John XXII to fight against the so-called enemies of the Church, most frequently in northern Italy and in the *Patrimonium Petri*. In certain cases, the accusations were tainted with magical and demonological elements, which the pope took very seriously, such as in the accusations lodged shortly after the election of John XXII against Hugues Géraud, the bishop of John's hometown of Cahors. According to a papal letter dated 22 April 1317, Hugues stood accused of plotting against the pope's life, as well as the lives of several cardinals, by means of poison, but also by making wax figures that represented his victims and were to be stabbed. In early 1318 a group of clerics, some of them residing at the papal curia in Avignon itself, was suspected by the pope of having dabbled in nigromancy, geomancy, and other magical arts, and on 23 August 1326 John XXII summoned the cardinal Bertrand of Montfavet to pursue an inquest that had been dragging along for several years against a canon of Agen named Bertrand of Audiran, who was deemed to practice 'condemned sciences and arts' that aimed to invoke demons and malign spirits.[4]

The 'obsession' of John XXII, to use Alain Boureau's words, 'with supernatural manipulations of nature' was manifested on the one hand in the series

2 I am currently preparing the first critical edition of this chronicle for the Monumenta Germaniae Historica in Munich. Here I refer to the outdated edition of A. Huber, *Heinricus de Diessenhofen und andere Geschichtsquellen Deutschlands im späteren Mittelalter, hg. aus dem Nachlasse Johann Friedrich Böhmers*, Fontes rerum Germanicarum 4 (Stuttgart, 1868), p. 61.

3 F. Bock, 'Studien zum politischen Inquisitionsprozess Johanns XXII.', *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 26 (1935–36), 21–142 (p. 21).

4 See A. Boureau, *Satan the Heretic: The Birth of Demonology in the Medieval West*, trans. T. L. Fagan (Chicago, 2006), pp. 22–5; F. van Liere, 'Witchcraft as Political Tool? John XXII, Hugues Géraud and Matteo Visconti', *Medieval Perspectives* 16 (2001), 165–73. On the trial against Hugues Géraud see specifically E. Albe, *Autour de Jean XXII: Hugues Géraud, évêque de Cahors. L'affaire des poisons et des envoûtements en 1317* (Cahors, 1904).

of trials described above. Their urgency was due to the pope imagining, at least in some of those affairs, that his own life was endangered, not to mention that certain alchemists and physicians had apparently established closer contact with real or potential adversaries – the Spiritual Franciscans, or members of the Orsini and Colonna clans – at the curia.[5] On the other hand, John's fixation also had a doctrinal dimension. In 1320, the pope would consult a group of ten high-ranking theologians and canonists (including Jacques Fournier, later Benedict XII) on the relationship between magic and heresy. The questions submitted to these experts were the following. Should people who baptize images in conformity with ecclesiastical rite in order to commit *maleficium* be considered as heretics or sorcerers? Is a priest who re-baptizes people in order to cure them of epilepsy to be considered as a heretic or a sorcerer? Should those who use the Eucharist to perform *maleficium* or sorcery be punished as heretics? Are those who sacrifice to demons in order to compel them to perform some service to be regarded as heretics or sorcerers? What is to be done with people who re-baptize others? In their answers to the pope's questions most of the experts agreed, albeit to varying degrees, to the extension of the notion of heresy to all these magical practices.[6] Several years later, in 1326 or 1327, John XXII issued the bull *Super illius specula*, in which practitioners of magic, described as 'being allied with death, making a pact with hell, sacrificing to demons, and adoring them', are indeed assimilated to heretics.[7] This equation of magic with heresy would pave the way for future doctrinal elaborations leading finally to the emergence of the witches' sabbath.[8]

Even though the magical and demonological dimension of judicial activity during the pontificate of John XXII is not my main focus here, it must be

5 Boureau, *Satan the Heretic*, p. 23.

6 The consultation of 1320 has been introduced and edited in A. Boureau, *Le pape et les sorciers. Une consultation de Jean XXII sur la magie en 1320 (manuscrit B.A.V. Borghese 348)*, Sources et documents d'histoire du Moyen Âge publiés par l'École française de Rome 6 (Rome, 2004). The questions submitted to the panel have not been preserved. However, Boureau has been able to extrapolate them from the experts' answers (pp. ix–xi). For more on this consultation, see the essay by Michael Bailey in the present volume.

7 *Super illius specula* has been edited more than once. I refer to Joseph Hansen's pioneering source collection *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Hexenwahns und der Hexenverfolgung im Mittelalter* (1901; reprint Hildesheim, 1963), pp. 5–6, no. 5.

8 On *Super illius specula*, see Boureau, *Le pape et les sorciers*, pp. xlviii–lii; idem, *Satan the Heretic,* pp. 10–14 (especially p. 11: 'The importance of categorizing the invocation of demons as heresy is obvious for the later construction of demonology and the Sabbath, which was largely carried out by inquisitorial work'). On John's obsession with demonology, divination, and sorcery, see also van Liere, 'Witchcraft as Political Tool?' (especially within the context of his political trials); M. Ostorero, *Le diable au sabbat. Littérature démonologique et sorcellerie (1440–1460)*, Micrologus Library 38 (Florence, 2011), pp. 236–7, 435–8; M. D. Bailey, *Fearful Sprits, Reasoned Follies: The Boundaries of Superstition in Late Medieval Europe* (Ithaca NY, 2013), pp. 75–80.

taken into account, because magical and demonological elements filtered into some of the great political trials of this era, notably in northern Italy, where they featured particularly in the trial of Matteo Visconti, lord of Milan, which began in the winter of 1317–18. In fact the process against Louis of Bavaria may be considered in a certain sense as the offspring of the Visconti affair, given that the initial clash between the German king and the pope resulted from Louis's support for the lords of Milan against John XXII.

On 9 February 1320 the Milanese clerk Bartolomeo Cagnolati, whose reliability as a witness has been questioned,[9] appeared in Avignon, where he was examined by a panel of high-ranking men in whom John XXII had absolute confidence. This commission included the cardinal Bertrand du Pouget, who would be dispatched only a few months later as a papal legate to Lombardy, where he was supposed to bring local Ghibellines under control. He would spend the next thirteen years, until 1334, in Lombardy and the Romagna, trying with varying success to strengthen papal authority. The two other members of the panel were the pope's nephew, Cardinal Arnaud de Via, and Pierre Tessier, 'doctor in decretis' and abbot of Saint-Sernin in Toulouse, who both had been involved only a few years earlier in the trial of Hugues Géraud. That trial had been recorded by Gérard de Lalo, public notary in Avignon and papal chaplain, who was to fulfill the same task in recording the testimony of Bartolomeo Cagnolati. Moreover, Pierre Tessier and Gérard de Lalo had also taken part in other great affairs during the early years of John's pontificate.[10] Thus, the panel hearing Bartolomeo Cagnolati's testimony was staffed with experts in the domain of political trials with a magical bent.

In his deposition, Cagnolati stated that back in October 1319, he had been invited by Matteo Visconti to join him in Milan. They met in Matteo's private rooms, in the presence of his lieutenant Scoto of San Gimignano, who would be targeted as a heretic in 1322, and the Lombard physician Antonio Pelacane. According to the witness, Scoto revealed a small silver statuette of human shape that was identified on its front by the words 'Jacobus papa Johannes', an unmistakable reference to Jacques Duèse, alias John XXII. On the chest of the statue was a sign, which the witness would associate in the course in his interrogation with the planet Saturn, and a second name, 'Amaymon', seemingly referring to a demon. According to Bartolomeo Cagnolati, it was Matteo Visconti himself who expressed the desire to kill the pope by fumigating the statuette. Cagnolati would be interrogated a second time, on 11 September 1320, by the same panel (except for Bertrand du Pouget, who

9 Van Liere, 'Witchcraft as Political Tool?', pp. 169–70.

10 See S. Parent, *Dans les abysses de l'infidélité. Les procès contre les ennemis de l'Église en Italie au temps de Jean XXII (1316–1334)*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 361 (Rome, 2014), pp. 69–71. On Betrand du Pouget, see also P. Jugie, 'Un Quercynois à la cour pontificale d'Avignon: le cardinal Bertrand du Pouget (v. 1280–1352)', *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 26 (1991), 69–95.

had left Avignon for Lombardy), but for our purposes we do not need to follow this intrigue any further. We need only note that the Visconti faction had become aware of Cagnolati's contact with Avignon. After his first stay at the curia, he had returned to Milan, where he had been, according to his own words, seized and brought before Scoto of San Gimignano, who questioned him about his doings in Avignon. Unconvinced by his elusive answers, Scoto had him brutally tortured. At this point, another character entered the scene, Matteo's son Galeazzo, who allegedly requested Cagnolati's aid in manipulating the above-mentioned statuette. Bartolomeo seemingly agreed to Galeazzo's request, but, having gotten hold of the statuette, he took it to Avignon, where it was presented to the members of the panel. Bartolomeo Cagnolati's testimony was not used immediately, as the heresy trial against Matteo Visconti was not officially launched until a year later. But it must have served as a convenient case in point when it came to incriminating the lord of Milan.[11]

Accusations of magic and demonology were not only lodged against high-profile targets such as Matteo Visconti. During John's reign there were also what one might term mass trials against so-called rebels against the Church, particularly in the March of Ancona, a province under the jurisdiction of the pope where 'only a few communities escaped condemnation at a given time'.[12] Among the communities that did not escape was one called Recanati. The nine articles against the so-called heretics of Recanati presented on 6 March 1320 included the possession of an idol placed in the communal palace and containing a demon, which they worshiped, and the possession of another idol to whom they attributed all their military victories. Moreover, they were said to have burned at the stake a straw figure representing the local bishop.[13]

The examples above are taken from Sylvain Parent's seminal study of Pope John's judicial struggle against the 'enemies of the Church' in Italy. In his introduction, Parent states that conflicts with political power-holders, but also with more modest lay insurgents rebelling against the secular power of the Church, have all too often been considered within the framework of purely political history. Thus, their proper judicial dimension has been somewhat neglected, and not much attention has been paid, again according to Parent, to the profound unity of these procedures, be they in the north of Italy, which belonged to the German empire, in the Church's own patrimony,[14] or, as I intend to extend the analysis to cover here, in the German heartland itself.

11 For Bartolomeo Cagnolati's testimony, see Parent, *Dans les abysses*, pp. 69–82.
12 Ibid., p. 159.
13 Ibid., pp. 271–5.
14 Ibid., p. 9.

Disobedience against the Church as Heresy

The particularity of the judicial struggle between the king and the pope lies in the fact that what seem to have been basically political antagonisms were fought partly in religious terms, with accusations of heresy being a useful way of exerting pressure. The heresy in these cases was the 'heresy of disobedience', to quote a phrase used by Othmar Hageneder, who traced it back to the depositions of King Henry IV by Pope Gregory VII in 1076 and 1080, because of the monarch's refusal to obey the Church. The staple element of this heresy would come to be disdain for the binding power of the pope, as was the case in 1210 or 1211 when Innocent III became the first pope to threaten a German monarch, in this case Otto IV, with a charge of heresy for disregarding the papal anathema. The same argument was used by Gregory IX against Frederick II in 1239,[15] and, as we shall see, it was used again by John XXII against Louis of Bavaria, although it formed only a part of John's overall legal attack.

Before we come back to our initial point, which is the condemnation of Louis of Bavaria on 23 October 1327, let us first return to Matteo Visconti and consider his condemnation as a 'manifest heretic' on 14 March 1322, which preceded the anathematization of Louis of Bavaria by five and a half years.[16] Matteo was condemned *in contumacia*, as he had been summoned but failed to appear before his judges, thus demonstrating his disdain for the power of the Church. The long list of accusations leveled against him includes such charges as: causing material damage to the Church of Milan; abusing young girls in female monasteries;[17] capturing clergymen, even those of high rank (in this context, the name of Matteo's *satelles* – 'satellite' – Scoto of San Gimignano, whom we have also already encountered, is singled out in the verdict);[18] impeding the transfer of Church tithes to the apostolic camera; intercepting and opening papal correspondence; disturbing the peace in Lombardy;[19] ignoring sentences of excommunication (which amounted to disrespecting the Church's binding power); violating the interdict on numerous occasions;[20] impeding synods, councils, and chapter meetings (so that the clergy under Matteo's authority could not be visited or corrected, which allegedly resulted in the spread of heresies and the increased exposure of the souls of the faithful

15 O. Hageneder, 'Die Häresie des Ungehorsams und das Entstehen des hierokratischen Papsttums', *Römische historische Mitteilungen* 20 (1978), 29–47 (pp. 37–8, 43–4); see also Parent, *Dans les abysses*, pp. 19–20.

16 There is no modern edition of this source. I therefore refer to F. Ughelli, *Italia sacra sive de episcopis Italiae*, ed. N. Coleti, 10 vols. (Venice, 1717–22), IV, cols. 202–6.

17 Ibid., col. 204B.

18 Ibid., col. 204C.

19 Ibid., col. 204D.

20 Ibid., col. 205A.

to perdition);[21] expelling papal inquisitors from Milan;[22] calling 'for the liberation of a certain heretic named Maifreda' ('rogavit pro liberatione cujusdam haereticae Manfredae nomine'), who was to be burned soon afterwards;[23] and, last but not least, frequently invoking demons, whose servant Matteo had become and 'with whom he seemed to have entered a pact' ('cum quibus confoederationem fecisse videtur'). The purpose of Matteo's contact with the demons was to 'ask them for answers [to his questions] and guidance for his actions' ('quesivit ab eis responsiones et consilia in agendis'),[24] which implied that his doings were overseen by demons. By contrast, his alleged doctrinal error, which consisted of denying the corporal resurrection of the dead,[25] seems negligible.

And yet, Matteo's alleged collusion with demons itself seems to have been relatively unimportant among the accusations, and the case against him is certainly not built upon it. What actually stands out among the accusations is Matteo's disrespect for the Church, as shown by his refusal to comply with the citations of the ecclesiastical judges, which resulted in his condemnation *in contumacia*, and his deliberate ignoring of excommunication letters and the interdict. His 'disobedience' thus appears evident, all the more so as other charges include further signs of disrespect such as capturing clergymen, intercepting papal letters, and impeding Church assemblies.

Matteo Visconti eventually died in late June 1322, only about three months after his condemnation, and was buried in a secret location in order to avoid his corpse being burned by papal partisans. After Matteo's death, his firstborn son Galeazzo took over the lordship of Milan. By this time, however, he too had come under attack by the papacy. Having been summoned with his brothers on 13 January 1322 to appear before an inquisitorial court, he failed to do so and was likewise excommunicated *in contumacia* on 1 March.[26] We will not review all the details of the papal action against Galeazzo and his brothers,[27] but we will examine his condemnation as a 'manifest heretic' on

21 Ibid., col. 205B.

22 Ibid., col. 205C.

23 Ibid., col. 205C–D. On Sister Maifreda da Pirovano, the putative 'earthly vicar' of the deceased Guglielma of Bohemia identified as the Holy Spirit incarnate in the body of a woman, see B. Newman, 'The Heretic Saint: Guglielma of Bohemia, Milan, and Brunate', *Church History* 74 (2005), 1–38. Sister Maifreda was executed after a lengthy trial that came to an end in December 1300. As she happened to be a cousin of Matteo Visconti, her case had a political dimension that would be remembered in the proceedings against the Visconti two decades later. It is only through the trial against Matteo Visconti in 1322 that Maifreda's fate is known.

24 Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, ed. Coleti, IV, col. 205D.

25 Ibid.

26 L. Besozzi, 'I processi canonici contro Galeazzo Visconti', *Archivio storico lombardo* 107 (1981), 235–46 (p. 236).

27 On this action see Besozzi, 'I processi canonici'.

12 March 1323.[28] As in the case of his deceased father, Galeazzo's sentence rehearses in detail all the steps leading to his condemnation, that is, all the citations addressed to the defendant as well as the latter's failures to comply. As to the accusations leveled against Galeazzo Visconti, the majority of them seem simply to have been taken from the verdict against his late father, except for the invocation of demons and the alleged pact made with them. These charges are conspicuously absent, although Galeazzo had been mentioned back in 1320, as we have seen, in Bartolomeo Cagnolati's deposition as having requested Bartolomeo's aid in manipulating the famous statuette of John XXII. Moreover, among the charges brought forward against the Visconti during pre-trial depositions of witnesses, court officials stated that Galeazzo 'honors statues and consults idols' ('Quod colit statuas et consulit ydola').[29] It seems, however, that this allegation was dropped in the final verdict. The reason for this omission is unknown, but it is worth noting that already in the condemnation of Galeazzo's father, on which Galeazzo's own verdict seems modeled, the accusation of diabolism had played only a marginal role.

The Clash with Louis of Bavaria

Diabolism was not an issue at all in the trial against Louis of Bavaria, although this trial was closely interconnected with the Visconti affairs insofar as one of the reasons the German king-elect came into conflict with the pope was his support for the lords of Milan. Louis's 'lapse' occurred at the end of July 1323, four and a half months after Galeazzo Visconti's condemnation as a 'manifest heretic'. After his victory against Frederick the Fair at the battle of Mühldorf on 28 September 1322, Louis turned his attention to northern Italy, a part of the German empire on which the emperor's grasp was particularly weak. On 2 March 1323 he sent envoys to Italy who were empowered to install imperial vicars and other officials in Lombardy, Tuscany, and other imperial provinces. Heinz Thomas, the author of the most comprehensive biography of Louis of Bavaria, stated that Louis should have been aware that his envoys would come into conflict with the papal legate Bertrand du Pouget. This happened on 5 May 1323, when Louis's envoys met in Mantua with du Pouget's plenipotentiaries. The meeting must have been tense, as the Germans ordered local Ghibellines who were about to reconcile themselves with the Church to

[28] Ibid., pp. 241–5.

[29] Parent, *Dans les abysses*, pp. 278–80 (p. 280 n. 296). In the pre-trial hearings an accusation of idolatry was also leveled against Galeazzo's brother Marco, accused of having burned statues representing the pope, the papal legate (Bertrand du Pouget), and the bishop of Vercelli (p. 281 n. 310). In the case of Marco's brother Giovanni Visconti, the accusation of consulting demons was deemed 'not proven' ('Quod consulit demones non probatur') (p. 284 n. 332).

intervene in favor of Milan, which was at that time threatened by du Pouget's troops. The papal side reacted swiftly. On 7 June Louis's envoys were excommunicated, and only a fortnight later, on 20 June, they were condemned for supporting heretics. This did not hinder them from intervening openly on the battlefield. They and their troops entered the incompletely encircled city of Milan and, moreover, managed on 27 July 1323 to entice several hundred German and Flemish horsemen from du Pouget's army to change sides, so that du Pouget finally had to give up the siege.[30] What had looked like an imminent victory for the papal side had been thwarted by imperial interference.[31]

Besides Louis's so-called 'provocation' of John XXII in 1323 – and it is indeed very unlikely that the Bavarian's envoys would have acted without their master's instructions[32] – the core of the antagonism between Louis of Bavaria and Pope John was the struggle for political supremacy in northern Italy, in which the Visconti were also deeply entangled as one of the leading Ghibelline families. The roots of this antagonism extend back to the time of the death of the emperor Henry VII on 24 August 1313 and to the contentious double election of Frederick the Fair and Louis of Bavaria in 1314. In the wake of Henry VII's death, the perpetuity of the offices bestowed by the late emperor on his Ghibelline followers became a much debated issue. To give only one example, Matteo Visconti had been appointed to the imperial vicariate for Milan in 1311. Following his election in late summer 1316, Pope John XXII reinvigorated the doctrine of papal supremacy in the empire during any vacancy on the throne, and, arguing that the discordant election of 1314 had failed to produce a legitimate king, the pope insisted that the empire was technically still vacant. It would thus be his prerogative to install imperial vicars. The open clash with Matteo Visconti occurred precisely because of this question. Matteo had in fact renounced his title in 1317, but he was nevertheless accused by the pope of doing so only in pretense, maintaining effective political power in his hands.[33]

In April 1317, John issued the bull *Si fratrum*, in which he stipulated 'that since the disputed imperial election of 1314 had created a vacancy in the empire, the pope was obliged to assume its jurisdiction', and that 'the exercise of the imperial vicariate in Italy without papal authorization would be punishable by excommunication and temporal sanctions'.[34] This bull

30 H. Thomas, *Ludwig der Bayer (1282–1347). Kaiser und Ketzer* (Regensburg, 1993), pp. 133–7.

31 M. Kaufhold, *Gladius spiritualis. Das päpstliche Interdikt über Deutschland in der Regierungszeit Ludwigs des Bayern (1324–1347)*, Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte 6 (Heidelberg, 1994), p. 55.

32 Thomas, *Ludwig der Bayer*, pp. 133, 136.

33 Parent, *Dans les abysses*, pp. 45–8.

34 On *Si fratrum*, see also Kaufhold, *Gladius spiritualis*, pp. 52–3, and the edition in Monumenta Germaniae Historica [hereafter MGH] *Constitutiones* 5, ed. J. Schwalm (Hanover, 1909–13), pp. 340–1, no. 401.

has been characterized by Sharon Dale as 'a transparent attempt to expand papal temporal authority in Italy at the expense of the empire and Italian Ghibellines'.[35] Friedrich Baethgen, who in 1920 published a major study on the popes' claims to the imperial vicariate, described the use made by John XXII of these claims as a 'weapon'.[36] Indeed, the theory that the pope was entitled to assume imperial power in the case of an imperial vacancy had entered canon law through the decretals of Innocent III as early as 1210, but it was not until the end of the thirteenth century that the papacy made practical political use of it. Clement V referred to it, for example, when, after the emperor's death, he rescinded Henry VII's condemnation of King Robert of Naples for high treason.[37] However, it was John XXII who relied in an unprecedented way upon this theory in order to pursue his political agenda against the Italian Ghibellines and Louis of Bavaria.[38] On the ground, the task of implementing the pope's claims was entrusted to the cardinal-legate Bertrand du Pouget, 'who brought the confrontation directly to the Visconti',[39] who in turn were to be assisted in 1323 by Louis of Bavaria.

As Jürgen Miethke has argued, John XXII innovated in papal political doctrine insofar as he fused two earlier theories: the idea that the elected German king had to be acknowledged first by the pope, and the idea of the papal vicariate during a vacancy on the German throne.[40] Accordingly, John had abstained from acknowledging the legitimate kingship of either Frederick the Fair or Louis of Bavaria, treating them both as kings-elect ('electi'), a practice that angered Louis, especially after his victory at Mühldorf in 1322. After their first clash in Italy in summer 1323, when the intervention of the imperial envoys and their troops had thwarted papal victory against the Visconti,[41] John XXII hardened his position against Louis of Bavaria considerably, summoning him on 8 October 1323 to relinquish his royal title and to have his election reviewed and approved by the Holy See within three

35 S. Dale, '*Contra damnationis filios*: The Visconti in Fourteenth-Century Papal Diplomacy', *Journal of Medieval History* 33 (2007), 1–32 (p. 3).

36 F. Baethgen, 'Der Anspruch des Papsttums auf das Reichsvikariat. Untersuchungen zur Theorie und Praxis der *potestas indirecta in temporalibus*', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 41, Kan. Abt. 10 (1920), 168–268, reprinted in *Mediaevalia. Aufsätze, Nachrufe, Besprechungen*, Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 17/1 (Stuttgart, 1960), pp. 110–85 (pp. 168–9).

37 Baethgen, 'Der Anspruch des Papsttums', pp. 113–14, 159, 163–4. On the cancellation of Robert's condemnation, see also Kaufhold, *Gladius spiritualis*, p. 52.

38 Baethgen, 'Der Anspruch des Papsttums', p. 169.

39 Dale, '*Contra damnationis filios*', p. 3.

40 J. Miethke, 'Der Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern mit Papst und avignonesischer Kurie in seiner Bedeutung für die deutsche Geschichte', in *Kaiser Ludwig der Bayer. Konflikte, Weichenstellungen und Wahrnehmung seiner Herrschaft*, ed. H. Nehlsen and H.-G. Hermann, Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte Neue Folge 22 (Paderborn, 2002), pp. 39–74 (p. 54).

41 Kaufhold, *Gladius spiritualis*, p. 55.

months' time; otherwise he would be excommunicated and his followers would be placed under an interdict. Among the accusations leveled against Louis was his aid to Galeazzo Visconti and his brothers: in assisting them he proved himself, according to the papal side, a defender of condemned heretics.[42]

This summons was the opening step in a process that would ultimately lead to Louis's condemnation as a heretic four years later. As Louis of Bavaria did not follow John's injunction to relinquish his title, the pope first extended the initial deadline by two months,[43] and then excommunicated the monarch on 23 March 1324.[44] On 11 July 1324 Louis was stripped of all the rights he had acquired by his election as king back in 1314;[45] in other words, John XXII declared the royal election null and void. The consequence of this was, at least from the viewpoint of the papal curia, a real vacancy on the imperial throne which would pave the way for papal interference in imperial affairs. The pope threatened with excommunication all dignitaries in the empire who might consider aiding or supporting Louis in any way; likewise all cities and communities that might do the same were threatened with interdict. Each step by the pope was equated to a 'process' against Louis of Bavaria, beginning with the injunction of 8 October 1323 ('primus processus') and ending with the 'former' king's deposition on 11 July 1324 ('quartus processus').

Louis did not, however, suffer passively the pope's blows against him. He reacted by publishing a series of three so-called 'appeals' in which he tried to counter John's accusations,[46] the third of which would provide the pope with a key element for pressing heresy charges against the king. In the first 'appellacio' or 'protestacio', issued on 18 December 1323 in Nuremberg, Louis asserted his fidelity to the Church and his obedience to the pope. To defend himself against the pope's allegations, Louis stressed, among other things, that German kings had from time immemorial been invested solely by the prince-electors' vote ('Romanorum rex eo solum quod electus est a principibus electoribus, ad quos pertinet ipsius eleccio …, rex est et pro rege habetur et rex nominatur'). Louis also argued that he had been ruling as a king for ten years without any challenge to his election or his person. As to the accusation of assisting Galeazzo Visconti and his brothers, Louis claimed, rather unconvincingly, that he had been ignorant of their status as condemned heretics.[47] Whether this first appeal was even transmitted to the pope has

42 MGH *Constitutiones* 5, pp. 616–19, no. 792 (esp. p. 617, ll. 27–33: reference to Galeazzo Visconti and his brothers).

43 Ibid., pp. 653–5, no. 835.

44 Ibid., pp. 692–9, no. 881.

45 Ibid., pp. 779–88, no. 944.

46 The contacts between the curia, Louis of Bavaria, and other parties were much more intense than can be shown here; see for instance Kaufhold, *Gladius spiritualis*, pp. 55–75.

47 MGH *Constitutiones* 5, pp. 641–7 (esp. p. 644, ll. 41–4), no. 824.

been vigorously debated.[48] What is known for sure is that it had no impact whatsoever on John XXII's politics. The same applies to Louis's second appeal, issued in Frankfurt-on-Main only a few days later on 5 January 1324, which closely resembled the previous version.[49]

Louis's third appeal was published in Sachsenhausen (today a neighborhood of Frankfurt) on 22 May 1324, two months after his excommunication on 23 March of that year. This document is much more elaborate than the two previous appeals. It exists in two versions, one described by its editor, Jakob Schwalm, as being 'Franciscan' ('Forma prior a fratribus Minoribus concepta'),[50] and a second version that was, according to Schwalm, devised in the royal chancellery ('Forma posterior in cancellaria regia redacta'), to which we will refer here.[51] The two versions are very similar, the only notable difference being their structure. This applies in particular to an extensive digression on the highly controversial question of Christ's poverty, the so-called 'Minoritenexkurs' (Franciscan digression). In the first version, this digression is found (in its modern edition) in chapter 28 of the appeal,[52] whereas in the second version, it is in chapter 30. It can, however, easily be missed in this second version, as Jakob Schwalm did not include it in the text, merely making a cross-reference to the first version at the place where it should figure in the second.[53] We will come back to the 'Minoritenexkurs', as it was to provide a key argument for John XXII's condemnation of the German king as a heretic.

In this third appeal, Louis considerably hardened his tone against the pope, which is only too understandable, given the grudge Louis must have had against John XXII by this time. Right from the beginning of this appeal, the pope's authority is challenged, as John is addressed as 'so-called pope' ('contra Iohannem qui se dicit papam vicesimum secundum'). He is accused of being an 'enemy of the peace' ('inimicus pacis') and a 'sower of discords and propagator of weeds' ('sator discordiarum et seminator zizanie') who strives to stir up 'discords and scandals not only in Italy but also in Germany' by enticing prelates and princes into war against the empire and against 'Louis, the emperor elect' (which was technically incorrect, but certainly a politically desirable claim, as at this point Louis had 'only' been elected to the kingship).[54]

The pope's allegation that Louis had assisted condemned heretics, including the Visconti, is countered by the claim that John XXII had turned

48 On this debate, see Kaufhold, *Gladius spiritualis*, p. 60 and n. 237.
49 MGH *Constitutiones* 5, pp. 655–9, no. 836.
50 Ibid., pp. 723–44, no. 909.
51 Ibid., pp. 745–54, no. 910.
52 Ibid., pp. 732–41, no. 909.
53 Ibid., p. 752, no. 910.
54 Ibid., p. 745, ll. 11–17, no. 910.

'pious', 'innocent', 'just', and 'faithful' Catholics into heretics 'in the whole of Lombardy and in divers parts of Italy'. The political dimension of what Louis asserted were false charges made by the pope becomes patent when the appeal states that the alleged heretics were condemned as such solely because of their fidelity to the empire ('nulla alia causa obtenta, hoc ipso quod fideles sunt imperii').[55]

Besides the fact that Louis implicitly questioned the (temporal) power of the Church, reminding the pope that 'whatever liberty and honor was at this moment in the possession of the Church' had been 'magnificently' conferred upon Pope Sylvester by the emperor Constantine,[56] he also challenged the due course of the process ('which is rather to be called excess') against him, because of the 'absence of the *pars citata*', that is, because of his own absence at his excommunication. Louis thus claimed that he had not been summoned.[57]

The pope's intention to destroy the empire is a leitmotif that is reiterated over and over again in numerous variations. Moreover, Louis stressed the righteousness of his election 'in concordia',[58] which was constantly being challenged by the pope, who claimed that the throne was technically vacant due to the discordant election of 1314. In the course of his appeal, Louis went on to defend openly the Visconti and other Ghibelline lords in northern Italy,[59] thus confronting the papal position in every respect, whereas he had previously asserted that he had not had any knowledge of their condemnation. As to John XXII's claims to the imperial vicariate in the case of a vacancy on the throne, Louis considered them simply an act of usurpation.[60] The last challenge to John XXII was the Bavarian's appeal to a general council and an 'apostolic, catholic, and legitimate future pope'.[61]

The aims of the three *appellationes* have been widely debated. Were they conceived as genuine appeals against the pope to a general council, anticipating later conciliarist ideas? Were they defense-statements meant to prevent a judgment? Or were they simply imperial propaganda? Alois Schütz has opted for the second possibility, stating that the goal of these appeals was to discredit John XXII as an accuser and a judge. This argument depends on the appeals actually having been delivered to the pontiff, which cannot be proven, but must, according to Schütz, be assumed. In any case, Schütz continues, John XXII would not have acknowledged receiving the appeals.[62]

55 Ibid., pp. 745, ll. 28–35; p. 748, ll. 15–19, no. 910.
56 Ibid., p. 746, ll. 7–8, no. 910.
57 Ibid., p. 746, ll. 16–18, no. 910.
58 Ibid., p. 747, ll. 3–9, 10ff.; p. 751, ll. 10–13 (where the election of Frederick the Fair is disputed), no. 910.
59 Ibid., p. 749, l. 1, through p. 750, l. 2, no. 910.
60 Ibid., p. 752, ll. 15–20, no. 910.
61 Ibid., p. 753, ll. 6–15, no. 910.
62 A. Schütz, 'Die Appellationen Ludwigs des Bayern aus den Jahren 1323/24', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 80 (1972), 71–112 (pp. 72–3, 83–4, 99);

As to the thorny problem of the authority of a general council versus papal authority, Schütz argues that, when calling for a council, the imperial party had in mind some kind of an 'arbitrating body' ('Schiedsrichterkollegium'), rather than anticipating latter-day conciliarism.[63] This interpretation has been endorsed by Hans-Jürgen Becker, though he maintains that Louis of Bavaria himself would probably have considered the council to be superior to the pope.[64] Be that as it may, and without excluding other motivations, a propagandistic *raison d'être* for these appeals can hardly be denied. This is notably the case with the third appeal, which has been preserved in several copies and adopts a much harsher discursive tone than in the two preceding ones, intended for propagandistic effect.[65] John XXII, however, simply ignored the gauntlet thrown down before him and did not enter into an argument about his own legitimacy or about the call for a general council. On the contrary, after Louis's appeal in Sachsenhausen on 22 May 1324 the pope went on to depose him as German king on 11 July 1324. It was not until 1327 that the pontiff would mention a sealed document containing heretical views on the question of Christ's poverty[66] – an allusion to the digression in Louis's Sachsenhausen appeal, to which we will return below.

A Pyrrhic Victory

Citing Louis's deposition by John XXII and John's public silence on Louis's appeals, Alois Schütz describes the pope's victory as pyrrhic,[67] as the interdict imposed on Louis's supporters in the empire would not only disrupt religious life, but would also stir up political unrest in Germany for more than two decades until Louis's death in 1347.[68] This unrest may not have been John XXII's intention, but it was nevertheless a consequence of his politics, and the pope was himself very aware of this fact.[69] The least one can say is that he lacked what a modern observer has called an overall 'political program,

idem, 'Papsttum und römisches Königtum in den Jahren 1322–1324', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 96 (1976), 245–69.

63 Schütz, 'Die Appellationen', pp. 79–80.

64 H. J. Becker, *Die Appellation vom Papst an ein allgemeines Konzil. Historische Entwicklung und kanonistische Diskussion im späten Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit*, Forschungen zur kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte und zum Kirchenrecht 17 (Cologne, 1988), pp. 83–99 (p. 85 n. 64).

65 Ibid., pp. 86–7 ('eine schärfere, auf propagandistische Wirkung berechnete Sprache').

66 Ibid., pp. 94–5.

67 Schütz, 'Papsttum und römisches Königtum', p. 267.

68 The impact of the interdict on Louis's supporters in Germany has been discussed by Kaufhold, *Gladius spiritualis.*

69 R. E. Lerner, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (1972; rev. edn Notre Dame IN, 1991), p. 236.

and therefore also a strategy'.[70] It is not by accident that the Constance canon Henry of Diessenhofen, a staunch partisan of the papacy mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, severely criticized John XXII for causing troubles in Germany with his pointless 'processes' against Louis of Bavaria ('statum Alamanie perturbavit in suis processibus contra Ludewicum factis, qui tamen male servabantur').[71] These words stand out all the more, as they are the chronicler's own interpolation within a broader passage based on the Venetian historiographer Paulinus Minorita. These words were a real *cri de cœur*, as Henry of Diessenhofen, in his function as canon of the Constance cathedral chapter, both witnessed and also suffered from the disruptions caused by the interdict on the city. Whereas the bishop and the cathedral chapter remained faithful to the pope and tried to maintain the interdict, Constance's citizenry and a part of the local clergy opposed it vehemently.[72]

Louis of Bavaria tried to break the political deadlock through another intervention into the Italian peninsula, leading eventually to his coronation as emperor in Rome and to his condemnation as a heretic. Louis's first step towards his expedition to Rome (*Romzug*) was necessarily his reconciliation with his Habsburg rivals. Preparatory negotiations began in 1325 and resulted in early 1326 in the 'double kingship' of Louis of Bavaria and Frederick the Fair,[73] in which Frederick's role became increasingly eclipsed until his death on 13 January 1330. Thus Louis was free of other political entanglements for his expedition to Rome, which began in the winter of 1326/27. On 24 December 1326 he was still in Munich, but in mid-January 1327 he reached Trent. It is beyond our scope to rehearse Louis's entire *Romzug*, so we will only mention the principal stages, which were these: Como; Milan, where he was crowned with the Iron Crown of Lombardy on 31 May 1327; Viterbo; and Rome, where he arrived on 7 January 1328. Here he had himself acclaimed by the people and crowned emperor on 17 January, in a ceremony during which he was consecrated by three Italian bishops and crowned by 'four *syndici* of the Roman people', among them two senators and the city's prefect. Louis's confrontation with the papacy culminated in the deposition of John XXII on 18 April 1328 and the creation of the ephemeral anti-pope Nicolas V on 12 May 1328, who in exchange crowned his patron for the second time on 22

70 M. Kaufhold, 'Die Kurie und die Herausforderungen der europäischen Politik: Standardverfahren oder abgestimmte Handlungsstrategien?', in *Papst Johannes XXII. Konzepte und Verfahren seines Pontifikats. Freiburger Colloquium 2012*, ed. H.-J. Schmidt and M. Rohde, Scrinium Friburgense 32 (Berlin, 2014), pp. 263–77 (p. 276).

71 Huber, *Heinricus de Diessenhofen*, p. 16.

72 On Henry of Diessenhofen's passage and its context, see G. Modestin, 'Das Bild Johannes' XXII. in der süddeutschen Reichschronistik', in *Papst Johannes XXII.*, ed. Schmidt and Rohde, pp. 467–99 (pp. 467–70).

73 See A. Lhotsky, *Geschichte Österreichs seit der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts (1281–1358)*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte Österreichs 1 (Vienna, 1967), pp. 287–93.

May, the day of Pentecost, 1328.[74] However, the 'emperor's triumph was only apparent', to quote Francis Rapp, probably the foremost French specialist on medieval Germany.[75] By August 1328 Louis had to abandon Rome, leaving the Avignon papacy shaken but unbeaten.

The Final Stage: The Condemnation of Louis of Bavaria

It was in early April 1327 at the latest that John XXII became aware that the Bavarian had entered the Italian peninsula not only to consolidate his imperial rights, but above all to be crowned in Rome. On 3 April, he stripped Louis of all his fiefs, including the inherited duchy of Bavaria;[76] in addition, he summoned Louis to appear before him by 1 October.[77] Apart from unspecified 'grave excesses and execrable offenses' alleged against his opponent, John XXII now blamed Louis specifically for publishing a *libellus* containing the heretical view that 'Jesus and the apostles did not have any right to the things they owned apart from the *usus facti*' ('quod immo Christo et apostolis in rebus quas habuerunt nullum ius competiit, set [*sic*] tantummodo usus facti'),[78] a concept at the core of the discourse on Franciscan poverty.[79] The pope's words refer to the so-called 'Minoritenexkurs' in the Sachsenhausen appeal of 1324, which resolutely adopts the Franciscan stance in the dispute on apostolic poverty that had poisoned relations between John XXII and the Franciscan order since at least 1322.[80] In the past, the authorship of the anonymous 'Minoritenexkurs' has been intensely debated, but based on simple chronology we can safely say that men like the Franciscans Michele of Cesena, Bonagrazia of Bergamo, and William of Ockham, or master Marsilius of Padua, who have all been considered as possible authors, are very unlikely to have been involved in this document. They attended the Bavarian's court

74 On Louis's expedition to Rome and the subsequent events, see the thorough study by F. Godthardt, *Marsilius von Padua und der Romzug Ludwig des Bayern. Politische Theorie und politisches Handeln*, Nova Mediaevalia, Quellen und Studien zum europäischen Mittelalter 6 (Göttingen, 2011).

75 F. Rapp, *Le Saint Empire romain germanique. D'Otton le Grand à Charles Quint* (Paris, 2003), p. 249.

76 MGH *Constitutiones* 6.1, ed. J. Schwalm (Hanover, 1914–27), pp. 178–84 no. 273.

77 Ibid., pp. 185–6, no. 274.

78 Ibid., p. 185, ll. 29–30, no. 274.

79 See for instance L. Duval-Arnould, 'Élaboration d'un document pontifical: Les travaux préparatoires à la constitution apostolique *Cum inter nonnullos* (13 novembre 1323)', in *Aux origines de l'État moderne. Le fonctionnement administrative de la papauté d'Avignon. Actes de la table ronde d'Avignon (23–24 janvier 1988)*, Publications de l'École française de Rome 138 (Rome, 1990), pp. 385–409 (p. 388).

80 See Duval-Arnould, 'Élaboration d'un document pontifical'. On other political ramifications arising from papal opposition to Franciscan poverty, see the essay by Elizabeth Casteen in this volume.

only in 1326 (Marsilius of Padua) or in September 1328 (the Franciscans).[81] Eva Luise Wittneben has come to the conclusion that the 'Minoritenexkurs' was compiled in the imperial chancellery on the basis of various Franciscan writings, partly in a Spiritualistic vein.[82] In this 'Franciscan digression', the pope is directly attacked, not only as a heretic, but also as a 'heresiarcha' and 'hereticus perfectus',[83] that is, a leader of heretics, which suits well the confrontational tone of the Sachsenhausen appeal.

The other reproaches voiced by John XXII against Louis in the citation on 3 April 1327 were the admission of Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun to his court, the violation of the papal interdict, and the 'solemnization' of an incestuous union. In connection to the first point, the admission of Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun, the pope mentions a 'book … not free from errors, but full of divers heresies'.[84] This is an allusion to Marsilius's *Defensor pacis*, but a discussion of this work is beyond the scope of this essay.[85] Let us simply add that by 3 April 1327 the information that Marsilius was in Louis's company in Trent, where the Germans had arrived in mid-January, had reached the curia in Avignon. Concerning the condemned union that Louis is said to have publicly solemnized, the pope accused the Bavarian of 'giving' to his second-born son a 'noble girl' related to him in a 'prohibited degree of consanguinity' without dispensation, thus showing his contempt for canon law. This alludes to the planned marriage of Louis's son Stephen II, duke of Bavaria, to Elizabeth, daughter of the Habsburg king Frederick the Fair. This dynastic union, arranged in 1325, was intended to seal the reconciliation between the two rival kings, but the plan was later abandoned.[86] The potential spouses were indeed related, as their common great-grandfather was King Rudolf I of Habsburg. Six days after the citation of 3 April 1327, on 9 April, the pope admonished Louis to leave Italy,[87] but to no avail.

81 Godthardt, *Marsilius von Padua*, pp. 79–88; A. Schütz, 'Der Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern gegen Papst Johannes XXII. und die Rolle der Gelehrten am Münchner Hof', in *Wittelsbach und Bayern I/1: Die Zeit der frühen Herzöge. Von Otto I. zu Ludwig von Bayern. Beiträge zur Bayerischen Geschichte und Kunst*, ed. H. Glaser (Munich, 1980), pp. 388–97 (pp. 391–2), and Schütz, 'Ludwig der Bayer', p. 338.

82 E. L. Wittneben, *Bonagratia von Bergamo. Franziskanerjurist und Wortführer seines Ordens im Streit mit Papst Johannes XXII.*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 90 (Leiden, 2003), pp. 229–53.

83 MGH *Constitutiones* 5, p. 734, l. 14, no. 909.

84 MGH *Constitutiones* 6.1, p. 186, ll. 5–6, no. 274.

85 On Marsilius of Padua and the *Defensor pacis*, see for instance Godthardt, *Marsilius von Padua*; also *The World of Marsilius of Padua*, ed. G. Moreno-Riaño, Disputatio 5 (Turnhout, 2006), especially the contributions by Frank Godthardt, Thomas Turley, and Gabrielle Gonzales.

86 S. von Riezler, 'Stephan II., Herzog von Baiern', in *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* 36 (Leipzig, 1893), pp. 64–8 (pp. 64–5).

87 MGH *Constitutiones* 6.1, pp. 187–9, no. 275.

The end point of our account, the condemnation of Louis of Bavaria for heresy, occurred on 23 October 1327,[88] before Louis had even reached Rome. The main accusation voiced against him was linked to the 'Minoritenexkurs'. The 'father of lies', that is, the devil, is said to have blinded the reason of many, to the point that they publicly defend the condemned heresy of claiming that Christ and his apostles had only the simple *usus facti* of their belongings without any other right. This applied, according to the pope, also to 'Louis of Bavaria, some time ago elected in discord king of the Romans, as they say', who had published 'in his insanity' the condemned *libellus* asserting this error, and additionally asserting that holding the contrary position, that of John XXII, was itself heretical.[89] The second point of accusation was giving shelter to Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun, and permitting them to 'dogmatize' their errors and heresies in public. The condemnation of Louis thus replicated the citation of 3 April 1327. This also applies to the third point, the violation of the interdict, which was said to prove Louis's contempt for the Church's power of the keys.

Since Louis had disregarded the citation of 3 April 1327, he was considered contumacious, and he was declared, reproved and condemned as a heretic. As a consequence, he was stripped of all his possessions and rights whatsoever. All his vassals and all communities, cities, or villages were liberated from their oaths of allegiance; all alliances with him were dissolved. All dignitaries, ecclesiastical or secular, along with all communities and cities were forbidden to support Louis or provide him with any supplies. Those who violated this edict would be considered defenders and adherents of heretics.[90]

Conclusion

The process leading to the condemnation of Louis of Bavaria lasted four years. The condemnation concurred with Louis's advance towards Rome, but preceded the Bavarian's most spectacular attacks against John XXII, the deposition of the pope, and the creation of an anti-pope. The condemnation rested upon three points: the question of apostolic poverty, harboring Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun, and the violation of the interdict. Concerning

88 Ibid., pp. 264–8, no. 361.

89 Ibid., p. 265, ll. 12–17, 25–34, no. 361.

90 This sentence was fixed to the door of the cathedral of Avignon and proclaimed publicly, a practice that raises the question of how information of this kind was effectively communicated to the principal addressee. This question is beyond the scope of this paper, but it is worth raising, as Louis and his partisans tried to impede the publication of papal letters; see for instance M. Kaufhold, 'Öffentlichkeit im politischen Konflikt: Die Publikation der kurialen Prozesse gegen Ludwig den Bayern in Salzburg', *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 22 (1995), 435–54. On the situation in Italy, see Parent, *Dans les abysses*, pp. 535–619.

the shelter given to the two fugitives, Marsilius was conveniently condemned in the constitution *Licet iuxta doctrinam* on 23 October 1327,[91] exactly the same day Louis of Bavaria was also condemned. As to the question of apostolic poverty, Louis's condemnation as a heretic referred to the constitutions *Cum inter nonnullos* (12 November 1323), in which the opinion asserting that Christ and the apostles possessed nothing was dismissed as heretical, and *Quia quorundam* (10 November 1324), in which the detractors of *Cum inter nonnullos* were reproved. The condemnation of Louis of Bavaria thus rested on solid doctrinal grounds that had been built by John XXII himself. The third point comes closest to what has been termed the 'heresy of disobedience', as the violation of the interdict was equated with evident contempt for the power of the Church: 'from which things he was vehemently presumed to be – rather, indeed, he was convicted of being – someone who openly holds the keys of the holy church of God in contempt' ('ex quibus vehementer presumebatur, immo convincebatur potius clavium ecclesie sancte Dei evidenter contemptor existere').[92] But, although the 'contempt' for the Church was included among the reasons for Louis's condemnation, it was not as central as one might assume.

It is also worth noting that no mention was made of an earlier charge, the support for the condemned Visconti, which may have seemed too blatantly political. Nor was there any mention of harmful magic and the conjuring of spirits, unlike in other (Italian) cases, the most famous again being the trial against the Visconti. It seems that no one thought to bring such an accusation forward against the German monarch. In a protracted political struggle over influence and power in northern Italy that had turned into a generalized dispute over mutual rights between the papacy and the empire, the final arguments against the contested emperor were perhaps less overtly political than one might expect, although political elements of course remained. Apart from the contempt for the binding power of the Church ascribed to Louis – a charge that may be termed political indeed – he was accused of fostering heretics and spreading heretical errors. Whereas the condemned theses of Marsilius's *Defensor pacis* were central to the question of power relations between the pope and the emperor,[93] the problem of Christ's possessions was not. One may ask why Louis had meddled in this thorny question in the first place, which was first and foremost a Franciscan concern[94] – all the more so

91 See T. Turley, 'The Impact of Marsilius: Papalist Responses to the *Defensor pacis*', in *World of Marsilius*, ed. Moreno-Riaño, pp. 47–64.

92 MGH *Constitutiones* 6.1, pp. 266, ll. 16–17, no. 361.

93 See for instance the contributions of Floriano Jonas Cesar and Bettina Koch in *World of Marsilius*, ed. Moreno-Riaño.

94 Schütz, 'Die Appellationen', pp. 93–7, has suggested that the 'Minoritenexkurs' might have been inserted into the Sachsenhausen appeal at the personal initiative of the imperial proto-notary Ulrich Wild. Wittneben, *Bonagratia von Bergamo*, pp. 230–1, underlines the importance of Ulrich Wild in the redaction of the Sachsenhausen appeal, yet

as the Franciscan refugees reached his court only in September 1328, in other words, more than four years after the publication of the Sachsenhausen appeal with the famous digression on apostolic poverty. Alois Schütz has argued that the accusation of heresy directed at John XXII in the 'Minoritenexkurs' aimed at contesting the pope's 'canonical jurisdiction' (*iurisdictio canonica*) and sought to lure him into convening a general council for arbitration.[95] If this was the plan, it failed, as John XXII did not think of stepping into the trap and convening a general council. Instead, he unswervingly pursued the struggle against his enemy, adopting one measure after the other.[96]

without implying that the notary could have added a lengthy passage to the text without the knowledge of his master.

95 Schütz, 'Die Appellationen', pp. 91–2, 97.

96 Miethke, 'Der Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern', p. 56.

5

Unusual Choices: The Unique Heresy of Limoux Negre*

Louisa A. Burnham

The word 'heresy' literally means choice. Instead of accepting the received wisdom of the Church, the heretic has chosen an alternate path. As Robert Grosseteste famously stated, 'heresy is an opinion chosen by human perception contrary to Holy Scripture, publicly avowed and obstinately defended'.[1]

While every heretic ultimately makes an individual choice, historians have privileged the study of movements, frequently led by charismatic individuals. Valdes of Lyon, Peter John Olivi, John Wyclif, and Jan Hus all made unorthodox choices in Biblical and theological interpretation, and the Poor Men of Lyon, Beguins, Lollards, and Hussites joined them in their ideological rebellions against the Church.[2] Our understanding of late medieval heresy is incomplete, however, if we do not allow space for the lone individual who made heretical choices on his or her own, choices that may not have resulted in the creation of a movement. Because it was not possible for the inquisitors who questioned and judged them to place them into pre-existing categories, the documentation for such people can be more ample than is common for members of movements. These so-called 'normal exceptions' of microhistory present rewarding opportunities to explore the

* This essay emerges from my larger project focused on Limoux Negre. My planned monograph will explore all of the tenets expressed in his testimony and use several different lenses to shed light on Limoux, his choices, and the society around him. I would like to thank the many participants in sessions and talks at the International Congress on Medieval Studies at Kalamazoo, the annual meeting of the American Society for Church History, the Carol Rifelj Faculty Lecture Series at Middlebury College, Yale University, Marist College, the Vermont Medieval Colloquium, the International Virtual Seminar sponsored by the University of Bristol, the Sewanee Medieval Colloquium, and the University of Rochester who have helped me to refine my approaches to Limoux.

1 See, for instance, A. Roach, *The Devil's World: Heresy and Society 1100–1300* (Harlow, 2005), pp. 1–2, and J. Kolpacoff Deane, *A History of Medieval Heresy and Inquisition* (Lanham MD, 2011), pp. 2–4.

2 For example, see elsewhere in this volume Sylvain Piron's essay on Peter John Olivi's 'best disciple'.

motivations and inspirations of all those whose individual choices might otherwise be lost to history.[3]

Limoux Negre (Limosus Nigri) is an example of this second kind of choice-maker. When he had appeared in Bishop Bartomieu's court in Alet-les-Bains in April 1326, summoned to answer questions about the sacraments and most especially the Eucharist, the bishop at first dismissed him, referring to his statements as mere 'stories' (*fabulas*).[4] The content of his testimony is indeed highly original, with fantastical imagery and unusual rejections of orthodox doctrine. Someone denounced him a second time, however, and the bishop of Alet sent Limoux to the inquisitors of Carcassonne, Jean Duprat and Henri de Chamayou,[5] who questioned him over a period of approximately three years before burning him as a 'pertinacious and obstinate heretic' in Carcassonne on 10 September 1329. He did not recant. The sole document we have about Limoux is the three thousand-word *culpa* (fault), which would have been redacted from his testimony in order to be read at the General Sermon where he was sentenced. It survives in Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Doat 27, fols. 216r–225r, a seventeenth-century transcription of register GGG of the Carcassonne inquisition.[6]

The material presented in any *culpa* is far from a transcript of the interrogation, deposition or testimony of the accused. The prisoner was interrogated in the vernacular, notes were taken in Latin, and the original full record of the deposition was written in Latin.[7] Since the *culpa* had to be read aloud in public after being orally re-translated back into the vernacular, the longer

3 Edward Muir's introduction ('Observing Trifles') to *Microhistory and the Lost Peoples of Europe*, ed. Muir and G. Ruggiero (Baltimore, 1991), pp. vii–xxviii, is a useful entry point to the genre of microhistory. More recently, a series of workshops at Duke University in November 2015 produced a themed issue of the *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 47:1 (January 2017) which explores the continued development and value of the microhistorical approach.

4 Bartomieu, abbot of the monastery of St Mary of Alet, was made bishop of the newly created diocese of Alet on 1 March 1318 and lived until 1333. He appears to have been a trusted member of the papal entourage, as Pope John XXII sent him in 1324 on an important mission to Gediminas, the pagan king of Lithuania who was believed to be prepared to convert to Catholic Christianity. Given the immediate and embarrassing failure of that mission, it is likely that he would have returned to Languedoc by April 1326. 'Letters of Gediminas', *Lituanus: Lithuanian Quarterly Journal of Arts and Sciences* 15 (1969), 7–46.

5 See L. Albaret, 'Pierre Brun (1324–1342) et Jean Duprat (1324–1328), une collaboration efficace', in *Les Inquisiteurs. Portraits de défenseurs de la foi en Languedoc (XIII^{e}–XIV^{e} siècles)*, ed. Albaret (Toulouse, 2001), pp. 145–51.

6 His sentence appears at fols. 234r–235v. Jean Duvernoy's transcription of this register is available online at http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/GGG.pdf. References here are to the Doat foliation, which is also indicated in Duvernoy's transcription.

7 Examples of more complete inquisitorial sources with notes from individual sessions of interrogation include those in the Jacques Fournier register: *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (1318–1325)*, ed. J. Duvernoy, 3 vols. (Toulouse, 1965).

record was abbreviated so as to include only the most important facts. With few exceptions, the *culpae* included in the two extant registers (DDD and GGG) of the fourteenth-century Carcassonne inquisition are short, usually only a few hundred words.[8]

Limoux's Latin *culpa* has been redacted even more thoroughly than most, clearly with a view toward a tight thematic organization. A brief narrative giving his name along with the date and circumstances of his capture and deposition is followed by the stories themselves. They first follow the order of the clauses of the Apostle's Creed (creation, incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, descent into hell, Last Judgment, resurrection of the dead), and then five of the sacraments of the Church (baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, confession, marriage). The *culpa* ends with an account of Limoux's revelation and the exposure of his heresy, and a few other topics that appear not to have fit into the taxonomy of the creed and the sacraments: the Pater Noster, the nature of the Church, and the priesthood, for example. Because of the redacted nature of this particular *culpa*, it is impossible for us to know with any certainty the manner and order in which Limoux's interrogation and testimony before inquisitors and scribes had proceeded.

Inquisitorial sources can be extraordinarily rich but also difficult to interpret. Relations of power between interrogator and interrogated are complex. While an inquisitor might ask leading questions or put pressure to confess on those suspected of heresy, the imprisoned had a different kind of power with which they could shape their own narratives and hide information or dissemble.[9] It is not always easy or possible to sort out fact from fiction, and the interrogated may also have been misunderstood or misrepresented in the texts.[10] Nevertheless, his testimony before the inquisitors of Carcassonne is all we have of Limoux.

The contradictory and interwoven nature of Limoux's stories makes the task of interpretation even more difficult. His stories can be impossible to reconcile: Jesus was both too good for the foulness and rottenness of the created world (fol. 217v) and an adulterer and murderer whose death on the cross was penance for his sins (fol. 218r). The soul was nothing more than 'wind or air' (fol. 217r), but God had also created souls in order that they might pass from body to body to receive new bodies on the Day of

8 The transcription of Register DDD is Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Doat 28. The original notary for both registers was Mennetus of Robécourt, who had a long career at the inquisitorial tribunal of Carcassonne. J.-M. Vidal, 'Menet de Robécourt, commissaire de l'Inquisition de Carcassonne (1320–1340)', *Le Moyen Âge* 16 (1903), 425–49.

9 See, for example, N. Z. Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford CA, 1990), and J. H. Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia, 2001).

10 L. Boyle, 'Montaillou Revisited: Mentalité and Methodology', in *Pathways to Medieval Peasants*, ed. J. A. Raftis, Papers in Mediaeval Studies 2 (Toronto, 1981), pp. 119–40, and M. G. Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels*: *The Great Inquisition of 1245–1246* (Princeton, 2001).

Judgment (fol. 220r–v). Mary was nearly synonymous with chastity itself in Limoux's account of creation (fol. 216v), but he also rejected the idea that any woman (specifically including Mary) could remain a virgin in the world (fol. 218r). It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that what he said was not just confusing but also confused. His stories were not consistent and do not depict a completely coherent ideology.

We also know little about Limoux himself. He told the inquisitors that he was sixty years old. Since at least as early as 1315, he had been living in Saint-Paul-de-Fenouillet, a small town on the border between France and Roussillon, forty kilometers from Perpignan. The inquisitors identified him only as a *habitator* of Saint-Paul, so it is probable that he was from elsewhere; his given name, Limosus, may indicate that he was a native of the town of Limoux just south of Carcassonne.[11] We do not know where he lived before 1315. His occupation is unspecified.[12]

Limoux was an unusual heretic in many ways. Unlike many other heretical choices, his were not founded on alternative Biblical interpretations, but were imaginative attempts to answer his own questions about Christian belief and practice. Dissatisfied with the Church's explanation of the incarnation as a miraculous conception, for instance, Limoux posited a kind of artificial insemination with a donor egg. The resurrection was an entirely natural event. The idea that the Eucharist was the body and blood of Christ was based on a misunderstanding. In every case, Limoux believed that the Church had invented orthodox doctrine in order to control Christians. He wished to escape that control and choose for himself.

It is nevertheless possible to find antecedents and suggest inspiration for some of Limoux's ideas. Anti-clericalism was an idea common to many heretical groups. Scholars have found other evidence of skepticism and materialism.[13] Limoux may have heard Cathar preachers or spoken with

[11] It was not unusual to name children after their towns or villages. In a 1246 list of 156 inhabitants of Limoux judged guilty of heresy, two were named Limosus. J.-L. Abbé, 'La société urbaine languedocienne et le catharisme au XIII^{e} siècle, le cas de Limoux', in *Religion et société urbaines au moyen âge: Études offertes à Jean-Louis Biget par ses anciens élèves*, ed. P. Boucheron and J. Chiffoleau (Paris, 2000), pp. 119–39 (pp. 133–4).

[12] Given the content of his testimony, we would especially like to know if he was university-educated. Though on fol. 185r in the consultation before the Sermon, the Doat text reads 'super culpa Limosi *Magistri* de Sancto Paulio', in every other location, the Doat text is clearly 'Limosus Nigri' or 'Negri'. There is another confusion of the two words in the same register: at the General Sermon of 11 November 1328, a deceased man called 'Guillelmus Stephani Magistri de Laurano' in the listing of his crimes on fol. 101r is called 'Stephanus Nigri de Laurano' on fol. 105v and 'Guillelmus Stephani Nigri de Laurano' on fol. 107r in his actual sentence. Whether the two misreadings occurred in the original register GGG or in the Doat scribes' transcription is impossible to know. In any event, when *magister* is an honorific denoting a notary or lawyer, for instance, it precedes the name rather than follows it (as 'magister Mennetus' the notary throughout).

[13] S. Reynolds, 'Social Mentalities and the Cases of Medieval Scepticism', *Transactions*

Cathar believers. There are also indications that Limoux had worked in alchemy, possibly inspiring some of his most unusual assertions. He himself, however, claimed mystical authority.

Limoux told the inquisitors that his ideas had come to him through revelation. In Lent of 1315 (he would have been forty-nine years old), he had decided to fast for forty days and forty nights and retired to the cave now known as the hermitage of Saint Antoine de Galamus in a nearby mountain, taking nothing with him to eat. Despite his resolve, he left the cave after only ten days, returned to Saint-Paul, and broke his fast. 'In that very hour', he testified, God placed in his heart 'this understanding that now he asserts that he has, this subtlety and this philosophy', which he then felt compelled to share with others.[14] No one else appears to have shared these beliefs, and some of his relatives and neighbors attempted to persuade him to renounce or hide them, but after eleven years, someone denounced him to the bishop and he was brought to Alet-les-Bains. At the end of his three years of incarceration, 'he did not wish to turn away from the aforesaid errors, but pertinaciously defended all of them'.[15]

The rest of this essay examines the ideas and possible inspiration for three of Limoux Negre's stories: the incarnation and nature of Jesus, creation, and resurrection. Together they highlight several of the most important means through which Limoux came to his unusual conclusions: a rejection of miracles, observation and deduction, imaginative invention in order to explain the unexplainable, and a learned but non-theological pursuit, alchemy.

Incarnation

Limoux did not accept the miraculous nature of the incarnation, and his account of it showcases his desire to find practical, physical ways to explain those things that the Church taught as mysteries:

> Gabriel received a small quantity of grain or human seed, and he made a cut in the belly of the blessed Mary, and had the human seed placed in

of the Royal Historical Society 6th s. 1 (1991), 21–41 (pp. 39–40); W. L. Wakefield, 'Some Unorthodox Popular Ideas of the Thirteenth Century', *Medievalia et Humanistica: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture* 4 (1973), 25–35 (p. 33); A. Murray, '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 D. Baker (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 83–106; idem, 'The Epicureans', in *Intellectuals and Writers in Fourteenth-Century Europe: The J. A. W. Bennett Memorial Lectures (Perugia, 1984)*, ed. P. Boitani and A. Tori (Tübingen, 1986), pp. 138–63.

14 Doat 27, fols. 223v–224r. It seems unlikely that this was a case of the 'ecstasy defense' proposed in R. E. Lerner, 'Ecstatic Dissent', *Speculum* 67 (1992), 33–57.

15 Doat 27, fol. 224v.

> it, and also the oil from some woman who was the sister, or some kind of relative of the blessed Mary, and out of this seed and this oil, the blessed Mary conceived this son.[16]

Limoux first asserted that Jesus was not the son of God in any way other than he himself was: 'all men could be said to be the sons of God since they were made out of his power'.[17] Jesus, he proclaimed, was sent to the earth by the sun and the moon and born from corruption, as was everyone else.[18]

Moreover, he told the inquisitors that he did not believe Jesus to be the son of God and did not believe that Mary had conceived through the overshadowing of the archangel Gabriel. The Church had deliberately invented the doctrine of the Annunciation in order to deceive the faithful. And yet, if Mary was a being not quite like any other, above the world of corruption (a belief we shall see in his account of creation below), a special technology was needed.

His explanation describes a process somewhat similar to modern artificial insemination. Limoux claimed it was on the orders of Gabriel that human seed (*grani seu seminis humani*) and some oil (*oleum*) from Mary's sister or relative were taken and a hole was cut in Mary's abdomen whence they were deposited in her womb (the passive voice is in the original). It was from this donor oil and human seed that Jesus was conceived. In modern terms, Mary was a gestational surrogate mother.

Though the topic of Jesus's conception was not unknown, it is difficult to see where Limoux might have derived such an elaborate explanation. Many thirteenth-century theologians discussed the physiology of the incarnation, so-called 'extraordinary generation'.[19] These explanations began with the orthodox assumptions that Mary was a virgin and conceived from the Holy Spirit, and that Jesus was truly human and she was his mother. Influenced by Aristotle and/or Galen, they debated whether or not Mary contributed 'seed' to Jesus's conception, as well as what physical matter Mary contributed to the development of Jesus's body in the womb. To use Maaike van der Lugt's apt term, they were studying 'divine embryology'.

The theologians did discuss the possibility of another kind of artificial insemination, demonic generation, which they suggested in cases like those of Old Testament giants, demons and Merlin. In the middle of the thirteenth century, for example, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas agreed that *incubi* might be responsible for impregnating women with human seed by means of copulation. They speculated that an *incubus* might acquire

16 Ibid., fol. 218v.
17 Ibid., fol. 217v.
18 Ibid., fol. 217r–v.
19 M. van der Lugt, *Le ver, le démon et la Vierge: Les théories médiévales de la génération extraordinaire* (Paris, 2004). Van der Lugt's discussion of Christ's virginal conception constitutes the third part of her monograph, pp. 371–452.

the seed either by harvesting the product of masturbation or nocturnal emissions, or by previously having seduced men in the form of a *succubus*.[20] Caesarius of Heisterbach, Thomas of Cantimpré, and Giovanni Balbi each also related versions of these theological positions in their more popular but still learned texts.[21] In all cases, however, the mechanism of impregnation was intercourse with a demon. Limoux's belief that it was a benign figure, Gabriel, who placed both male and female seed in a surgical cut in Mary's side without any kind of sexual activity appears to have been his own invention.

For Limoux, the story of the virgin birth was a cover-up to make Church law and the Church's control over Christians more palatable to mankind. Church leaders had decided that people were more likely to obey the Church if they thought that Jesus had miraculously been born of a virgin, that he was both God and man, and that he had died for the redemption of sins. But Limoux declared that all of that was a lie: 'the Scriptures that say this are false and fiction and completely made up and invented'.[22]

What might have led Limoux to such unusual conclusions? It was not encounters with other local heretics, for the local Cathars maintained that Jesus was pure spirit, in no way conceived by Mary.[23] Limoux rejected the very idea of miracles and knew that conception was ordinarily the result of sexual intercourse.[24] But if Mary were chaste and abstinent, natural conception would be impossible. His logical and inventive mind thus imagined an adroitly engineered scenario where Gabriel harvested male 'seed' and female 'oil' from others and placed them inside Mary's womb, thus anticipating modern reproductive technology by many hundreds of years. By observing, pondering and inventing, he came to his conclusion: Jesus, like everyone else, was created from corruption. Jesus could only be called the son of God 'because we are all sons of God'.[25]

20 Ibid., pp. 273–9, and see the helpful chart on p. 280.

21 Ibid., pp. 285–91.

22 Doat 27, fol. 218v.

23 Scholars continue to debate the use of 'Cathar' to describe dualist heretics in Languedoc in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (and some deny the existence of any such heresy). As a matter of convenience, I use the word Cathar here to denote the dualist beliefs described by the men and women who testified before bishop Jacques Fournier in Pamiers and the inquisitorial tribunals of Carcassonne and Toulouse at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Their testimonies attest to the existence of a group of clandestine preachers who crisscrossed the Pyrenees, ministering to a loose network of followers. For the debate, see *Cathars in Question*, ed. A. Sennis (York, 2016), and for a summary of these beliefs see M. Lambert, *The Cathars* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 250–5.

24 Van der Lugt, *Le ver, le démon et la Vierge*, p. 421. For common and learned medieval assumptions about conception see M. Green, *The Trotula: A Medieval Compendium of Women's Medicine* (Philadelphia, 2001), pp. 84–5; also J. Cadden, 'Western Medicine and Natural Philosophy' and J. Salisbury, 'Gendered Sexuality', both in *Handbook of Medieval Sexuality*, ed. V. L. Bullough and J. A. Brundage (New York, 1996), pp. 51–80, 81–102.

25 Doat 27, fol. 219r.

Creation

If Limoux's explanation of the incarnation is unusually creative, his complicated and heterodox account of creation is even more so:

> Then he said that the sun and the moon urinated, and that this urine was congealed on the earth, such that the earth out of this urine and from corruption was made.

Though Limoux calls God the 'creator of all', he actually sets up a chain whereby each set of created beings creates the next: God first created archangels, the archangels created angels and the Virgin Mary by the power they had received from God, and the angels then created 'abstinence and chastity'. Beneath abstinence and chastity were the sun and the moon.

Limoux said that, along with everything below them (air, earth, and lesser beings), the sun and the moon could be called feminine and were thus corruptible and created from corruption or rottenness.[26] That the physical world is corruptible is clear from the means of its creation; the sun and the moon urinated, and their urine coagulated into earth so that the earth was also made out of corruption. Adam and Eve were also created by the power of the sun and the moon, and not by God at all, since God had never made anything sinful.

He further declared that neither Adam nor Eve nor anyone else had a soul, for the soul is nothing more than wind or air. It is the power of the sun and the moon that makes people speak and animals 'moo' (*mugire*). Calling this wind 'soul' is another example of the Church's fraud, like the story of the incarnation: if people knew the truth, 'they would be more inclined to do evil'.[27]

In short, the entirety of 'creation' is two-fold: a pure upper realm created ultimately by God separated from a lower realm made of corruption in the form of the sun and moon's commingled and coagulated urine. There is a division between purity and corruption, good and evil.

Such a sharp divide between good and evil makes one think of Cathar ideology. Such influence is certainly possible. Limoux's town, Saint-Paul-de-Fenouillet, is located in a region of Pyrenean passages from east to west and north to south, and the preachers of the late Cathar revival passed through there in the early years of the fourteenth century. The Cathar preacher Felip of Alayrac was recaptured in the Fenouillèdes in 1309 after an escape.[28] Cathar

[26] As noted above, Limoux's testimony contains inconsistencies. Here (as in many other places in his *culpa*), feminine has negative connotations, even if Mary does not appear to be counted as feminine. Elsewhere, however, he describes her as part of the corrupt world.

[27] Doat 27, fols. 216r–217r.

[28] *Registre d'inquisition*, ed. Duvernoy, III, 160.

shepherds like the Maury brothers of Montaillou passed through with their flocks and on several occasions wintered their sheep in a valley close to Saint-Paul.[29] Cathar beliefs were also a matter of public discussion locally. In 1308, one of the Maury brothers, Peire, was twice summoned to the main square of Saint-Paul-de-Fenouillet by the procurator of the archbishop of Narbonne to answer charges of heresy.[30] These were public events: the lord of the town and the bailiff were sitting with the procurator in judgment. Though Peire managed on that occasion to acquit himself of any trouble (he was well known to both the lord and the bailiff), his deposition before Bishop Jacques Fournier of Pamiers reveals him to have been an ardent and knowledgeable Cathar believer who had heard and remembered many sermons given by Cathar preachers.[31] Limoux may have been living in Saint-Paul in these years before the time of his mystical revelations in 1315, and thus would have had every opportunity to learn about at least some aspects of Cathar theology.

The Cathar accounts of creation preached in the region involve a divide between spiritual and physical realms, the spiritual created by God and the physical created by Lucifer, the devil.[32] Those accounts appear almost mythological in nature, involving seven heavens made of glass, an alluring woman brought by Lucifer to tempt the angels, and a hole created in one of the heavens allowing angels to escape in order to become mere men, only to be stopped by God placing his toe into the hole.[33] But Limoux's account is stranger still, with earthy details like that of the coagulating urine that appear nowhere else.

Urine that congeals is a striking image, especially since it is not the usual behavior of urine to coagulate. Urine can, however, coagulate in particular circumstances: protein in urine will solidify when heated. This condition is called proteinuria and is a symptom of a number of medical disorders ranging from acute nephritis (malfunction of the kidneys) to pre-eclampsia and eclampsia among pregnant women. The proteins are technically called albumin, and are similar to the albumen that comprises the white of an egg.[34]

29 Peire spent three winters in the Fenouillèdes. *Registre d'inquisition*, ed. Duvernoy, III, 159–60; also II, 505 (for Johan); E. Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou: The Promised Land of Error*, trans. B. Bray (New York, 1979), pp. 91–2.

30 *Registre d'inquisition*, ed. Duvernoy, III, 160.

31 Ibid., III, 110–252. Peire's own deposition is usefully supplemented by that of his brother Johan (II, 441–519), the notary Arnau Sicre (II, 20–81), and Peire's one-time employer Sibilla Peire (II, 403–29), all of which relate similar stories. These four individuals heard many of the same sermons by the Cathar preachers Guilhem Belibasta and Jacme and Guilhem Autier.

32 See, for example, the Occitan prayer or creed recited by Johan Maury: *Registre d'inquisition*, ed. Duvernoy, II, 461.

33 *Registre d'inquisition*, ed. Duvernoy, II, 406–7.

34 Heating urine was the standard diagnostic test for pre-eclampsia practiced by midwives at least as recently as the mid-twentieth century. J. Worth, *Call the Midwife: A True Story*

Limoux's image, therefore, is less bizarre than it seems: the urine of a person with certain medical conditions will form a mass like the white of a poached egg when heated.

Who might have been in a position to observe such a thing? Since uroscopy, the examination of urine, was one of their principal diagnostic tools, medieval physicians are one possibility. Fresh urine, placed in the distinctively-shaped urine flask that became the universal attribute of the physician in artistic depictions, was carefully investigated for its quantity, consistency, color, and tendency to settle in layers.[35] The diagnostic possibilities of heating urine were apparently unknown to medieval medicine, however, and not discovered until at least the seventeenth century.[36] Is it possible that Limoux was a physician? The inquisitors do not refer to Limoux anywhere as a physician (or any kind of medical practitioner), and such a profession was sufficiently rare for it to seem unlikely for them to have omitted it if they had known.

Heating urine was, however, common in certain trades in the Middle Ages. Urine was an inexpensive alkali and a source of ammonia when stale. In combination with grease of various kinds, it was an effective soap. Laundresses soaked stained laundry in urine. Wool preparers used urine to remove lanolin from the unprocessed fleece. Fullers used it in combination with fullers' earth or grease. Dyers used urine's alkali to prepare vegetable dyes and as a mordant to fix them. Tanners soaked hides in urine to remove hair before tanning. These processes all required the urine to be heated. A practitioner of any of these trades might well have had occasion to note the coagulation of certain batches of urine, those we now assume to have been collected from individuals suffering from proteinuria. The urine of many individuals would probably have been mixed together and thus a fuller or a dyer might not know which individuals had provided any particular batch of urine; the occasional coagulation may have seemed to come out of nowhere.[37] It is therefore also possible that Limoux was a practitioner of one of these common trades.

There are indications in his imagery and language, however, that lead us in a different direction altogether: alchemy. Medieval alchemists also heated

of the East End in the 1950s (London, 2002), p. 82. I am grateful to Helen Cuthbertson for calling this practice to my attention.

35 L. Demaitre, *Medieval Medicine: The Art of Healing, from Head to Toe* (Santa Barbara CA, 2013), pp. 45–7.

36 *The Nephrotic Syndrome*, ed. J. S. Cameron and R. J. Glassock (New York, 1988), p. 6. The first unambiguous description of albumin in heated urine comes from 1695. J. S. Cameron, 'Milk or Albumin? The History of Proteinuria before Richard Bright', *Nephrology, Dialysis, Transplantation* 18 (2003), 1281–5.

37 Wool preparation and fulling: J. H. Munro, 'Textile Technology', in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. J. Strayer, 13 vols. (New York, 1982–89), XI, 693–711 (pp. 694, 705). Dyeing: R. Multhauf, 'Dyes and Dyeing', in ibid., IV, 325–9 (pp. 326–8).

urine in the pursuit of their art. Urine was what is called in alchemical terms a *menstruum*, or organic solvent. It was used for its organic qualities (having been produced by the human body), and for the same chemical qualities sought after by dyers, fullers, and tanners.

At this point, we must return to the account Limoux gave of his revelations. When he came down from his mountainous cave, he said 'God put this understanding into his heart that now he asserts that he has, this subtlety and aforementioned philosophy'.[38] These scholarly words (*subtilitas* and *philosophia*, as well as *scientia*, which appears later) are striking, and very unusual in the context of the inquisitorial corpus of fourteenth-century southern France.[39] *Subtilitas* appears nowhere else and *philosophia* appears in only one other context, that of a priest accused of magic and alchemy.[40] *Scientia* is almost as rare, and never used elsewhere in the context of abstract knowledge. It thus seems unlikely that a scribe would have employed them in error or confusion. Limoux would have given his testimony in Occitan, and the Occitan equivalents for *subtilitas*, *philosophia*, and *scientia* are close Latin cognates: *sotiledat*, *philozofia* or *filozofia*, and *escięnsa*.[41] In all probability, therefore, Limoux used those very words when he described his experience to the inquisitors. These are learned words that evoke a mental world rather different from that of the other heretics prosecuted in Carcassonne, Toulouse, and Pamiers. They are, however, common in alchemical texts of the period.

As Michela Pereira has observed, medieval alchemy was a discipline (or as she suggests, an *opus*, somewhere between a philosophy and a technical pursuit) that combined theoretical learning with laboratory practice. It had a potentially wide audience: one early fourteenth-century author suggested that it appealed to 'the very rich, the learned, abbots, priests, canons, physicians, as well as the unlearned'.[42]

At the beginning of the fourteenth century, however, alchemy was also a suspect discipline. In 1317, Pope John XXII issued a decretal, *De crimine falsi*, that prohibited the practice of the transmutation of metals.[43] Practitioners of the 'art of alchemy' were nothing other than criminals and frauds. Three would-be alchemists appear in the records of the Carcassonne inquisition, in the same register

38 Doat 27, fols. 223v–224r.

39 I have searched registers DDD and GGG of the Carcassonne inquisition (Doat 28 and 27), the register of Jacques Fournier, and the sentences of Bernard Gui: *Le livre des sentences de l'inquisiteur Bernard Gui (1308–1323)*, ed. and trans. A. Pales-Gobilliard, 2 vols. (Paris, 2002).

40 He sought to create the 'philosophers' stone' in order to transmute metals. Doat 27, fol. 48r. See also below.

41 *Dictionnaire de l'Occitan Médiéval* (DOM en ligne). http://www.dom-en-ligne.de/.

42 M. Pereira, 'Alchemy and the Use of Vernacular Languages in the Late Middle Ages', *Speculum* 74 (1999), 336–56 (pp. 337–8).

43 Also known as *Spondent pariter.* It appears in the *Extravagantes communes* of John XXII. *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. E. Friedberg, 2 vols. (1879–81; reprint Graz, 1959), II, cols. 1295–6. A translation into English is in J. J. Walsh, *The Popes and Science* (London, 1912), pp. 125–6.

as Limoux himself. A priest and two clerics confessed to a variety of attempts at 'the seven arts of necromancy', including using the 'philosophers' stone' to make silver and gold.[44] These three were sentenced on 11 November 1328 to serious punishment: they had to spend three Sundays in the stocks in front of two different churches in Carcassonne and a Monday in the market square, and they were condemned to the strictest form of perpetual imprisonment.[45]

Contrary to much popular misunderstanding, both medieval and modern, alchemy was not always about the transmutation of base metals into gold or silver. In the alchemical tradition derived from Roger Bacon, so-called 'medical alchemy', the goal was to create an elixir that could heal all ills and place an individual's body and soul in such perfect harmony that he or she could live virtually forever.[46] Alchemists attempted to create this elixir by the lengthy and careful manipulation of a variety of inorganic and organic materials in the laboratory.

Michela Pereira has described the beginning of the fourteenth century in the Catalan and Occitan worlds between Barcelona and Montpellier as an outstanding time and place in the development of this medical tradition of alchemy.[47] Several treatises long but incorrectly attributed to Arnau of Vilanova and Ramon Llull are devoted to the pursuit of the elixir. Two of these early fourteenth-century texts, the pseudo-Arnaldian *Rosarius* and the pseudo-Llullian *Testamentum*, both probably written by alchemists with ties to the university at Montpellier, even exist in early vernacular translations.[48] The pseudo-Llullian tradition, characterized by explaining relationships, concepts, and procedures through symbolic alphabets, complex geometrical figures, and combinatory tables and revolving wheel charts (*volvelles*) not unlike those in Llull's 'Great Art', is particularly relevant.

44 Doat 27, fols. 42r–51r.

45 Ibid., fols. 91v–94v. There are no indications in Limoux's *culpa* or sentence that the inquisitors of Carcassonne noticed the alchemical content of his testimony.

46 See L. DeVun, *Prophecy, Alchemy, and the End of Time: John of Rupescissa in the Late Middle Ages* (New York, 2009), pp. 54–6 for a succinct summary. Also, Z. A. Matus, *Franciscans and the Elixir of Life: Religion and Science in the Later Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2017), esp. ch. 2.

47 M. Pereira, 'Alchimia occitanica e pseudolullismo alchemico: Osservazioni in margine a una recente ricerca', *Studia Lulliana* 43 (2003), 93–102 (p. 101). Pereira links this to the strong interest in medicine and its practice in Catalan society described by Michael McVaugh. Pereira, 'Alchemy and the Use of Vernacular Languages', p. 343; M. McVaugh, *Medicine before the Plague: Practitioners and their Patients in the Crown of Aragon, 1285–1345* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 88. See also Ll. Cifuentes i Comamala, *La ciència en català a l'Edat Mitjana i el Renaixement*, 2nd edn (Barcelona, 2006), esp. pp. 33–49.

48 A. Calvet, *Le Rosier alchimique de Montpellier, 'Lo Rosari' (XIV^e siècle): Textes, traductions, notes et commentaires* (Paris, 1997); M. Pereira and B. Spaggiari, *Il 'Testamentum' alchemico attribuito a Raimondo Lullo: Edizione del testo latino e catalano dal manoscritto Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 244* (Florence, 1999); *Le Testament du pseudo-Raymond Lulle*, trans H. van Kasteel (Grez-Doiceau, 2006).

Alchemy was meant to be esoteric knowledge and not for the uninitiated, so alchemical authors often used a cryptic symbolic vocabulary, calling lead 'Saturn', quicksilver 'Mercury' (an alchemical coinage that we have preserved), and gold and silver 'sun' and 'moon'. Secrecy was all-important; in some manuscripts, certain terms are written only in a coded script.[49] As the author of the pseudo-Llullian *Testamentum* (known as 'the Master') wrote, 'Above everything else, hide and guard this book from our enemies and the friends of the world'.[50] The *Testamentum* provides a crucial key to many parts of Limoux's *culpa*, and especially that most unusual part of his account of creation, the coagulating urine of the sun and the moon.

Michela Pereira also points out that the pseudo-Llullian corpus, and especially the *Testamentum*, looked at the alchemical process as analogous to creation. At the very beginning of the work, the Master outlines a simple cosmogony. God created a first pure substance that he divided into three parts: from the purest part he created the angels, from the second the heavens and planets and stars, and from the final, less pure part, he created the natural world. When the Master returns to the same subject later, he elaborates: out of this 'less pure' confused mass came the four elements in which nature lies 'in great corruption'. The artist (alchemist) must model his own work on this creation, extracting his goal from 'the belly of corruption'.[51]

Laboratory instructions are in the second of three distinct sections of the *Testamentum*.[52] The principal ingredients in alchemical manipulations were metallic or mineral (gold, silver, mercury, sulphur), but an organic *menstruum* was essential. In the *Testamentum* (as in other pseudo-Llullian texts), this was urine, preferably the 'urine of young choleric boys'.[53] Because it was derived from the human body, urine possessed the 'power of generation' (*virtus generativa*).[54]

49 See, for instance, the Catalan version in Pereira and Spaggiari, *Il 'Testamentum' alchemico*, pp. 311–13, and Table 2, p. clxiv.

50 Pereira suggests calling him the *Magister Testamenti* because of his apparent medical training and ties to Montpellier. Pereira and Spaggiari, *Il 'Testamentum' alchemico*, pp. x, 134–5.

51 M. Pereira, 'Cosmologie alchemiche', in *Cosmogonie e cosmologie nel medioevo: Atti del Convegno della Società Italiana per lo Studio del Pensiero Medievale (S.I.S.P.M.), Catania, 22–24 settembre 2006* (Turnhout, 2008), pp. 363–410, esp. pp. 400–10; Pereira and Spaggiari, *Il 'Testamentum' alchemico*, pp. 12–13, 250–5.

52 Many important clarifications are found in the initial theoretical section or in the third part, known as the codicil.

53 Pereira and Spaggiari, *Il 'Testamentum' alchemico*, pp. 206–7. Another pseudo-Llullian text is more specific: 'the urine of twelve clean virgin beardless boys between the age of eight and twelve, the first water after their first sleep'. See M. Pereira, 'Un lapidario alchemico: Il *Liber de investigatione secreti occulti* attribuito a Raimondo Lullo. Studio introduttivo ed edizione', *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale: Rivista della Società Internazionale per lo Studio del Medioevo Latino* 1 (1990), 549–603 (pp. 557, 601).

54 M. Pereira, *L'oro dei filosofi: Saggio sulle idee di un alchimista del Trecento* (Spoleto, 1992), p. 98.

The Master tells his student that it would take an experienced alchemist approximately a year and three months to complete the elixir, but two years for a novice.[55] The text is frequently obscure about the details. The work was divided into four essential processes, but had seven major steps, arranged in an inversed repetition with vapor at the center: liquefaction (*liquefactio*), dissolving into elements (*solutio et elementatio*), solidification of elements (*elementatio et congelatio*), sublimation or vaporization (*sublimatio*), a second solidification, dissolving into elements again, and a final liquefaction. Different stages (and there were many manipulations inside each major one) resulted in different physical products. These were sometimes solid (described as ashes, earth, or powder), but in other cases one of two kinds of liquid: *aqua* (transparent or colored) or *oleum* (more or less unctuous). Sometimes these are described using the names of the four elements: *aqua* (water), *terra* (solids), *ventus* (often used as a synonym for *oleum*), and *ignis* (the force that activated all phases of the procedure).[56]

As a mnemonic device for the initiate, the author of the *Testamentum* uses an alphabetical system of equivalences in the practical section, a system very much like those of the authentic Ramon Llull.[57] He elaborates them both as figures and in the text.[58] The very first letter, A, 'signifies God, from whom everything proceeds'.[59] 'Without him, no thing can be created or generated, no work begun or finished … he is the principal efficient and final cause of all creations and operations'.[60] Though silver and gold are F and H respectively, the text also calls them by their actual names as well as 'moon' and 'sun'. E is the *menstruum,* and the other letters between A and H denote mercury, sulphur, and a variety of chemical salts.

The very first instruction to the would-be alchemist is that he should, 'by the power of A' (God), wash and crush an ounce of silver, combine it with an ounce and a half of urine, and leave it in a warm bath for three days. He is then to add mercury and more urine and perform a sequence of heatings, distillings, and coolings, culminating by leaving the mixture to putrefy for a month and a half over a temperate heat. A similar process involving urine, mercury, and other ingredients follows for gold, also ending in a month and a half of putrefaction. The stages of gold's transformations are described as three forms of 'corruptible waters'. The result of these two operations is the composition of both 'moon' and 'sun', a composition that is fecund because of

55 Pereira and Spaggiari, *Il 'Testamentum' alchemico*, pp. 142–3.
56 Pereira, *L'oro dei filosofi*, p. 105.
57 Ibid., p. 136.
58 The figures are included in modern re-drawings (pp. cxxxix–clxi) and in (partial) facsimile (pp. clxii–clxiii) in Pereira and Spaggiari, *Il 'Testamentum' alchemico.*
59 Pereira and Spaggiari, *Il 'Testamentum' alchemico*, pp. 310–11.
60 Ibid., pp. 310–13.

its ultimate rottenness or corruption.[61] As the Master described, if the student is 'expert in his corruption, so will he be in his creating; just as he corrupts, so will he create'.[62] It is only out of corruption or decay, derived in no small part from urine, that creation can happen.

Limoux's account of creation echoes the theoretical alchemical cosmogony combined with the fruits of acute observation in the course of alchemical experimentation. In practice, the *Testamentum* combines the 'sun' and the 'moon' with urine and mercury to form the basis of alchemical production of the so-called 'elixir of life' from fertile corruption, a process that can only proceed through the power of God himself. Limoux posited a personified sun and moon whose mingled and coagulated urine created a corrupted world formed from the four elements – elements and corruption that also constituted the composition of all beings: Adam and Eve, the animals, and every human including even Jesus himself.

Resurrection

Limoux's description of the resurrection ties his stories even closer to alchemy. Jesus was brought back from the dead not by a miracle, but by use of an unguent that effected his revival through natural means:

> Four ministers … took the body of Jesus, and putting it down, they bathed it in the oil of the tree of man. After it was bathed, it cried out to the faces of the ministers, saying, 'Lord, Lord, Lord!' And suddenly the aforementioned prophet began to breathe, and speaking, said 'Men, behold your God', and thus, as he [Limoux] said, the resurrection of this prophet was done naturally by way of the unction of the oil.[63]

According to Limoux, there was nothing supernatural about Jesus returning from the dead, provided one accepts the possibility of a vivifying oil, 'the oil of the tree of man' (*oleo arboris humani*).

The anointing of Jesus is part of the Gospel story of his death and resurrection. In all four Gospels, an unknown woman anoints Jesus with a precious ointment at Bethany, and in all but Luke, Jesus explicitly links this to preparing his body for burial (Matthew 26. 6–13; Mark 14. 3–9; Luke 7. 36–50; John 12. 1–8). The Gospel of John reports only that Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus wrapped the body of Jesus in linen with myrrh and aloes before

61 Ibid., pp. 320–7. Moon is composed of water, white earth, and air, while sun comprises air, red earth, water, and fire: see Figure 3, p. cxli.

62 Ibid., pp. 142–3. The imagery of generation and corruption is ultimately derived from Aristotle, *De generatione et corruptione.*

63 Doat 27, fol. 219r–v.

its burial (John 19. 39–40), while in Mark and Luke, the women bring 'sweet spices' specifically in order to anoint Jesus's body on the Sunday morning of the resurrection (Mark 16. 1; Luke 23. 55–24, 1). But in all of these cases, the oil used is part of the traditional preparation for burial and not, as Limoux would have it, an agent in the resurrection itself.

The idea of supernaturally healing oil has a long history, deriving from the Gospel of Mark 6. 13 where the apostles conduct healings: 'And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them'.[64] The practice is also mentioned in James 5. 14: 'Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord'. By the high Middle Ages, the dying were anointed with oil in the sacrament of extreme unction, though since Limoux mentions only that his relatives urged him to confess and take communion when he believed he was dying, it is possible that the practice was not current in Languedoc at this time.[65] Putting the Gospel accounts of Jesus's resurrection together with ideas about healing oil may have suggested an explanation to Limoux.

This does not, however, explain 'the oil of the tree of *man*'. References to the 'tree of life' are many, ranging from Genesis and the Book of Revelation to Bonaventure, but the 'tree of man' does not appear to have been a medieval coinage. An 'oil of the wood of the tree of life' with the gift of immortality appears in the fourth-century apocryphal text the *Recognitions* of Pseudo-Clement, and pilgrims to the Holy Land in the early Middle Ages brought back flasks full of olive oil that were labeled 'oil of the tree of life from the holy places of Christ', but a naturally healing 'oil of the tree of man' appears to be Limoux's own invention (the word *naturaliter* appears in the text).[66] The goal of the alchemist was to create just such a life-giving substance. Though the medicinal product that brings Jesus back to life is an oil, not an elixir, it

64 J. John, 'Anointing in the New Testament', in *The Oil of Gladness: Anointing in the Christian Tradition*, ed. M. Dudley and G. Rowell (London, 1993), pp. 46–76 (pp. 52–9).

65 Hugh of Saint-Victor devoted a section of his treatise *De sacramentis* to this subject (Book 2, Part 15). See M. Dudley, 'Holy Joys in Store: Oils and Anointing in the Catholic Church,' in *The Oil of Gladness*, ed. Dudley and Rowell, pp. 113–33 (p. 116). For Limoux's experience of deathbed rituals, see Doat 27, fol. 224r.

66 Pseudo-Clement, *Recognitions* 1:45, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D.* 325, ed. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, 10 vols. (New York, 1908), VIII, 89; H. Willoughby, 'The Distinctive Sources of Palestinian Pilgrimage Iconography', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955), 61–8 (pp. 62–3). Willoughby dates the ampullae from Monza and Bobbio to the sixth or seventh century. A different possible referent might be Ramon Llull's 'Arbor humanalis', one of the sixteen parts of his 'Arbor scientiae', a kind of encyclopedia derived from his Great Art. Llull's 'human tree' deals with and describes both bodily and spiritual human nature, but it is an explanatory fiction, not real enough to furnish oil. Ramon Llull, 'Arbre de ciència', ed. T. and J. Carreras i Artau, in *Obres essencials de Ramon Llull*, ed. M. Batllori et al., 2 vols. (Barcelona, 1957–60), I, 549–1046 (p. 551).

is worth recalling that in the alchemical process, a liquid more viscous than water could be described as *oleum*.

Given that he says nothing about it himself, it is difficult for us to know exactly how Limoux came about his familiarity with the processes described in the *Testamentum*, but it is possible to speculate. If the *Testamentum*'s colophon is correct, it is not possible for Limoux to be the treatise's author because the colophon declares that the author had made it in England in the church of St Katherine in London in 1332, and Limoux was dead by then.[67] Moreover, there are parts of the *Testamentum* that directly contradict parts of Limoux's testimony. Chapter 29 of the third part of the *Testamentum*, for instance, contains a defense of many core Christian doctrines and sacraments denied by Limoux: Jesus as God and man, the virgin birth, the Holy Trinity, baptism, and the Eucharist.[68]

A text such as the *Testamentum*, however, must have taken many years of research, most particularly laboratory research, before coming to its fruition. I suggest instead that Limoux may have been a collaborator with the *Testamentum*'s author or a laboratory assistant who participated in the experimentation that ultimately led to the composition of the treatise. For such a pursuit, Limoux might not even have needed to know Latin. Michela Pereira describes the relationship between alchemist and assistant as more like craft master and apprentice than university teacher and student. Alchemy took place outside the university context and the language around the alchemical furnace was the vernacular.[69] The *Testamentum* is one of the earliest complete alchemical texts to exist in the vernacular. While Barbara Spaggiari has shown that the Latin text predates the Catalan, Pereira suggests that the Catalan translation may well have been made by the author himself.[70]

Where did Limoux encounter his alchemical master? His *culpa* does not specify his residence prior to 1315 (the date of his revelations), and he might have spent the nearly fifty earlier years of his life anywhere. The author of the *Testamentum* appears to have been a Catalan with ties to the university of Montpellier. Saint-Paul-de-Fenouillet is close to the capital of the Kingdom of Majorca, Perpignan, a city that lies (approximately) halfway between Montpellier and Barcelona, both centers of alchemical production.

Limoux was not only, or merely, an alchemist. Some of the foundational pieces of his *philosophia* echo alchemical concepts and practices, most especially those of Pseudo-Llull's *Testamentum*, but the theological conclusions he draws from them are decidedly his own. Limoux absorbed everything he heard,

67 Pereira and Spaggiari, *Il 'Testamentum' alchemico*, pp. 512–15.

68 Ibid., pp. 446–51.

69 Pereira, 'Alchemy and the Use of Vernacular Languages', p. 337.

70 Pereira and Spaggiari, *Il 'Testamentum' alchemico*, pp. xl–xlii, esp. p. xl n. 2. Though philologists distinguish between Catalan and Occitan, the two languages were mutually comprehensible in this period.

observed, thought, and pondered, and ultimately came to his own original and idiosyncratic heterodox opinions. In the case of the incarnation, the creation, and the resurrection, that meant relying on what he saw as rational explanations and the properties of nature.[71]

Conclusion

It is tempting to see Limoux Negre as a proto-Menocchio, nearly three hundred years too early. As Carlo Ginzburg has shown, the Friulian miller Domenico Scandella, commonly known as Menocchio, was a voracious reader who devoured every vernacular book that crossed his path. His ponderings on those texts turned his own original ideas into the heady and heterodox brew of theologies and cosmologies that led him to the stake in 1599.[72] Some of their conclusions are similar: Limoux's world formed of coagulated urine sounds strikingly similar to Menocchio's world created like cheese from milk. Menocchio believed that angels were the worms that emerged from the cheese.[73] Both men carefully observed the world around them and drew logical conclusions from it. Even Menocchio's leaping cheese-worms may have their origin in his observation of daily life. Certain recondite Italian cheeses, including *cazu marzu* ('rotten cheese') from Sardinia and *formaggio saltarello* ('little jumping cheese') from Menocchio's Friuli, are considered delicacies because the maggots of the cheese fly (*Piophila casei*) turn the interior of the cheese into a sharp cream. The maggots jump out of the cheese and are eaten along with the cheese itself. Menocchio's passage from cheese maggots to angels is not unlike Limoux's albumin in heated urine turning into the inchoate mass whence comes the world.

There are other similarities, some of them related to parts of Limoux's deposition not discussed here. Both men dwelled on the composition of creation and mankind itself from the four elements.[74] Like Menocchio, Limoux believed that Muslims, Jews, and Christians would all be saved together.[75] Both stated that Mary could not possibly have been or remained a

71 His explanation of the Eucharist uses the word *rationabiliter* to describe how Jesus explained his elevation of the bread to give thanks to God for the four elements that comprised it. Doat 27, fol. 222v.

72 C. Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*, trans. J. and A. Tedeschi (Baltimore, 1980). A full transcription of the text of his two trials (far longer and more detailed than Limoux's *culpa*) is in A. Del Col, *Domenico Scandella Known as Menocchio: His Trials before the Inquisition*, trans. J. and A. C. Tedeschi (Binghamton NY, 1996).

73 Del Col, *Domenico Scandella,* p. 25, among other places.

74 Doat 27, fols. 216v–217r, 221v. Del Col, *Domenico Scandella*, p. 53.

75 Doat 27, fols. 220v, 221r–v. Del Col, *Domenico Scandella,* p. 43.

virgin.[76] Both rejected many of the activities of the Church: Limoux declared that the Church had deliberately invented the incarnation and Eucharist, for instance, 'with the aim of cheating', while Menocchio said that baptism and the Eucharist were invented by the Church, and the law and commandments of the Church, as well as its priesthood, were 'just business'.[77]

Perhaps their most salient similarity is that neither one could stop talking about his beliefs. It was as a relapsed heretic who had continued to spout heterodoxy that the inquisitors burned Menocchio. The bishop of Alet initially let Limoux go – until someone denounced him for continuing to speak.[78]

There are many differences in addition to these similarities. Due to the nature of the sources, Menocchio appears much more prolix than Limoux. Menocchio insisted vehemently that he had not gotten his ideas from other people: 'I got them out of my own head or read them in books'.[79] Limoux declared with equal vigor that his explanations came from revelation. Even after his fate was sealed because he had relapsed into his heresy, Menocchio recanted his beliefs, seeking absolution and communion.[80] Limoux, however, clung to his ideas all the way to the stake.[81] Yet Menocchio's words could easily apply to them both: 'I have a subtle mind and I sought after lofty things which I did not know about.'[82]

A microhistorical approach allows historians of heresy to study individual choices in addition to heretical movements. When we look at movements, we often see 'Waldensians' or 'Beguins'. This is frequently due to the influence of our sources. When an inquisitor such as Bernard Gui interrogated the individuals brought before him, he sought to categorize the beliefs they confessed to him, categories that he laid out in his systematic inquisitorial manual.[83] We, too, sometimes subsume the individual to the whole, seeing creeds instead of choices.

All heretical choosing is ultimately individual. Even inside a heretical movement, every person makes decisions at every phase: to listen to a heretical preacher, to read a vernacular Bible or a tract, to attend a meeting or service, to support one's fellows emotionally or practically, to lie to one's neighbors, to change behavior, to avow different beliefs, and to deny or maintain those beliefs when confronted by the authorities.

It is easier for us to perceive the magnitude of such choices when they seem unusual or even outlandish, outside of a group. That has been the

76 Doat 27, fol. 218r. Del Col, *Domenico Scandella*, pp. 24, 26.
77 Doat 27, fols. 221v–222r. Del Col, *Domenico Scandella*, pp. 43–4.
78 Del Col, *Domenico Scandella*, p. 156.
79 This insistence appears in several places in his testimony. See Del Col, *Domenico Scandella*, p. 154, where he attributes his ideas about universal salvation to Boccaccio's *Cento novelle*.
80 Del Col, *Domenico Scandella*, pp. 160–1.
81 Doat 27, fol. 224v.
82 Del Col, *Domenico Scandella*, p. 41.
83 Bernard Gui, *Manuel de l'inquisiteur*, ed. and trans. G. Mollat, 2 vols. (Paris, 1926).

enduring appeal of Ginzburg's Menocchio: even at a distance of more than four hundred years we can watch him read, ponder, and speak to his neighbors, and imagine his individual moments of choosing. Limoux – keen observer, listener, alchemist, and imaginative thinker – takes us further back in time into an even more unusual mind. A full range of perspectives on late medieval heresy demands the inclusion of even the unusual choices made by a heretic such as Limoux Negre.

6

Princely Poverty: Louis of Durazzo, Dynastic Politics, and Heresy in Fourteenth-Century Naples

Elizabeth Casteen

In March 1362, Bertrand de Meyshones, archbishop of Naples, and three Dominican inquisitors initiated heresy proceedings against the Angevin prince Louis of Durazzo (1324–62). Louis stood charged with offering assistance to radical Franciscan dissidents who had rallied around him, and the trial formed part of a larger papal effort to root out Spiritual Franciscan heresy. Louis's birth and social standing were enough to make the trial noteworthy. The grandson of King Charles II of Naples (d. 1309), Louis belonged to a celebrated royal dynasty that ruled a papal fief (the Kingdom – Regno – of Naples) and identified itself as the champion of the Church and papacy. Louis was also the nephew of Élie de Talleyrand (1301–64), the cardinal protector of the Franciscan order and leader of a powerful faction within the papal curia.[1] Louis was thus phenomenally well connected, with close ties to the papal hierarchy.

Equally extraordinary, Louis was already in prison for rebelling against his cousins Johanna of Naples and Louis of Taranto, who ruled Naples. Louis's rebellion was driven by desire for greater control over his family's wealth and holdings, and he had twice summoned Great Companies into the Regno, where they terrorized Neapolitan subjects. Louis's revolts garnered support, both within the Regno and outside it, and he portrayed himself as moved by orthodox religious zeal when he rebelled in 1356, during a period when Naples' rulers were excommunicated for failing to pay the annual census they owed the Church. Louis of Durazzo was a rebel and a traitor in the minds of many contemporaries, but it was not obvious that he was a heretic. Yet, when

[1] Louis's mother was Agnes of Périgord, daughter of Count Élie VII of Périgord and sister to both Cardinal Talleyrand and two successive counts of Périgord. See N. P. Zacour, 'Talleyrand: The Cardinal of Périgord (1301–1364)', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* n.s. 50 (1960), 1–83, esp. pp. 6–24 on his family and early career. Both Giovanni Villani and Francesco Petrarch describe Talleyrand as an influential figure in papal conclaves, and Zacour argues that he played an important part in the elections of Benedict XII, Clement VI, Innocent VI, and Urban V. See Giovanni Villani, *Nuova cronica* 12:21, ed. G. Porta, 3 vols. (Parma, 1991), III, 64, and Francesco Petrarca [Petrarch], *Le familiari. Edizione critica* 14:2, ed. V. Rossi, 4 vols. (Florence, 1968), III, 106–8.

he was finally captured and imprisoned in 1362, he and his supporters were examined not for political insurrection but for heresy. In a paradoxical twist of fate, a prince who had rebelled in order to recover his wealth after finding himself reduced to *povero stato*, in the words of Matteo Villani, faced trial for his support of apostolic poverty.[2]

Around the time of Louis's arrest, the archbishop and inquisitors learned that he had offered assistance to sects of Franciscan Spirituals who gathered around him at Monte Gargano. Louis, it transpired, had harbored and shown great reverence for the former bishop of Aquino, Tommaso of Boiano, who had fled his see and was sought as a heretic. In 1357, Innocent VI (r. 1352–62) had proclaimed Tommaso *perditionis filius* ('a son of perdition').[3] Louis's connection to Tommaso and his followers, who called themselves the Brethren of the Poor Life, provided a rationale for Louis's examination in an inquisitorial rather than a royal court. Émile Léonard, the great historian of Angevin Naples, suggests that Naples' king and queen were at a loss regarding what to do with him, and that the ecclesiastical court provided a welcome opportunity to condemn Louis and rid themselves of a dangerous rival.[4] Yet, in the end, Louis's sudden transformation from traitor to heretic was short-lived. He died in prison, before the process could be completed, in June 1362.

Scholars such as Felice Tocco, Franz Ehrle, Henry Charles Lea, Marjorie Reeves, and Gordon Leff have treated Louis's alliance with the Brethren of the Poor Life as evidence of Neapolitan veneration of the *fraticelli* and lingering sympathy for the Spiritual cause within the Angevin family, which scholars have long argued protected Franciscan heretics. Contemporaries, however, were less certain about Louis's motivations and were suspicious of both the religious justification for his actions and the proceedings against him. This essay will examine the inquisitorial process for Louis's trial and assess the disparate narratives and interests that constructed Louis as a rebel and heretic. Louis's actions and his trial, in the course of which the inquisitors sought evidence not only that he colluded with heretics but also that he was one of their leaders, expose the complex interconnection between dynastic and religious politics in fourteenth-century Naples. Indeed, Louis's trial took shape not merely amid competing definitions of orthodoxy and heresy but also against a backdrop of tensions and factionalism within the papal curia, between rival branches of the Angevin family, and over the nature of political authority in a valuable papal fief.

2 Matteo Villani, *Cronica, con la continuazione di Filippo Villani* 4:31, ed. G. Porta, 2 vols. (Parma, 1995), I, 516.

3 F. Ehrle, 'Der Process gegen die Fraticellen des Herzogs Ludwig von Durazzo und des Bischofs Thomas von Aquino vom Jahre 1362', *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* 4 (1888), 95–104 (p. 104).

4 É. G. Léonard, *Histoire de Jeanne I^re^, reine de Naples, comtesse de Provence (1343–1382)*, vol. 3, *Le Règne de Louis de Tarente* (Monaco, 1936) [hereafter Léonard, *Règne*], p. 476.

Neapolitan dynastic politics, which provides the context for the trial, was profoundly complicated. Louis of Durazzo was born in 1324, the second son of John of Gravina, duke of Durazzo, the youngest of Charles II's five sons. He spent his youth at the cosmopolitan Neapolitan court. His uncle, King Robert the Wise (r. 1309–43), had been a patron of arts and letters. His court hosted cultural luminaries, including Giotto, Francesco Petrarch, and Giovanni Boccaccio, along with scholars and theologians, including many Franciscans. Robert's contemporaries praised his erudition, and he cultivated a reputation as a 'second Solomon' by preaching learned sermons and writing treatises that took up the most pressing questions of his day, including the dispute over evangelical poverty.[5] The Angevin court was also home to Robert's second wife, Sancia of Majorca (*c*. 1285–1345), noted for her piety, devotion to the Franciscan order, asceticism, and yearning for a religious life.[6] After Robert's death in 1343, she retired to a Clarissan convent, but up to that point she had wielded great power and influence at court and had taken a firm stance in support of evangelical poverty, earning Pope John XXII's censure.

In 1343, Robert was succeeded by his seventeen-year-old granddaughter, Johanna I.[7] Louis became caught up in vicious factional divisions at court, primarily centered on competition for power and influence over Johanna and her husband, Andrew of Hungary (1328–45). Andrew was, like both Johanna and Louis, a member of the Angevin dynasty, and many contemporaries saw his claim as superior to Johanna's, because he was the grandson of Robert's eldest brother, who had predeceased Charles II. Neapolitan politics descended into chaos as Johanna and Andrew competed for power with one another and with six male cousins: Louis himself; his two brothers, Charles, duke of Durazzo, and Robert; as well as Robert, Louis, and Philip of Taranto, all grandsons of Charles II.

In the opening years of Johanna's reign, it appeared that the Durazzeschi would dominate the court, particularly after Louis's eldest brother, Charles, married Johanna's younger sister and heir, Mary, in 1344. In September 1345, however, Andrew of Hungary, who was about to be crowned by a

5 On Robert's career and reputation for erudition, see S. Kelly, *The New Solomon: Robert of Naples (1309–1343) and Fourteenth-Century Kingship* (Leiden, 2003); on his treatment of Franciscan poverty, see esp. pp. 80–1.

6 On Sancia's piety, see C. Bruzelius, *The Stones of Naples: Church Building in Angevin Italy, 1266–1343* (New Haven CT, 2004), pp. 140–53; eadem, 'Queen Sancia of Mallorca and the Church of Sta. Chiara, Naples', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 40 (1995), 69–100; R. Musto, 'Queen Sancia of Naples, 1286–1345, and the Spiritual Franciscans', in *Women of the Medieval World: Essays in Honor of J. H. Mundy*, ed. J. Kirschner and S. Wemple (Oxford, 1985), pp. 179–214; Kelly, *New Solomon*, pp. 83–6.

7 On Johanna's career, see E. Casteen, *From She-Wolf to Martyr: The Reign and Disputed Reputation of Johanna I of Naples* (Ithaca NY, 2015).

papal legate, was brutally murdered. Johanna and all of her cousins were suspected of conspiracy against him. In the tumult that followed, the fortunes of the Durazzeschi declined precipitously. Johanna secretly married Louis of Taranto, and the pendulum swung in favor of the Tarantini. In 1347, Andrew's brother, King Louis of Hungary (1326–82), invaded Naples to avenge his murder and claim the Neapolitan throne. Johanna and Louis of Taranto fled to Avignon, but the other Angevin princes remained and attempted to make peace with Louis of Hungary, who responded by executing Charles of Durazzo and imprisoning the remaining princes, including Louis of Durazzo.

The Tarantini and Durazzeschi princes would spend the next five years as captives in Hungary. In the meantime, Louis of Taranto and Johanna returned to Naples. By 1352 they had triumphed over Louis of Hungary's forces and celebrated a joint coronation, after which Louis of Taranto marginalized his wife and ruled Naples in his own name. That same year, the Durazzeschi and Tarantini princes were freed from captivity in Hungary, but Louis of Taranto had already confiscated and disposed of many Durazzeschi holdings.[8] The Durazzeschi faced a harsh new reality: their home was under the rule of an enemy, they were essentially without property, and what influence they had wielded in Naples was severely diminished. Robert of Durazzo elected to travel to Avignon instead of to Naples. He received nothing on his return from captivity, while Louis of Durazzo, who did return to the Regno, received little. The Tarantini, on the other hand, were welcomed and enriched by their brother.[9]

Even with peace between Hungary and Naples, many of the questions and tensions that had occasioned the war were left unsettled. The threat of renewed hostilities between Naples and Hungary remained omnipresent, as did deep factional discord within the royal family. One constant, aggravating question was that of the succession to Johanna. By 1352, two of her three children had died, leaving Johanna's nieces – the daughters of Mary of Naples and Charles of Durazzo – plausible heirs to the Regno.[10] Louis might have hoped to benefit from his status as their uncle, but he returned to Naples to find that his eldest niece, Johanna of Durazzo, had become duchess and was firmly under the control of the Tarantini.[11] Mary's 1355 marriage to Philip of Taranto deepened the rift between the rival branches of the family. Struggle over Durazzeschi property and for influence over Johanna of Durazzo would ignite a new phase in the conflict between the cousins.

There was little to suggest that, in the course of that conflict, Louis of Durazzo would find himself the enemy of the Church, given the pre-eminent place held at the curia by his maternal uncle, Talleyrand. As Norman Zacour

8 Léonard, *Règne*, p. 3.
9 Zacour, 'Talleyrand', p. 37.
10 Johanna's remaining child, Catherine, would die in 1362.
11 Léonard, *Règne*, p. 33.

notes, Talleyrand is probably the cardinal Petrarch described as 'one in a million, a prince among princes, the greatest of the great'.[12] He headed one of the two dominant factions at the papal court, and numerous accounts identify him as a pope-maker, one to whom Innocent VI likely felt beholden. Talleyrand's influence and determination to help his nephews led him into an open feud with Louis of Taranto, who ordered his nuncios at the papal court to avoid any dealings with Talleyrand.[13] At the same time, Louis of Taranto rapidly alienated Innocent VI. They argued over misuse of Church property, royal abuses of power, and most crucially Louis's failure to pay the annual census that Naples' monarch owed the Church.[14] Ultimately, the distance between Louis of Taranto and the pope became so great that, Léonard argues, it began to look as though Innocent's concerns regarding Naples revolved entirely around the Durazzeschi.[15]

In the 1350s and early 1360s, Naples was ravaged by internal dissent and warfare. The Great Companies that had served Louis of Hungary remained active in the Regno, and relations between Naples and Avignon continued to decline. Despite papal favor, however, Louis of Durazzo became increasingly distanced from and hostile to his cousins; ultimately, he became an outlaw and a rebel. At an unknown date, he fled Naples and took refuge at Monte Gargano, near the sanctuary of Monte Sant'Angelo (dedicated to the archangel Michael), where he allied with other dissidents, including the Pipini, rebel nobles turned violent brigands, and even appealed to Louis of Hungary to renew his assault on the Regno.[16] Mary of Naples' marriage to Philip of Taranto in 1355 may have helped to push Louis into open rebellion. He attacked Neapolitan territory the following year, just as Innocent VI excommunicated Johanna and Louis of Taranto for their failure to make their census payments and published a bull declaring that Louis was 'to be shunned' (*vitandus*).[17]

His cousins' excommunication, and perhaps especially the anathematization of Louis of Taranto, provided Louis of Durazzo religious cover for his rebellion. To Innocent VI's dismay, he declared a crusade against his cousins and portrayed himself as the champion of the Church, [18] recalling the crusade by which Charles of Anjou had claimed the Regno from Frederick II's heirs in 1266. To further complicate what was already a very complicated situation, Louis of Durazzo's brother Robert had recently attacked (in April 1355) the

12 Petrarca, *Familiari* 13:6, ed. Rossi, III, 78; Zacour, 'Talleyrand', p. 27.

13 Zacour, 'Talleyrand', p. 36; Léonard, *Règne*, p. 47.

14 Léonard, *Règne*, p. 40.

15 Ibid., p. 46.

16 Ibid., pp. 115–16. Cf. M. Camera, *Elucubrazioni storico-diplomatiche su Giovanna I.ª, regina di Napoli, e Carlo III di Durazzo* (Salerno, 1889), pp. 191, 195.

17 The excommunication was publicized by a papal letter of 13 January 1355 (Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana [BAV], Reg. Vat. 237, fol. 6v). Cf. Léonard, *Règne*, p. 124.

18 Zacour, 'Talleyrand', p. 39.

fortress of Les Baux, in Provence, to avenge himself on Sybil des Baux, who had previously imprisoned him.[19] Léonard theorizes that Robert's attack on Les Baux damaged both Talleyrand's and Louis of Durazzo's standing at the curia, and he speculates that Innocent's regularization of Mary's (initially illicit) marriage in the autumn of 1357 reflects their loss of influence.[20] Talleyrand found himself forced to defend Robert in consistory, even as Robert continued to rampage through the Provençal countryside.[21] Meanwhile, in 1356, Louis of Durazzo marched through the Regno at the head of a Great Company that he claimed represented the Church, even as it, too, ravaged Angevin territory – in the words of Johanna's secretary, 'besieging, preying on, occupying, burning, uprooting, looting, and seeking the total desolation of the Regno'.[22] The Franciscan prophet John of Rupescissa, who charted the affairs of the Angevin family from prison in Avignon, wrote in his *Liber ostensor* that Louis, whom he had earlier seen as a potentially heroic figure, devastated Apulia at the head of an 'infernal company' (*infernalis societas*), 'like a voracious locust' (*ut locusta voratrix*).[23]

Having two brothers simultaneously attacking different parts of Angevin territory, and one who had the temerity to represent himself as a defender of the Church while he despoiled a papal fief, pushed Innocent's patience beyond its limit. Both Durazzeschi princes found themselves excommunicated, and Innocent lifted the interdict on the Regno in May to counter the appearance that Louis of Durazzo was in fact acting on behalf of the Church.[24] Even now, however, Innocent did not entirely abandon the Durazzeschi. The pope urged Louis of Hungary to make peace with them in 1356 and demanded that the Tarantini hand Johanna of Durazzo over into Louis of Durazzo's care.[25] He also continued to correspond with Louis of Durazzo himself.

Nevertheless, by 1360, the relationship between Innocent VI and Naples was sorely strained. Innocent named a new papal legate, Gil Albornoz (1310–67), to reform the Regno, which he argued was overrun by heretics, and he issued angry epistolary fulminations against Louis of Taranto and Johanna

19 On Robert's (mis)adventures, see ibid., pp. 38–9, and Léonard, *Règne*, pp. 134–43.

20 Léonard, *Règne*, p. 360.

21 Zacour, 'Talleyrand', pp. 38–9.

22 Register of Nicola d'Alife, quoted in Camera, *Elucubrazioni*, p. 195; Léonard, *Règne*, pp. 144–5.

23 John of Rupescissa, *Liber ostensor quod adesse festinant tempora* 8:63, 12:49, ed. A. Vauchez, C. Thévenaz Modestin, and C. Morerod-Fattebert (Rome, 2005), pp. 429, 849. On Rupescissa's evolving understanding of the Angevin dynasty, see E. Casteen, 'Gilding the Lily: John of Rupescissa's Prophetic System and the Decline of the Angevins of Naples', *Mediaevalia* 36/37 (2015/16), 119–45.

24 Léonard, *Règne*, p. 360.

25 *Innocent VI (1352–1362): Lettres secrètes et curiales*, ed. P. Gasnault and N. Gotteri, vol. 4, fasc. 1 (Rome, 1976), no. 2229 (4 July 1356), no. 2268 (17 July 1356), and no. 2269 (17 July 1356).

for their refusal to pay their debts and failure to extirpate heresy from their realm.[26] On 16 May 1360, Innocent revoked the spiritual penalties to which he had subjected Johanna and Louis of Taranto after they paid 50,000 florins of their debt, but the pope continued to express indignation at the treatment of Mary of Naples, whose dowry still had not been paid. He remained indignant with Louis of Durazzo as well, because Louis had occupied Durazzeschi territory that should, by right, have been held by Mary's daughters.[27]

Robert of Durazzo had met his death fighting for France at Poitiers in 1356, but Louis lived to fight on, rebelling again against Louis of Taranto and Johanna in the spring of 1360. Louis of Taranto responded by destroying the homes of his supporters and taking hostage Charles of Durazzo, Louis's son, to ensure peace. Louis soon rebelled again, although he and Louis of Taranto agreed to papal arbitration of their dispute.[28] Yet, despite this agreement, Louis of Durazzo was probably behind the 1360 invasion of the Regno by the German mercenary captain Hanneken of Baumgarten (d. 1375).[29] Naples' seneschal saved the Regno by buying off the Great Company, and Henneken then fled to Atella, held by Louis of Durazzo. His arrival forced Louis, who had been feigning compliance with papal directives, to openly declare himself a rebel.[30] The Regno descended into war.

In early 1362, Louis took refuge in his castle at Monte Sant'Angelo in Gargano, but fled after the inhabitants of Monte Gargano revolted against him. In January, he was forced to throw himself, quite literally, at the feet of Johanna and Louis of Taranto – a humiliating defeat which, as Louis of Taranto wrote to Innocent VI, brought him to tears.[31] Louis of Durazzo was stripped of his remaining territory and imprisoned in the Castel dell'Ovo. By March, he and his supporters were on trial for heresy.

How did Louis of Durazzo go from rebel to heretic? The origins of his association with the Spiritual Franciscan dissidents known as the *fraticelli* are not clear. In mid-1356, in an early stage of writing the *Liber ostensor*, John of Rupescissa had dared to hope that Louis of Durazzo would emerge as a hero who would fight for the Church. Louis of Taranto, Rupescissa charged, persecuted the Franciscan order, and Rupescissa expressed the hope and belief that the Regno would pass to the Durazzeschi, 'who love the Friars Minor [Franciscans]' (*qui diligunt fratres minores*) and 'who have always loved the order as if they were [themselves] Friars Minor' (*qui semper ac si fratres*

26 Léonard, *Règne*, pp. 366–9.
27 Ibid., p. 392.
28 Ibid., pp. 404, 406.
29 Ibid., p. 409.
30 Ibid., pp. 421–4.
31 On Louis's arrest, see ibid., p. 461, and É. G. Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples* (Paris, 1954), pp. 392–5. Cf. F. P. Tocco, *Niccolò Acciaiuoli: vita e politica in Italia alla metà del XIV secolo* (Rome, 2001), p. 193.

essent minores ordinem dilexerunt).[32] In September 1356, Innocent wrote to Louis urging him to distance himself from a convicted heretic named Francesco of Turre, with whom, the pope had learned, Louis shared a dangerous familiarity.[33] Innocent warned Louis of the perils of aiding heretics, which suggests that rumors of Louis's association with Franciscan dissidents may have been circulating by 1356. And if the testimony of witnesses during the heresy process is to be believed, Louis had emerged not merely as an associate but as a leader and protector of Franciscan heretics by 1359.

The Process against Louis of Durazzo

Felice Tocco, who analyzed and published part of the heresy process, commented that Louis's trial was more political than religious, an assumption common among scholars.[34] Louis had been arrested at Monte Gargano, where it was discovered that he had hosted *fraticelli*, including Tommaso of Boiano, in a hostel beside his castle. Presumably, the revelation that Louis had been a patron of the *fraticelli* opened the possibility of trying him as a heretic rather than simply as a rebel, and created a way for Louis of Taranto and Johanna to rid themselves of a dangerous enemy while appearing to do their sacred duty as papal vassals. Matteo Villani reports that Louis of Taranto was wildly unpopular, while Louis of Durazzo enjoyed widespread support in the Regno; the men of Nido and Capovana refused to fight against him, and even after his capture, there were many who hoped that the king might still pardon him.[35] Louis's conviction for heresy would have justified the confiscation of his goods, and it would have lent his eventual punishment the appearance of justice it might otherwise have lacked.

Because of the clear political motivations for Louis's trial, some scholars have rejected the validity of the charges or argued that they were exaggerated. Indeed, as Francesco Grillo points out, Johanna dismissed the charges against Louis not long after he died in 1362, during the early stages of the trial. Louis of Taranto had already died shortly before Louis of Durazzo, and Johanna, newly restored to her sovereign status, pardoned her cousin for his rebellion and fostered his young son Charles (who would later depose her) at the royal court.[36] Other scholars, however, have found in the process accurate, invaluable information about the *fraticelli* active in Regno, evidence

32 John of Rupescissa, *Liber ostensor*, p. 164, §IV.47.

33 *Innocent VI: Lettres*, ed. Gasnault and Gotteri, no. 2355 (5 September 1356).

34 F. Tocco, 'Un processo contro Luigi di Durazzo', *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 12 (1887), 31–40.

35 Matteo Villani, *Cronica* 9:94, 10:86, ed. Porta, II, 419, 562.

36 F. Grillo, 'Ludovico di Durazzo e Giovanna I di Napoli', extract from *Calabria nobilissima* 4 (1950), 20. On Johanna's pardoning of Louis of Durazzo, see also Léonard, *Règne*, p. 480.

of more general royal sympathy for them, and proof that the *fraticelli* not only survived but also thrived in the Regno thanks to aristocratic patronage.[37]

Extracts from the process survive among the papers of Cardinal Gil Albornoz in the Real Colegio de España in Bologna.[38] Albornoz, Innocent VI's legate, had been charged in 1359 with finding and prosecuting the many heretics, 'particularly those that are vulgarly called *fraticelli*', whom Innocent believed to be active in the Regno.[39] Albornoz was not present in Naples in 1362, but he heard about the trial and requested extracts, which were transcribed in 1366 by order of the Dominican inquisitor Philip of Nuceria.[40] The transcription does not preserve the complete process, and any testimony by Louis himself is absent. Albornoz, who was himself entangled in Angevin politics as an ally of Johanna,[41] was interested primarily in the organization and doctrine of the different sects of *fraticelli* active in the Regno, although he also took a keen interest in Louis's behavior; the transcription contains the depositions of Fra Novellus of Roccabantre, from the abbey of San Germano, Fra Jacopo of Aflicto de Scalis, and Fra Pietro of Novara, all of whom described a summit of Spiritual Franciscans at Monte Gargano and offered insight into their beliefs.

For scholars of medieval heresy, the process has been most valuable for the insight it provides regarding the *fraticelli*, many of whom lived in hiding in the mountains of the Abruzzi. The depositions reveal that they belonged to competing sects. According to Fra Novellus, some were followers of Tommaso of Boiano, the former bishop of Aquino, and called themselves *fratres de paupere vita*, or the Brethren of the Poor Life. Others, called the Brethren of the Minister, followed Bernardo of Sicily, whom they recognized as minister general of their order. The final group called themselves followers of Angelo Clareno; Fra Novellus admitted that he did not know what their beliefs were, simply that they did not accord with those of the other two groups.[42] Jacopo of Aflicto also testified to the diversity of opinions that divided the *fraticelli*;

37 Indeed, Franz Ehrle, who published the only full transcription of the process, prefaces his analysis of the text with the observation that the *fraticelli* had survived for so long because they enjoyed seigneurial patronage (Ehrle, 'Process', p. 102).

38 Archivo del Colegio de España, vol. 8, n. 23; reference in Ehrle, 'Process', p. 96.

39 Letter of Innocent VI, 21 April 1359 (BAV, Reg. Vat. 234, fol. 4r–v, litt. 13), *Diplomatario del Cardenal Gil de Albornoz: Cancillería pontificia, 1357–1359* (Barcelona, 1995), p. 191.

40 Ehrle, 'Process', pp. 101–2. Cf. Tocco, 'Un processo contro Luigi di Durazzo', p. 31. While Tocco (1887) analyzed only a portion of the process, which was published again in F. Tocco, *Studii francescani* (Naples, 1909), pp. 339–52, Ehrle (1888) transcribed Albornoz's copy of the process in full.

41 On Albornoz's involvement in Neapolitan politics, see H. Bresc, 'Albornoz et le royaume de Naples de 1363 à 1365,' in *El Cardenal Albornoz y el Colegio de España*, ed. E. Verdera y Tuells, 3 vols. (Bologna, 1972–73), I, 681–707. Bresc (p. 689) argues that the activities of Franciscan dissidents were of concern to both the papacy and the archbishop of Naples in 1365, when Albornoz was again a likely candidate to be sent to Naples as papal legate, and when his nephew, Gomez Albornoz, was involved in the Neapolitan administration.

42 Ehrle, 'Process', p. 97.

he revealed that some of the *fraticelli* were followers of Bernardo of Sicily and did not agree with the Brethren of the Poor Life, who were also sometimes called Evangelical Brethren, Brethren of Truth, Brethren of Brother Philip of Majorca, or True Friars Minor. They differed over whether the friars should have a minister general and whether they should recognize the ordination of prelates ordained under heretical popes. All, however, agreed that Pope John XXII was a heretic and that no pope after him was a true pope.[43]

About three years before he was summoned to testify before the inquisitors, Novellus reported, the followers of Tommaso of Boiano and the followers of Bernardo of Sicily had been called, along with Franciscus Marchisius, formerly archdeacon of Salerno and now bishop of Trivento, among others, to the court of Louis of Durazzo near the sanctuary of Monte Sant'Angelo. Louis hosted a 'great disputation' (*magnam disputationem*) whose ultimate purpose was to reconcile the sects. Jacopo indicates that Louis of Durazzo appointed an arbiter, Marchisius, called the Archdeacon, to judge the arguments presented. When concord proved impossible, the Brethren of the Minister departed. Novellus reports that the Archdeacon, in consultation with Louis of Durazzo, pronounced Tommaso of Boiano's arguments the strongest. Jacopo's testimony reveals that the dispute centered around the relationship between the sects and the institutional Church, with the Minister's followers insisting on the validity of ordination within the Church and Tommaso of Boiano's followers insisting that such ordination was invalid.[44] The followers of the Minister declared that they would remain loyal to him despite the Archdeacon's judgment, prompting Tommaso to tell Louis, 'Send them away, let them go with the devil'.[45]

Although the process has not been studied systematically in over a century, it has nevertheless been cited in numerous studies of Spiritual Franciscan heresy. Decima Langworthy Douie found the process invaluable for the light it cast on 'the darkness which surrounds the later history of the Fraticelli in Naples', where 'Franciscan malcontents … [lived] comparatively free from molestation and persecution' under the protection of Robert and Sancia.[46] Gordon Leff cited the process as a source of information about the *fraticelli de paupere vita*, identified as followers of Angelo Clareno. For Leff, the process provided evidence of the existence of three sects of *fraticelli* united by a shared 'apocalyptic anti-papalism', and of ongoing Angevin patronage of the heretics.[47] Marjorie Reeves, too, identified the *fratres* with Angelo's

43 Ibid.

44 Ibid., p. 100.

45 Ibid.; cf. Tocco, 'Un processo contro Luigi di Durazzo', p. 40.

46 D. L. Douie, *The Nature and Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli* (Manchester, 1932), pp. 211–13.

47 G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages: The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent, c. 1250–c. 1450* (Manchester, 1967), p. 234.

followers, whom she assumed came as refugees and then flourished in the Regno because of Angelo's influence over Philip of Majorca, Robert, and Sancia. She read the depositions as evidence of Tommaso's 'striking personality' and his followers' insistence on 'the schismatic position that since the time of John XXII the Roman Church had altogether ceased to be the true Church'.[48] Henry Charles Lea argued that Louis turned to the *fraticelli* for support during his rebellion because they were popular in the Regno, where the efforts of inquisitors were so poorly supported that they merely 'dragged on a moribund existence'.[49] Gennaro Maria Monti has argued that Angevin rulers generally respected and cooperated with inquisitors, but that inquisitorial activity declined during Johanna's reign, in part because of resistance by royal officials.[50] He goes on to comment that this generalized resistance did not prevent the use of inquisition for political purposes when it came to prosecuting Louis of Durazzo.[51]

Close examination of the process reveals that neither model – Louis as typically Angevin in his devotion to the *fraticelli* or Louis as simply a victim of his cousins' political machinations – will hold up. The three depositions that survive demonstrate that the inquisitors were interested both in the doctrines of the *fraticelli* and in Louis's connection to the sects. While we lack any evidence of how Louis characterized his involvement with the sects he summoned to Monte Gargano, the three depositions suggest that he wished to be – and was – seen as their committed advocate and a leading figure among the dissidents.

Albornoz's copy begins with the deposition of Fra Novellus, given on 8 March 1362. Its structure makes clear that the inquisitors sought from the outset to discover both Novellus's own heresy and the nature of Louis's beliefs and association with Franciscan heretics. Novellus's testimony immediately established his close connection to Louis. Asked where he had stayed, he responded, 'in Monte Sant'Angelo de Apulia from the time when Lord Louis of Durazzo withdrew from Naples and went to that place'. He testified that he had been called to Monte Sant'Angelo for the debate between the sects, and that Louis had provided the horses that carried the friars to and from the summit. He also testified, as did the other deponents, that Louis not only hosted the debate between the friars but that he also presided over it as the ally of Tommaso of Boiano.[52]

Jacopo's deposition, given 15 March 1362, is far longer than Novellus's

48 M. Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (1969; reprint Notre Dame IN, 1993), pp. 219–20.

49 H. C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (New York, 1887), III, 165–6; II, 284.

50 G. M. Monti, *Dal Duecento al Settecento. Studi storico-giuridici* (Naples, 1925), pp. 108, 118.

51 Ibid., p. 118.

52 Ehrle, 'Process', p. 97.

and provides greater detail about Louis's central role among the *fraticelli*.[53] He revealed that he had traveled to Monte Sant'Angelo with Brother Raynerio of Messana, because they had heard that Tommaso of Boiano was there. Jacopo testified that Raynerio equated Tommaso to John the Baptist, saying, 'Let us go, because John the Baptist has arisen to preach the truth'.[54] He revealed as well that they had stopped in Tursi, where they met with Pietro of Novara, another leader of the *fraticelli* (and the third deponent in the process), who absolved Jacopo's sins and provided him great comfort by reassuring him that where wickedness had abounded, grace would now abound.[55] Pietro also instructed Jacopo regarding how to comport himself before Louis: When he arrived at Louis's court, he and Raynerio should genuflect before Louis 'out of reverence' (*genu flecterent pro reverencia*), and they should do so a second time on behalf of Pietro himself (*et pro ipso eciam fratre Petro genuflecterent iterato*). From Tursi, they continued to Monte Gargano and the hostel at Monte Sant'Angelo, where they met with Tommaso, to whom Jacopo also genuflected (*genuflexit*), as did Raynerius, and kissed Tommaso's hand (*osculantes ei manus*).

The inquisitors' questioning thus prompted Jacopo to reveal the respect that leaders of his sect expressed for Louis, and that he himself showed the same reverence to other *fraticelli* leaders that he intended – and had been explicitly instructed – to show to Louis. Indeed, Jacopo revealed that soon after he met with Tommaso, he was summoned to Louis's castle, where he was received enthusiastically by Louis, to whom he immediately paid due reverence (*facta sibi … reverencia)*. Louis then drew him to one end of the altar in the church, where he told Jacopo that he hoped that 'neither fear nor shame' (*nec timore nec verecundia*), nor 'any sort of honor' (*honorem aliquem*), would cause him 'to leave the path of truth he had taken up' (*viam veritatis assumptam dimictere*), urging him to be 'strong and constant' (*fortis et constans*), and telling him, 'I am one of you' (*Ego sum unus de vestris*). Jacopo's testimony thus establishes Louis not merely as a patron and host of the *fraticelli* but as a committed believer and proponent of their cause.[56]

Jacopo and Raynerio then returned to see Tommaso, who was gravely ill (*graviter infirmatus*). Tommaso asked them to renounce their orders – Raynerio his ordination as a deacon and other minor orders, and Jacopo his minor orders. Once they had done so, Tommaso absolved them of the

[53] Jacopo's testimony can be found in Ehrle, 'Process', pp. 97–100. Tocco, 'Un processo contro Luigi di Durazzo', pp. 35–40, also reproduces it in full. Ehrle (p. 97 n. 4) reproduces a letter of Pope Gregory XI that reveals that Jacopo was convicted of heresy, given penance, and absolved by Archbishop Bertrand. Gregory's letter commends Jacopo's subsequent honest, virtuous behavior and restores his ordination.

[54] Ehrle, 'Process', p. 98.

[55] Ibid., pp. 98–9.

[56] Ibid., p. 99.

excommunication that inhered to all who were under papal obedience and restored Jacopo's ordination, placing his hand on his head. Jacopo, now received as a member of the sect, and other *fraticelli* were then called to Louis of Durazzo's court, where they performed the divine office (*faciebant et fecerunt officium*) in Louis's presence and 'remained with him during meals and at his table' (*remanserunt in prandiis cum eo et in mensa sua*).[57]

Jacopo's testimony is unambiguous about Louis's enthusiastic support for Tommaso and his followers. Indeed, it suggests that Louis built his ritual and spiritual life around the *fraticelli*, who performed all of the religious functions of his household. Some days after Jacopo's reception into the order, Louis visited Tommaso and the friars in the hostel, where he bowed before Tommaso and appealed to him to preach on Good Friday, repeating his request until Tommaso consented.[58] The friars then moved into Louis's castle, where they remained through the Easter season, dining with Louis and performing the divine office daily in his presence. Louis's court thus became a shadow court to the one in Naples. Here a rival Angevin ruler supported and participated in the religious activities of a rival Franciscan order that claimed a monopoly over religious truth. This shadow court provided the backdrop for the dramatic dispute between the different *fraticelli*, who were summoned to Monte Gargano after Jacopo's re-ordination. Jacopo's testimony might even be taken to suggest that Louis presided over the proceedings as a committed follower of Tommaso of Boiano and as a revered patron and leader of the order, thus fulfilling the traditional royal role of reconciling rival religious orders – very much in the way that Robert of Naples had waded into the debate between the Dominicans and Franciscans over poverty.[59]

The third and perhaps the most interesting deposition is that of Pietro of Novara. He appeared before the inquisitors on 26 April 1362, more than a month after Jacopo had testified. Like Novellus and Jacopo, he described the time of the summit at Monte Gargano, but he provided a version of events that stressed the prophetic, charismatic nature of the friars' spirituality, as well as Louis's role in building alliances between the *fraticelli* and in celebrating and publicizing visions that demonstrated their true orthodoxy. Pietro revealed that, at the time of the gathering at Monte Sant'Angelo, he and the Archdeacon disagreed vehemently. Later, when both men were in the friars' dormitory, the Archdeacon asked Pietro, 'Why do you run from me and avert your eyes?' (*Quare fugis a me et avertis oculus tuos?*). Pietro responded, 'Because you hold me to be a heretic, and I you' (*Quia tu reputas me hereticum et ego te*). The Archdeacon, who retained a position in the Church, then went to Louis and revealed a vision that he had received. He had seen, Pietro reports, a Franciscan friar who held a naked sword over his

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid., pp. 99–100.

59 On Robert's intervention in the dispute over poverty, see Kelly, *New Solomon*, pp. 79–81.

head (*unus frater minor tenebat ensem evaginatum super caput suum*). Terrified, he asked, 'Why do you want to kill me?' The friar responded, 'I want to kill you because you are persecuting my brothers'. When the Archdeacon replied that, on the contrary, he was a friend to his brethren, the friar countered, 'These are not my brothers, but Brother Pietro, whom you persecute, he is my brother' (*Illi non sunt fratres mei, sed frater Petrus, quem tu persequeris, est frater meus*).[60]

Pietro further told the inquisitors that, according to the Archdeacon, the friar who appeared to him was in fact Francis of Assisi. Upon learning of the vision, Louis called for Pietro, whom he warmly congratulated, saying, in a neat inversion of John 19. 27, 'Behold your enemy' (*Ecce inimicus tuus*), and presented him to Marchisius. Like a second Christ, Louis made an alliance between Pietro and the Archdeacon that was ratified by Francis's identification of Pietro as a true friar. Louis then compelled Marchisius to describe a series of visions (*seriem visionis*) or dreams that he had received and to swear to the truth of what he revealed. Afterward, Pietro testified, the Archdeacon no longer contradicted him and, presumably, treated him as a leader among the *fraticelli*.[61]

While the testimony gathered by the inquisitors in 1362 demonstrates a keen interest in the workings of the different sects of *fraticelli*, it reveals an even more profound concern with hierarchy and authority. The depositions revolve less around questions of poverty than around where the friars identified legitimate authority: not in the pope, Naples' suzerain, but in the person of Tommaso of Boiano and, to a lesser degree, in his ally and protector, Louis. The testimony also reveals a driving concern about Louis of Durazzo's beliefs and allegiances. Taken together, the three depositions suggest that Louis not only harbored Spiritual Franciscans but also held a leadership position and helped to spread the teachings of the *fraticelli*. According to these depositions, Louis supported and sustained the friars, he participated in the divine office with them, he appealed to Tommaso of Boiano to preach, he apparently sanctioned the re-ordination of friars who had abandoned the orthodox Church, and he played a key role in debates meant to reconcile and strengthen the rival Franciscan sects. The image of Louis that emerges is of a prince who located the true Church with the *fraticelli* and dedicated himself to serving them, most importantly Tommaso of Boiano but also, Pietro claims, Pietro himself – a true friar identified by Francis as a man who walked what Louis reportedly called 'the path of truth'.

60 Ehrle, 'Process', p. 101.
61 Ibid.

Fraticelli, Franciscan Poverty, and the Angevin House

It was long assumed that the Angevin family was sympathetic to the Spiritual cause and harbored the *fraticelli* in defiance of the pope. Scholars who have seen the Angevins as protectors of the *fraticelli* have found ample evidence on which to base such a claim. Angelo Clareno's followers were active in the Regno, and one of their most ardent defenders, Philip of Majorca, was the brother of Robert of Naples' queen, Sancia.[62] Many scholars argue that there is clear evidence of Joachite thought at the Angevin court, and that Sancia, like her brother, embraced the ideal of Franciscan poverty.[63] It is possible, though not likely, that Arnau of Vilanova appealed to Robert, whom David Burr describes as 'more than normally interested in religious matters', to intervene on his behalf with the minister general of the Franciscan order.[64] Perhaps most importantly, Robert's elder brother, Louis of Toulouse, had renounced the throne, become a Franciscan friar, and embraced the ideal of poverty before dying in 1297 at the age of twenty-three. In their youth, Robert and Louis had been hostages in Catalonia and had corresponded with Peter John Olivi, who had declined to visit them lest he be accused by Charles II of 'beguinizing' them.[65] For a long time, the scholarly consensus was that the brothers had indeed been beguinized. Ronald Musto has described Robert as an ardent defender 'of the Spiritual position on poverty', following scholars like Alessandro Barbero, who portrays Robert as having been converted to the Spiritual cause in his youth.[66]

Louis of Toulouse's link to the radical wing of his order, however, is far from certain. For the Franciscan order, Louis's sanctity rested on his rejection of wealth and the throne, and the Franciscan liturgy praised him for 'despising deceptive riches'.[67] Yet, he was portrayed in hagiography less

62 D. Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century after Saint Francis* (University Park PA, 2001), pp. 252, 291–5, 300–1.

63 On Joachite thought and sympathy for the Spirituals in Naples, see R. Musto, 'Franciscan Joachimism at the Court of Naples, 1309–1345: A New Appraisal', *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 90 (1997), 419–86, and D. Pryds, 'Clarisses and the House of Anjou: Temporal and Spiritual Partnership in Early Fourteenth-Century Naples', in *Clarefest: Word and Image. Selected Papers*, ed. I. Peterson (St Bonaventure NY, 1996), pp. 99–114.

64 Burr, *Spiritual Franciscans*, p. 112. Burr follows Samantha Kelly in questioning Robert's support for the *fraticelli*.

65 Ibid., p. 74; on the association between Louis of Toulouse and Olivi as representatives of two different strands of Franciscan piety, see H. J. Grieco, 'The Boy Bishop and the "Uncanonized Saint": St. Louis of Anjou and Peter of John Olivi as Models of Franciscan Spirituality in the Fourteenth Century', *Franciscan Studies* 70 (2012), 247–82, esp. pp. 253–4.

66 Musto, 'Queen Sancia', pp. 193–4; idem, 'Franciscan Joachimism', pp. 422, 483; A. Barbero, *Il mito angioino nella cultura italiana e provenzale fra Duecento e Trecento* (Turin, 1983), pp. 144–6, 150–2; cf. Kelly, *New Solomon*, pp. 75–7, esp. p. 76 nn. 9, 10.

67 M. C. Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca NY, 2008), p. 169.

as the embodiment of the mendicant ideal than as an exemplar of charity. As Donald Prudlo has pointed out, in the process of canonization, conducted during the pontificate of John XXII, 'Louis' mission is transposed from beggar to almoner'.[68] Witnesses during the canonization trial described his generosity to the poor, and later hagiographers identified his sanctity not with mendicancy but with humility and the rejection of riches and comfort.[69]

More recently, scholars have raised important objections to the idea that the Angevin court protected the *fraticelli*. Members of the dynasty supported mendicant orders, but their patronage was public and orthodox in nature and benefited the Augustinians and Dominicans as well as the Franciscans.[70] While some members of the family, most notably Sancia, favored the Poor Clares, many patronized other orders. Robert and Sancia chose to be buried in the monastic church of Santa Chiara, which some scholars have identified as the Angevin equivalent to Saint-Denis, but many of their kin, including Louis of Durazzo's father, chose to be buried at San Domenico, which also received Robert's heart.[71] Although Caroline Bruzelius has argued that the architecture of Santa Chiara, founded by Robert and Sancia, 'was conceived from the start with views embedded in the religious principles of the Spirituals', she also points out that the ornate royal tombs and frescoes with which the royal family filled the monastery transformed it 'into one of the most lavish monasteries of medieval Italy'.[72] Santa Chiara thus reflects the ambivalence with which the royal court and perhaps particularly Robert himself approached Franciscan theology and debates, intellectually favoring some Spiritual ideas while also hewing to a more orthodox reading of Franciscan ideology and of the link between the ruling dynasty and the order.

Rejecting the idea that Robert was inculcated with Spiritual ideas during his youth that he then concealed from Pope John XXII for his own political ends, Samantha Kelly argues persuasively that scholarly conviction regarding Robert's heterodox leanings 'rests on a selective examination of the evidence and on much conjecture'.[73] Kelly points out that John XXII himself, as the Neapolitan chancellor Jacques Duèse, likely had far more influence on Robert

68 D. Prudlo, *The Origin, Development, and Refinement of Medieval Religious Mendicancies* (Leiden, 2011), p. 102.

69 Ibid., p. 102.

70 Ibid., p. 256.

71 R. Di Meglio, *Ordini mendicanti, monarchia e dinamiche politico-sociali nella Napoli dei secoli XIII–XV* (Raleigh NC, 2013), pp. 94–5. On Robert and Sancia's patronage of Santa Chiara, see Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, pp. 140–53, and eadem, 'Queen Sancia of Mallorca'.

72 Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, p. 134. For Bruzelius's Joachite reading of the monastery's plan, see pp. 149–51. Bruzelius draws on Ronald Musto's arguments regarding Franciscan Joachimism in Angevin Naples for her analysis of the royal embrace of Joachite ideas embedded in Santa Chiara. See Musto, 'Franciscan Joachimism'.

73 Kelly, *New Solomon*, pp. 75, 77.

than did Olivi, with whom Robert had corresponded but never met.[74] Indeed, it was John XXII who canonized Louis of Toulouse in 1317 – a clear mark of favor for Robert and the Angevin house – while Robert 'lobbied intensively during the papal vacancy of 1314–16 for Jacques' election, which occurred in August 1316'.[75] John and Robert both celebrated Louis of Toulouse as a model of Franciscan orthodoxy, not as a proponent of apostolic poverty.[76] Indeed, it is not clear that Louis himself favored the Spiritual position, or that he identified with Olivi. As Holly Grieco points out, Louis returned to Naples after his captivity and began to study theology under the tutelage of two Franciscan friars, Guillaum of Falgar and Richard of Mediavilla, who opposed the Spirituals; Richard of Mediavilla was in fact one of the theologians who had condemned a portion of Olivi's scholarship in 1283.[77] The bull of canonization, *Sol oriens mundo*, portrays Louis's renunciation of the throne and princely luxuries in favor of a religious vocation and his imitation of 'Christ's compassion for the poor' as clear indicators of his sanctity, eschewing the praise that John XXII's predecessor, Clement V, had lavished on Louis's imitation of Christ's own poverty.[78] John held Louis up as the embodiment of Franciscan orthodoxy even as he persecuted Franciscans who insisted on apostolic poverty, using Louis to demonstrate that true Franciscan emulation of Christ 'did not draw fundamentally on Christ's poverty, but on his humility'.[79]

Robert did the same in his deployment of Louis as a signifier of his dynasty's legitimating links to sanctity and quasi-sacral kingship, discernible both in his patronage and in his sermons.[80] Rather than concealing his secret

74 Ibid., p. 77.

75 Ibid.; cf. Burr, *Spiritual Franciscans*, p. 74. Although the process was begun in 1307 under Clement V, Louis was formally canonized by John XXII, who had reopened the process shortly after his election, in April 1317.

76 Prudlo, *Origin*, p. 103.

77 H. Grieco, '"In Some Way even More than Before": Approaches to Understanding St. Louis of Anjou, Franciscan Bishop of Toulouse', in *Center and Periphery: Studies on Power in the Medieval World in Honor of William Chester Jordan*, ed. K. L. Jansen, G. Geltner, and A. E. Lester (Leiden, 2013), pp. 135–56 (p. 141).

78 Grieco, 'Boy Bishop', p. 267.

79 Ibid., p. 268.

80 On the Angevin dynastic emphasis on its *beata stirps*, including Louis of Toulouse, see A. Vauchez, '"*Beata stirps*": Sainteté et lignage en Occident aux XIII^{e} et XIV^{e} siècles', in Vauchez, *Saints, prophètes et visionnaires: Le pouvoir surnaturel au Moyen* Âge (Paris, 1999), pp. 67–78; G. Klaniczay, *The Uses of Supernatural Power: The Transformation of Popular Religion in Medieval and Early Renaissance Europe*, trans. S. Singerman, ed. K. Margolis (Princeton, 1990); idem, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe,* trans. É. Pálmai (Cambridge, 2002); idem, 'La noblesse et le culte des saints dynastiques sous les rois angevins', in *La noblesse dans les terroires angevins à la fin du moyen âge*, ed. N. Coulet and J.-M. Matz (Rome, 2000), pp. 511–26; J.-P. Boyer, 'La "Foi Monarchique": Royaume de Sicile et Provence (mi-XIII^{e}–mi-XIV^{e} siècle)', in *Le forme della propaganda politica nel Due e nel Trecento*, ed. P. Cammarosano (Rome, 1994), pp. 85–110; J.

sympathies for the radical wing of the Franciscan order, Robert had close ties to Franciscans who opposed the Spirituals, including Michele of Cesena.[81] While Robert 'defended apostolic poverty as a true and orthodox belief' in his writing and his sermons, he remained loyal to John XXII after the promulgation of *Cum inter nunnullos* in 1323; indeed, Robert and Franciscans at the Angevin court became increasingly hostile to Spiritual ideas after they became associated with the emperor Louis of Bavaria.[82] Robert's shift away from the ideal of Franciscan poverty was marked enough that he refrained from discussing his brother's commitment to poverty in the sermon that he delivered to celebrate Louis of Toulouse's canonization in 1317. Simone Martini's altarpiece representing Louis crowning Robert – commissioned by Robert in 1317 or 1318, the year that a group of Spiritual Franciscans was burned in the Angevin city of Marseille – portrays Louis not as a paragon of Franciscan poverty but as 'an example of Angevin magnificence and sanctity' clad in rich robes that cover but do not mask the simple Franciscan habit below.[83] Angevin dynastic propaganda stressed this image of Louis under Robert and under Johanna, who commissioned frescoes at the new royal church of Santa Maria dell'Incoronata in the mid-1360s that portray Louis in episcopal garb.[84] The dynasty's pro-papal stance of course does not predict what Louis of Durazzo himself believed, but it is worth noting that Louis's father, John of Gravina, led the Angevin forces that fought on John XXII's behalf at Rome in 1328.[85]

There were, however, those at court who remained sympathetic to the Spiritual cause. The most significant support came from the circle of Sancia of Majorca.[86] Philip of Majorca was in Naples in 1329 and defended the *fraticelli*

Dunbabin, *The French in the Kingdom of Sicily, 1266–1305* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 189–98; Casteen, *From She-Wolf to Martyr*, pp. 8–9, 157–61.

81 Kelly, *New Solomon*, pp. 78–9.

82 Ibid., pp. 80–1. See further the essay by Georg Modestin in the present volume.

83 Ibid., p. 98. In his decision to portray Louis not as a poor friar but as a bishop and prince – one whose robes bear both Angevin and Capetian heraldic symbols – Simone Martini helped to inaugurate a trend in portrayals of Louis, as of other Franciscan saints. See Gaposchkin, *Making*, p. 155; N. M. Thompson, 'Cooperation and Conflict: Stained Glass in the Bardi Chapels of Santa Croce', in *The Art of the Franciscan Order in Italy*, ed. W. R. Cook (Leiden, 2005), pp. 257–77 (pp. 266, 266 n. 35, 269); A. Hoch, 'The Franciscan Provenance for Simone Martini's Angevin St Louis in Naples', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 58 (1995), 22–34; and J. Gardner, 'Saint Louis of Toulouse, Robert of Anjou, and Simone Martini', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 39 (1976), 12–33.

84 On Louis's portrayal in the frescoes at Santa Maria dell'Incoronata, see P. Vitolo, *La chiesa della regina*: *l'Incoronata di Napoli, Giovanna I d'Angiò, e Roberto d'Oderisio* (Rome, 2008), pp. 29–30; F. Bologna, *I pittori alla corte angioina di Napoli, 1266–1414, e un riesame dell'arte nell'età fridericiana*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1969), II, 293; Casteen, *From She-Wolf to Martyr*, pp. 158–9.

85 Kelly, *New Solomon*, p. 82.

86 Ibid., p. 83. See also Musto, 'Franciscan Joachimism', and idem, 'Queen Sancia'.

in a sermon, while Sancia was chided by John XXII for her reported protection of Franciscan dissidents and unorthodox spiritual inclinations.[87] Kelly has argued that to whatever extent there was royal patronage of the Spirituals, it occurred in the early 1330s, during a period of political tension between Robert and John XXII, and that it is difficult to disentangle spiritual concerns from political ones.[88] Certainly, Sancia's most open support for the *fraticelli* coincided with the Angevin court's estrangement from John XXII. Perhaps in this, she provided a precedent for Louis of Durazzo.

Louis of Durazzo, Rebel and Heresiarch?

The question of what drove Louis of Durazzo to ally himself with Spiritual Franciscans is one to which we will likely never have a full answer. The traditional explanation that Louis's religious sentiments simply echoed those of his family makes little sense; indeed, Louis's alliance with Franciscan dissidents during his rebellion suggests that he saw them as useful allies against his orthodox cousins and their papal suzerain. There is no reason to assume that Louis grew up in an environment suffused with Joachite or Spiritual ideas, or that he was predisposed to support the *fraticelli*. Tocco has suggested that he was compelled to make alliances with all of the dissident elements within the Regno, and that the *fraticelli* appealed both because they enjoyed popular support and because they were opposed to the papacy, which sustained the Angevin monarchy. Perhaps this was the case; after all, Louis found common cause with other rebels whose interests did not obviously align with his own as he struggled against his cousins and to reclaim his patrimony. Indeed, he was not above allying himself with outright mercenaries like Hanneken of Baumgarten.[89] Louis seized any opportunity that presented itself in his quest to defeat his cousins, which became increasingly desperate toward the end of his life.

Franz Ehrle, however, takes the possibility of Louis's heretication more seriously, suggesting that his uncertain religious sentiments led him to be influenced by the various *fraticelli* sects' appearance of holiness.[90] Certainly the depositions given before the inquisitors in 1362 portray Louis as far more than a political ally of the *fraticelli*. His behavior, especially his close association with Tommaso of Boiano and his decision to gather the different sects together, was dangerous, particularly for his family connections. Talleyrand had been able to protect him before his arrest, but Louis's patronage of a council of heretics that declared all popes since John XXII heretical made

87 Kelly, *New Solomon*, p. 84.
88 Ibid., p. 88.
89 Tocco, 'Un processo contro Luigi di Durazzo', pp. 32–3.
90 Ehrle, 'Process', p. 102.

any further defense very difficult, especially as Innocent VI was tiring of the Durazzeschi anyway. Previously, Louis had attempted to portray his attacks on Naples in a religious light and to claim for himself the role of crusader and papal champion that traditionally belonged to the Regno's ruler. His alliance with the *fraticelli* was a radical departure, and it constituted a gross act of lèse-majesté, a rebellion against his dynasty's traditional ally and against his overlord, the pope, even as it bordered on heretical renunciation of the Church. Seen in that light, it made perfect sense for Louis of Taranto and Johanna to allow the Church to try him, thus maneuvering around Talleyrand and embarrassing a powerful opponent in the curia.

In Louis's trial, as in the brief rupture between the Angevin sovereigns and John XXII in the 1330s, it would have been impossible to separate the political from the religious. Politics and religion were inextricably linked in Naples. Talleyrand had been made a cardinal by John XXII, to whom he was related by marriage, and had begun his rapid ascent in the curia under John's patronage. Talleyrand had kept Louis of Durazzo's interests at the center of discussion in Avignon, and he had been his nephew's most ardent and effective advocate.[91] It would have been no small thing for his nephew to now renounce John. Such a renunciation might have put Louis beyond his uncle's aid and ensured that he could no longer threaten Louis of Taranto. Louis of Taranto, for his part, treated Talleyrand as an enemy and allied himself with his arch-rival in the curia, Guy of Boulogne. As a result, the courts of Avignon and Naples became even more profoundly entangled, and Neapolitan politics were inevitably religious politics.

One expression of the sacral kingship central to Angevin ideology was rulers' involvement in theological disputes. Another was their active patronage of religious orders and oversight of meetings of religious; Johanna, for instance, hosted the general chapter of the Franciscan order in 1370 and presided over a lavish banquet to which the friars processed through the streets of Naples.[92] The Angevins also publicized and celebrated their *beata stirps*, most importantly Louis of Toulouse, Louis IX, and Elizabeth of Hungary, and they promoted the canonizations of saints with whom they were associated, such as Elzéar of Sabran and Birgitta of Sweden.[93] It is tempting to see in Louis's alleged activities at Monte Gargano an effort to emulate and even embody these aspects of Angevin monarchy. Talleyrand's and Innocent's ultimate failure to restore his position or his holdings in the Regno and the pope's increasing tendency to favor Louis of Taranto and Johanna may have driven Louis of Durazzo to create a shadow court. At Monte Gargano, at the Regno's fringe and surrounded by rebels and outlaws,

91 Zacour, 'Talleyrand', pp. 8–15.

92 Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples*, p. 431.

93 On Angevin ideology and promotion of *beata stirps* under Johanna, see Casteen, *From She-Wolf to Martyr*, p. 160.

Louis ruled like an Angevin king, and he set himself up as the patron and close ally of spiritual men. Perhaps he was disillusioned with the institutional Church, and his rebellion against his cousins culminated in rejection of and rebellion against the pope (and papal sovereign) who had failed him. Driven to outlawry, Louis made common cause with supporters who revered him and offered an alternative church to replace the Church whose interests were so enmeshed with those of the Angevin rulers. If Johanna and Louis of Taranto had political reasons for seeing Louis of Durazzo tried in a religious court, Louis himself had religious motivations that grew out of and became entangled with the political motivations for his rebellion.

7

Disentangling Heretics, Jews, and Muslims: Imagining Infidels in Late Medieval Pastoral Manuals

Deeana Copeland Klepper

> *We discussed above concerning Jews and pagans* [*Saracens*]*, who dishonor God through infidelity. Now we wish to discuss heretics, who, by deviating from the faith, sin against God in many ways.*
>
> Raymond of Penyafort, *Summa de casibus de poenitentia* (*c.* 1224)[1]

> *We have heard about Jews and Saracens who, through infidelity, and obduracy, and depraved understanding or blindness, do not recognize the Lord, but blaspheme and dishonor him; now we will deal with heretics, who, apostatizing from faith, are seen to sin against God in many ways.*
>
> Hostiensis, *Summa aurea* (*c.* 1253)[2]

> *Indeed in sins you* [*heretics*] *surpass all, having been made more perfidious than Jews and crueler than pagans.*
>
> Innocent III, *Si adversus nos terra consurgeret* (1205)[3]

As the epigraphs above illustrate, it was a commonplace in late medieval texts to describe the depth of a heretic's depravity by relationship to that of Jews, Muslims, or pagans, and the language used to do this seems to have intensified during the first half of the thirteenth century. R. I. Moore's *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (1987) notably made the case that new efforts to identify heretics, Jews, and other 'marginalized' groups of people as threats to Christian society in the twelfth century served an important social function in the construction of a new Christian body politic.[4] In the decades since its

1 Raymond of Penyafort, *Summa de casibus de poenitentia*, Book 1, Title 5. *S. Raimundus de Pennaforte, Summa de paenitentia*, ed. X. Ochoa and A. Diez. Universa bibliotheca iuris I/B (Rome, 1976), col. 317.

2 Hostiensis, *Summa aurea* (Venice, 1574), Book 5, col. 1528.

3 Raymond of Penyafort, *Liber extra* 5.7.11. *Liber extravagantium decretalium*, in *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. E. Friedberg, 2 vols. (1879–81; reprint Graz, 1959), II, col. 783.

4 R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe*

publication, scholars have pushed back against some aspects of Moore's structuralist reading of the rise of inquisition and isolation of 'outsiders', but the notion that the twelfth century saw a new and fundamental linkage between Jews, heretics, Muslims, and other so-called marginal groups remains strong. Recent surveys of medieval heresy by Jennifer Kolpacoff Deane and Christine Caldwell Ames represent the state of the field well, and both embrace the notion that medieval Christians understood various categories of person to be members of a broadly construed group of 'the infidel'.[5]

There is good reason for the wide acceptance of this framework; the language of canon law texts and commentaries, theological treatises, and judicial and political policies all provide plentiful support for it. In a recent article, Stefan K. Stantchev examined the tension between efforts to define all forms of deviance specifically and to join them together as a common threat to Christian community: 'On the one hand, popes and canonists faithfully preserved a taxonomy of otherness inherited from the Church's ancient past. On the other hand, they often reduced all difference to the pastoral distinction between flock and "infidels".'[6] Popes, councils, universities, and the mendicant orders all contributed to sharpening definitions of Christianity over the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; their efforts to standardize practice within a Christian body politic erected barriers between the Christian faithful and all manner of unbelievers.

Our understanding of the linkage between heretics, Jews, and others depends heavily upon sources derived from a particular set of religious authorities, as noted above. But what happens if we move outside the realm of the papal court, the university, or the Dominican convent? To what extent was this vision embraced, for example, at the level of the parish? Did the linking of various unbelievers as 'boundary-makers' for Christian society still hold? This essay re-examines the notion that medieval heresy was fundamentally linked with Judaism and Islam by shifting attention to a late fourteenth-century local adaptation of pastoral care, the *Speculum clericorum* composed by Albert of Diessen, an Augustinian canon regular in Bavaria. Albert wrote his manual for priests working in a diocesan context, with

950–1250, 2nd edn (Oxford, 2007). The first edition appeared in 1987. Moore's recent *The War on Heresy* (Cambridge MA, 2012) continues to stress the links between Jews and heretics in the Christian imagination.

5 J. Kolpacoff Deane, *A History of Medieval Heresy and Inquisition* (Lanham MD, 2011), and C. Caldwell Ames, *Medieval Heresies: Christianity, Judaism, and Islam* (Cambridge, 2015). Caldwell Ames attempts a distinctive approach to the survey of heresy by including Jewish and Muslim constructions alongside Christian ones, but she still adheres to the notion that from a Christian perspective, the identification and persecution of heretics was interrelated with the treatment of Jews and Muslims in Christian societies.

6 S. K. Stantchev, '"Apply to Muslims What Was Said of the Jews": Popes and Canonists Between a Taxonomy of Otherness and *Infidelitas*', *Law and History Review* 32 (2014), 65–96 (p. 66).

primary responsibility for parish-level care. As we will see, he had quite a lot to say about the place of Jews in Christian society, but precious little to say about Muslims or heresy.

Albert built his text on a Dominican foundation, itself grounded in a long canon-law tradition, that engaged extensively with concerns about Jews, Muslims, and heretics alike. His decision to ignore information about Muslims and heretics is, therefore, significant. Looking at the question of the interrelationship of various categories of infidel from the perspective of late medieval local parish culture may add nuance to our understanding of the perception of heresy as a danger (or not). At the same time, exploring the relationship of representatives of infidelity within local parish culture enhances our understanding of medieval Christianity itself, as a tradition defined and enforced in part by popes, councils, and scholars with putative authority, but also as a tradition expressed in a variety of ways by the local religious experts given the task of managing the intimate lives of self-defined Christians in parish communities. Local voices proliferated toward the end of the fourteenth and into the fifteenth centuries, and Albert's pastoral guide must also be seen in that context, as an example of an increasing religious diversity and independent-mindedness noted by John Van Engen and others.[7] Albert comfortably claimed the authority to adapt and modify a shared Christian tradition as he saw fit, and the view of heretics, Jews, and Muslims entangled in a shared state of infidelity was apparently not useful to him.

In order to understand the significance of Albert's disentanglement of heretics from other infidels, it is necessary to trace the long process by which those groups had become systematically joined, first in canon law and then in thirteenth-century pastoral literature. We will first consider the treatment of heretics, Jews, and Muslims in medieval canon law, including the impact of new twelfth- and thirteenth-century canon law compilations and commentaries on the representation of these groups as interconnected. Next, we will examine the transmission of that canon law perspective into a new, widely diffused genre of pastoral literature in the decades following the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. Finally, we will explore Albert of Diessen's reception of the pastoral tradition in the late fourteenth century, and examine his dismantling of these categorical linkages.

Jews, Pagans, and Heretics in the Canon Law Tradition

The linkage of Jews with pagan unbelievers and heretics began early in Christian tradition as part of the process of forging a distinctive Christian

[7] On the creativity and diversity of late fourteenth- and fifteenth-century western European Christianity, see e.g. J. Van Engen, 'Multiple Options: The World of the Fifteenth-Century Church', *Church History* 77 (2008), 257–84.

identity.[8] But for our purposes here, we can begin with Gratian's twelfth-century *Decretum*. The *Decretum* was organized in such a way that canons pertaining to Jews, heretics, pagans, and others somehow outside the Christian community are scattered throughout the text.[9] In a section devoted to marriage, for example, there are discussions of Jewish 'infidelity' as an impediment to Christian marriage; in a section on tithing, the question of Jewish payment of the tithe is raised; in a section on criminal accusations, the question of Jewish witness against a Christian appears, and so on. Canons on Jews are contained primarily within two distinctions (D 45 on conversion and D 54 on servants and slavery) and three cases (C. 17 q. 4 on Jews holding public office, C. 2 q. 7 on Jewish witnesses, and C. 28 q. 1 on marriage).[10] Cases 25–26 have much to say about heresy and heretics, but there are many references to heretics in other parts of the *Decretum* as well. Some canons (or discussions of canons or cases) link Jews with heretics in a shared category of 'infidelity' as, for example, in C. 2 q. 7 c. 23, which bears the title 'Heretics, Jews, or pagans cannot accuse Christians' ('Heretici, Iudei, vel pagani Christianos accusare non possunt'). One can find many references in canons and decretals collected up to that point that utilize outsiders in order to define

8 For a very informative introduction to canon law traditions connecting or distinguishing between types of non-'Catholics', see D. M. Freidenreich, 'Jews, Pagans, and Heretics in Early Medieval Canon Law', in *Jews in Early Christian Law: Byzantium and the Latin West, 6th–11th Centuries*, ed. J. Tolan, N. de Lange, C. Nemo-Pekelman, and L. Foschia (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 73–91. There are many good studies of the place of Jews in canon law. Foremost among them, see W. Pakter, *Medieval Canon Law and the Jews*, Abhandlungen zur Rechtswissenschaftlichen Grundlagenforschung 68 (Ebelsbach, 1988); J. Gilchrist, 'The Perception of Jews in the Canon Law in the Period of the First Two Crusades', *Jewish History* 3 (1988), 9–24; A. García y García, 'Jews and Muslims in the Canon Law of the Iberian Peninsula in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Period', *Jewish History* 3 (1988), 41–50. Also central to the conversation are works dealing particularly with popes and Jews. See especially S. Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews* (Toronto, 1988), and R. Rist, *Popes and Jews, 1095–1291* (Oxford, 2016). On Muslims in canon law, see D. Freidenreich, 'Muslims in Canon Law: 650–1000', in *Christian–Muslim Relations: A Bibliographic History*, ed. D. Thomas (Leiden, 2009), pp. 83–98. The scholarship on the treatment of heretics and heresy in canon law is vast but tends to be scattered (i.e., studies of heresy include discussion of canon law, but not necessarily as the primary object of study); for a helpful introduction to the treatment of heretics in canon law in the thirteenth century, see L. J. Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century* (York, 2011), pp. 88–113.

9 There is no current consensus on the precise dating of Gratian's *Decretum*; Anders Winroth suggests that both recensions were likely written between 1139 and 1158. For helpful discussions of the issues, see A. Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum* (Cambridge, 2000), and M. H. Eichbauer, 'From the First to the Second Recension: The Progressive Evolution of the *Decretum*', *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* 29 (2012), 119–67.

10 Kenneth Pennington has noted that canons dealing with Jews are absent from the early recension of the *Decretum* and appear only in a later recension of the text; see K. Pennington, 'Gratian and the Jews', *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* 31 (2014), 111–24.

and protect Christian insiders, but it seems not to be a central component of Gratian's perspective.

In the canon law tradition that flourished after the completion of Gratian's work, Jews and Muslims (the latter sometimes identified as 'pagan', sometimes as 'Saracen') were linked together more consistently and explicitly, and these religious outsiders were also linked with heretics and schismatics more intentionally.[11] Bernard of Pavia's *Breviarium extravagantium* (also known as the *Compilatio prima*, completed 1191) assembled decretals having to do with Jews and Muslims into a shared title 'Concerning Jews, Saracens, and their servants' ('De Iudeis, Saracenis, et eorum servis') in the fifth and final book, placed alongside titles dedicated to simony, heresy, and schism under the rubric of crime and punishment ('Liber V: De criminibus et poenis').[12] While the occasional linkage of Jews, Muslims, and heretics in specific decretals and discussions points to a longstanding effort to draw distinctions between Christians in good faith and others outside the faith or the community of the faithful, the drawing of those scattered canons together in a shared unit detailing criminal activity intensified the connection between diverse sorts of infidel. The result illustrates the sort of twelfth-century boundary-marking that scholars of heresy have long noted. It is difficult to ascertain cause and effect, but it is worth noting that many of the early explicit attempts to link the crime of heresy with the 'perfidy' of the Jews came from decretals issued by Innocent III (r. 1198–1216) in the period of this transition in the organization of canon law. In Innocent III's 1205 *Si adversus nos terra consurgeret*, for example, heretics and their defenders are described as 'more perfidious than Jews, and crueler than pagans'.[13] From this point forward, we can speak of structural/organizational linkages between various groups of unbelievers and intentional linkages within specific decretals.

Bernard of Pavia's new organization was embraced in subsequent decretal collections, including the remaining four collections that made up what became known as the *Compilationes antiquae* and Raymond of Penyafort's

[11] On the linking of Jews and Muslims in canon law see B. Z. Kedar, 'De Iudeis et Sarracenis: On the Categorization of Muslims in Medieval Canon Law', in *Studia in Honorem Eminentissimi Cardinalis Alphonsi M. Stickler*, ed. R. J. Castillo Lara, Studia et textus historiae iuris canonici 7 (Rome, 1992), pp. 207–13; García y García, 'Jews and Muslims'; and Stantchev, 'Apply to Muslims'.

[12] On Bernard's *Breviariarium* and the work of the decretalists after 1190, see K. Pennington, 'The Decretalists: 1190–1234', in *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140–1234: From Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX*, ed. W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (Washington DC, 2008), pp. 211–45; K. Pennington, 'Decretal Collections: 1190–1234', in ibid., pp. 293–317. In addition to the spiritual 'crimes' of heresy, simony, and so on, the book on crimes includes decretals on murder, adultery, rape, usury, and sorcery.

[13] See n. 3 above.

(*c*. 1175–1275) *Decretales Gregorii IX*, or *Liber extra*.[14] The *Liber extra,* composed at the request of Pope Gregory IX and completed in 1234, achieved near-canonical status very quickly, circulating across Europe and becoming one of the most important collections studied in the schools.[15] While the collection drew primarily from extant collections of law, Raymond exercised a confident hand in editing, elevating assumptions about papal authority, excising a considerable amount of text, and adding new text to patch over the gaps.[16] Widely read commentators like Hostiensis (Henry of Susa, *c*. 1200–71) used the *Liber extra* as the primary text in their own work, glossing it and solidifying its place in the study of law.[17]

Raymond is of special interest here not only because of his important role in the development of new approaches to canon law and papal authority (although that role was important indeed), but also because he was author of one of the first (and unquestionably the most influential) pastoral manuals to appear in the wake of the Fourth Lateran Council.[18] New approaches to canon law were disseminated not only through schools of law, but also by the work of moral theologians, especially mendicant friars, who adapted legal material for practical usage by a broader readership in various *summae* and pastoral manuals.

Adaptation and Dissemination of the Canon Law Tradition: Summae poenitentiarum *and Related* Pastoralia

Pastoral manuals, guides intended for regular and secular priests with immediate care of souls, are a fascinating genre because they purport to reflect a common canon law tradition and base their authority on knowledge of that tradition, but they actually construct surprisingly diverse ideals for Christian community. Whether written in Latin or in the vernacular, they tend to draw on a common set of texts, each author choosing what to include and what to exclude based upon what he thought his audience most needed to

14 E. Friedberg, *Quinque compilationes antiquae: nec non collectio canonum lipsiensis* (Leipzig, 1882), and *Liber extravagantium decretalium*, in *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. Friedberg.

15 On Raymond and the *Liber extra*, see E. A. Reno, 'The Authoritative Text: Raymond of Penyafort's Editing of the "Decretals of Gregory IX" (1234)' (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 2011), and E. A. Reno, 'Gregory IX and the *Liber extra*', in *Pope Gregory IX (1227–1241)*, ed. C. Egger and D. J. Smith (forthcoming).

16 See the excellent analysis in Reno, 'The Authoritative Text', pp. 50–77.

17 K. Pennington, *Popes, Canonists and Texts*, *1150–1550* (Brookfield VT, 1993).

18 On the relationship of the Fourth Lateran Council to pastoral literature as a genre, see L. E. Boyle, 'The Fourth Lateran Council and Manuals of Popular Theology', in *The Popular Literature of Medieval England*, ed. T. J. Heffernan (Knoxville TN, 1985), pp. 30–43, and the introduction and many of the essays in *Texts and Traditions of Medieval Pastoral Care: Essays in Honour of Bella Millett*, ed. C. Gunn and C. Innes-Parker (York, 2009).

know.[19] One of the things that distinguishes this genre from earlier medieval penitential literature is the integration of canon law traditions and, by the end of the thirteenth century, moral theology.[20]

Some manuals aimed for comprehensive coverage while others were especially brief and focused primarily or exclusively on certain key sacramental functions. Some were very learned and scholastic in character (following, for example, a *questio* format and incorporating substantive theological discussion), while others were quite simple. Some imagined broad audiences while others were clearly aimed at a more regional readership. Whatever their specific characteristics, pastoral manuals provide insight into the application of legal and theological ideals in communities. And the positioning of this genre between the work of canonists, theologians, and parish priests makes it especially useful for exploring questions like the one that concerns us here.

It is not surprising to find that some of the most important thirteenth-century manuals were authored by Dominican friars. While the Dominicans may have been founded as a preaching order, by 1221 Pope Honorius III encouraged the friars to take on the role of the confessor as well. Either just before or just after Honorius's encyclical *Cum qui recepit prophetam*, Paul of Hungary, a Dominican teacher of law in Bologna, offered a fairly brief *Summa de penitentia* for confessors, and other friars quickly followed suit.[21] Paul's short text is focused primarily around the performance of the sacrament of confession and the sins that a friar would be most likely to encounter under ordinary circumstances, helping the confessor to distinguish varieties of lying, perjury, forms of adultery and other sexual sins, usury, and so on. There is nothing about heretics, Jews, or Saracens, all of whom lie outside the purview of the text. Paul's manual reflects his legal education, but he did not explicitly turn to a juristic framework for his penitential.

Subsequent Dominican manuals tended to be more expansive and to integrate explicitly the canon law tradition as taught in the schools, including the structure that linked Jews, Muslims, and heretics together in a section devoted to crime. For example, the *Summula magistri Conradi*, composed

[19] I am considering here only pastoral manuals written by priests for other priests. Nicholas Watson, Cate Gunn, and other scholars of the late medieval English tradition have convincingly demonstrated that a range of texts written in the vernacular for lay audiences ought to be considered as part of the same tradition of *pastoralia*. See their essays and others in *Texts and Traditions*, ed. Gunn and Innes-Parker.

[20] On the development of a new type of penitential literature in response to a new emphasis on confession and 'interior contrition', and the importance of Dominican authors in that tradition, see M. M. Mulchahey, *'First the Bow is Bent in Study': Dominican Education before 1350* (Toronto, 1998), pp. 527–55.

[21] An edition of Monte Cassino MS 184 was published under the title 'Rationes penitentie composite a fratribus predicatorum', in *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, 5 vols. (Monte Cassino, 1873–94), IV, 191–215. See also Mulchahey, *'First the Bow is Bent in Study'*, pp. 530–2.

in Bavaria or Swabia sometime between 1226 and 1229, treated heretics alongside Jews, Muslims, and other infidels in its third and final book, which dealt with crime.[22] The content in this area is minimal, and acknowledging the category seems as important as the material itself. After introducing the etymology of names by which Jews are known and explaining that Jews and Saracens should not be compelled to accept baptism, Conrad follows with a few paragraphs on proper relations between Christians and Jews and then ends by noting that everything said about Jews should apply also to Saracens, except that while the consumption of Jewish food was prohibited, the consumption of Muslim food was acceptable. Heretics received even less of Conrad's attention: a sentence describing heretics as those who hold false beliefs and are therefore excommunicate, a few sentences addressing how to handle baptism and ordination by a heretical priest, and a concluding note that what was said about heretics applies also to schismatics.[23] This is in marked contrast to very long discussions of simony and homicide. Was the information on Jews and heretics particularly necessary for Conrad's intended audience? Judging from the rest of the text, probably not. But incorporating these categories of error into his framework acknowledged the importance of new canon law collections, helped to establish the boundaries of Christian community, and provided a moral center from which to operate.

The *Summula magistri Conradi* circulated quite widely in German-speaking lands, but its success was eclipsed by that of Raymond of Penyafort's *Summa de casibus*.[24] In Raymond's *Summa*, we fully see the turn toward the confessor's manual as what Pierre Michaud-Quantin called 'tracts of juridicized morals' ('traités de morale juridiseé'), with a legal framework firmly applied

22 As described in a one-sentence prologue, the first part was dedicated to tithes and vows, the second to the seven sacraments of the Church, and the third to simony, usury, and 'other titles as indicated'. See J.-P. Renard, *Trois sommes de pénitence de la première moitié du XIII^e siècle: La 'Summula Magistri Conradi', les sommes 'Quia non pigris' et 'Decime dande sunt'*, 2 vols., Lex spiritus vitae 6 (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1989). Book 3 of the *Summula Conradi* is in II, 78–133. Renard's careful study of the manuscript tradition calls the authorship of the text into question. Over half of the sixty-three attested manuscript copies present the text anonymously; others identify the author by a range of names with a range of affiliations (Dominican, Franciscan, or simply 'magister'). Renard concludes that the text must have been written during the pontificate of Honorius III, sometime between 1226 and 1229. He finds no reliable evidence that the purported author, the Dominican Conrad Höxter, actually composed the text, but chooses to call the author 'Conrad' for lack of a better alternative. For similar reasons of convenience, I treat the text in the context of Dominican activity here, recognizing that the motivations underlying this early Dominican activity were embraced by others at the time.

23 Renard, *Trois sommes*, II, 85–91.

24 For the manuscript tradition of the *Summula Conradi*, see Renard, *Trois sommes*, I, 1–24. For an edition of Raymond of Penyafort's *Summa*, see n. 1 above. On Raymond's *Summa* and the Dominican tradition of penitential manuals, see also P. Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique et manuels de confession au moyen âge (XII–XVI siècles)* (Louvain, 1962), pp. 33–43, and Mulchahey, *'First the Bow is Bent in Study'*, pp. 527–52.

to the understanding of the confessor's role.[25] Raymond of Penyafort began his career as a cathedral canon in Catalonia and then studied law in Bologna, eventually attaining the rank of master and teaching there for three years. In 1223, shortly after his return to Barcelona, he joined the newly formed Dominican order. One of his first projects as a Dominican was to adapt the canon law tradition of case study to devise a widely accessible guide for friars and other priests. This was some years before Gregory IX charged Raymond with the preparation of a new canon law collection, but we can already see his deep familiarity with the canon law tradition underpinning the work. As Michaud-Quantin stressed, the novelty here was a juridical understanding of the confessor's role. In addition to the incorporation of a new mode of approaching penitential literature, Raymond also applied the structure of canon law. This included what had by then become the standard organizational structure linking heretics with Jews, Saracens, and others who sin against God (i.e., who commit spiritual crimes against God). But where canon law collections placed that material in Book Five, Raymond moved it front and center as Book One of the text. He further amplified the link between different categories of sinner by introducing new connective language linking one group with another. Where others, like the *Summula Conradi*, for example, simply offered a title borrowed from the *Compilationes antique* and then began with content material, along the lines of 'On Heretics: A heretic is one who fashions a false opinion concerning faith or follows falsehood',[26] Raymond drew explicit narrative links from one category of 'transgressor' to another, introducing the new category with reference to the previous one. So, for example, in the title 'On Jews, Saracens, and their Servants', we find this opening sentence as a transition from the section 'On Simony': 'We have treated those who blaspheme against the Holy Spirit through simony; now we will treat those who dishonor God by worshiping in an evil manner, that is, Jews, Saracens, and heretics'.[27] In the title 'On Heretics' we find this opening sentence: 'We discussed above concerning Jews and pagans [Saracens], who dishonor God through infidelity. Now we wish to discuss heretics, who, by deviating from the faith, sin against God in many ways'.[28]

Raymond's connective language found its way back to the canon law tradition where glossators like Hostiensis picked it up and amplified it. In his *Summa aurea* (1253), Hostiensis transitioned from the title on Jews, Saracens,

25 Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes*, p. 40.

26 'De hereticis: Hereticus est, qui fingit falsam opinionem de fide vel fictam sequitur', Renard, *Trois sommes*, II, 89.

27 'Egimus de eis qui Spiritum Sanctum per simoniam blasphemant. Nunc de eis agamus qui male colendo Deum inhonorant, ut sunt iudaei, sarraceni, et haeretici'. Ochoa and Diez, *Raimundus de Pennaforte*, col. 307.

28 'Dictum est supra de iudaeis et paganis qui per infidelitatem Deum inhonorant. Nunc agendum de haereticis, qui a fide deviantes in Deum multipliciter peccant'. Ochoa and Diez, *Raimundus de Pennaforte*, as n. 1 above.

and their servants to the one on heretics with this connective statement: 'We have heard about Jews and Saracens who, through infidelity, and obduracy, and depraved understanding or blindness, do not recognize the Lord, but blaspheme and dishonor him; now we will deal with heretics, who, apostatizing from faith, are seen to sin against God in many ways'.[29] There may not be any particularly new ways of thinking about the wickedness of Jews and Saracens here, but the intensification of the language used against them also intensifies the sin of the heretic, linked here with that wickedness.

Unlike the *Summula Conradi*, Raymond's chapters on Jews, Saracens, and heretics in the *Summa* did more than merely serve as a placeholder reminding readers of the conceptual presence of infidels in Christian societies. The text aligns closely with the *Compilationes antique* tradition that he would soon edit for Gregory IX in the *Liber extra*. Raymond's *Summa* came to circulate with various glosses and stood as the pre-eminent guide to canon law for a good fifty years. With developments in scholastic theology and law, it eventually became dated, but it was given a second life through the labors of another Dominican, John of Freiburg (*c*. 1250–1314).[30] John was trained as a theologian rather than a canon lawyer, and from about 1280 he served as lector at Freiburg, a position that required him to teach student friars. It seems clear that he wrote his expansive *Summa confessorum* with those students in mind. John built his pastoral guide on the foundation of Raymond of Penyafort's *Summa de casibus*, adding theological material drawn from Albertus Magnus (d. 1280), Thomas Aquinas (1225–74), Ulrich of Strasbourg (*c*. 1220–77), and a number of other, largely Dominican, sources, as well as newer legal material from the canonist Hostiensis, among others.[31] If Raymond of Penyafort gets credit for the rise of a juridical approach to pastoral literature, John gets credit for the moral-theological reorientation of that genre. John's work clearly filled a need, and it was widely copied and disseminated. In her expansive study of Dominican education up to 1350, M. Michèle Mulchahey noted that, 'From 1300 onwards John of Freiburg's *Summa confessorum* was preferred

[29] 'Audiuimus de Iudaeis et Saracenis qui per infidelitatem, et duritiam, et prauam intelligentiam seu caecitatem dominum non recognoscunt, sed ipsum potius blasphamant, et inhonorant: nunc agendum est de haereticis, qui apostatando a fide in Deum multipliciter peccare videntur'. Hostiensis, *Summa aurea*, as n. 2 above.

[30] Johannes Rumsik, known as Johannes Friburgensis, was active in the Dominican convent of Freiburg im Breisgau, an important urban center and an archbishopric. For background on John, see L. Boyle, 'The *Summa confessorum* of John of Freiburg and the Popularization of the Moral Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas and Some of his Contemporaries', in *St. Thomas Aquinas, 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, ed. A. A. Maurer et al., 2 vols. (Toronto, 1974), II, 245–68. See also Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes*, pp. 43–53; Mulchahey, *'First the Bow is Bent in Study'*, pp. 543–9.

[31] On John's various efforts to revise Raymond's *Summa de casibus* and his continued revising and abridging of the *Summa confessorum*, see Boyle, 'The *Summa confessorum*'; Mulchahey, *'First the Bow is Bent in Study'*, pp. 543–8.

to all other manuals of penitential practice within the Dominican order'.[32] John's manual was clearly aimed at an audience of Dominican friars, but it was extremely well received outside the order as well, and there are well over 150 extant manuscripts from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[33] By the time John wrote his text, the Dominican role in the increasingly important function of confession, still new in Raymond's day, was firmly established. John brought a wealth of Dominican tradition to his exhaustive, scholastic project.

John maintained the structure of Raymond's *Summa de casibus*, so he, too, began his guide for priests with a long treatment of those who stood outside the communion of the Church as perpetrators of 'crimes' against God: simoniacs, Jews, Saracens, and heretics. John also retained Raymond's narrative language connecting one category of infidel to the next, and so the theological connection between simoniacs, Jews, pagans, and heretics was explicit in the opening lines of each section. Simoniacs blaspheme against the Holy Spirit by their simony while Jews and Muslims dishonor God by worshiping badly. Jews and Saracens 'fail to honor God through faithlessness (*infidelitatem*)', while heretics 'sin against God in many ways by deviating from faith'.[34]

The majority of questions dealing with Jews, Saracens, and heretics appear in Book One of John's manual: twenty-three questions on Jews and Saracens in Title Four, and nineteen on heretics in Title Five. This part of the *Summa* contains a great deal of additional material, especially from Thomas Aquinas and Hostiensis. One can readily see in John what scholars have come to identify as the normative canon law position on heretics, Jews, and Muslims as joined together as a body of 'otherness' against which the priest and the community are meant to be on guard.

Many readers found the *Summa* so helpful that they used its content to create pastoral manuals of their own. Leonard Boyle outlined this process long ago; any time one comes across a pastoral manual with John's distinctive set of authorities, one can be fairly confident that the author had John of Freiburg's text at hand.[35] What a reader would have absorbed from John was a view of Christian society in which those outside the communion, linked through a designation as much criminal as sinful, were of central importance

[32] Mulchahey, '*First the Bow is Bent in Study*', p. 547.

[33] In addition to many manuscript copies, the *Summa confessorum* appeared in seven printed editions between 1476 and 1619. See T. Kaeppeli, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum medii aevi*, 4 vols. (Rome, 1975), II, 428–36.

[34] 'Dictum est supra de iudeis et paganis qui per infidelitatem deum inhonorant. Nunc agendum est de hereticis qui a fide deviantes in deum multipliciter peccant', Johannes Friburgensis, *Summa confessorum* (Augsburg, 1476), fol. 19r. Available online at http://opacplus.bsb-muenchen.de/search?oclcno=645244394.

[35] Boyle, 'The *Summa confessorum*'.

in the definition of Christian community. Errors outside the pale helped to put more readily correctible errors in perspective.

A View from the Parish: Heretics, Jews, and Muslims in a Manual for Bavarian Priests

Much of the pastoral literature that proliferated after the Fourth Lateran Council was authored and disseminated by mendicant friars, especially Dominicans. As we have seen, it was closely tied to the canon law tradition as it developed over the course of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and it drew heretics, Jews, and Muslims together in a common position marking out the boundaries of Christian community and communion. Given how widespread this view became with the diffusion of John of Freiburg's pastoral manual, we would be justified in presuming this to be characteristic of late medieval Latin Christianity as a whole. But in addition to the widely-read guides by Raymond and John, many new guides for priests were written and copied in the fourteenth century, often aimed at a more limited, regional, parish-oriented audience, and devised outside university and mendicant contexts. These pastoral manuals, even when based heavily upon Dominican models, often rejected the organizational, theological, and legal structures presented therein. The remainder of this essay will examine one such pastoral guide, the *Speculum clericorum* composed by Albert of Diessen, an Augustinian canon regular in Bavaria, looking in particular at the way he disentangled heretics, Jews, and Muslims. Albert broke with the thirteenth-century genre conventions that had come to bind heretics, Jews, and Muslims together, treating each group in a substantially different way. He gave considerable thought to interaction with Jews, virtually ignored Muslims, and treated heretics, if at all, as primarily of historical interest or as a rhetorical device.

Albert wrote at least three versions of his *Speculum clericorum*, the first in 1369, the second in 1373, and the third in 1376. We possess autograph copies of each of these versions, which gives us considerable insight into Albert's approach to his work. We can see changes in his thinking as he revised and expanded the original 390 chapters into 596 chapters in the second and third versions. There are well over fifty extant manuscript copies of the text, representing all three versions.[36] Textual evidence indicates that he wrote for an audience of Augustinian canons regular with responsibility for direct pastoral

[36] The autograph manuscripts are now held in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich: Clm 5668, Clm 12471, and Clm 18387. They have now been digitized: http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00036537/image_1; http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00036397/image_1; http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00036398/image_1. On Albert and his

care.[37] The text circulated primarily in a southern German orbit (upper Bavaria, eastern Swabia, and Tyrol), and mainly, although not exclusively, among Augustinian canons regular. Many local parishes had been incorporated into Augustinian communities over the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the Augustinians played a vital role in parish life and the 'care of souls' in the region. Augustinians tended to educate themselves within their own communities rather than attending universities, but their libraries held many of the standard works that were part of university and mendicant curricula, Raymond of Penyafort's and John of Freiburg's treatises among them.[38] In spite of the fact that Albert had these Dominican models in front of him, however, in his parish-oriented guide the connection between Jews, Muslims, and heretics as infidel transgressors against God disappeared.

John of Freiburg's *Summa confessorum* was the primary medium through which Albert accessed the pastoral tradition we have examined thus far; no other source comes close in importance. But Albert structured his *Speculum*

manuscripts, see D. C. Klepper, 'Pastoral Literature in Local Context: Albert of Diessen's *Mirror of Priests* on Christian–Jewish Coexistence', *Speculum* 92 (2017), 692–723.

37 On Albert's intended audience as Augustinian canons with parish level duties, see Klepper, 'Pastoral Literature', pp. 697–9. Evidence that Albert expected his Augustinian readers to have care of souls in parishes is found throughout the text. For example, in the first version of the text, Clm 12471, we find on fols. 1v–2r: 'Moreover, in order that such harmful ignorance may be supplanted among the clergy, I, Albert, canon regular of Diessen, though the least, have therefore gathered together the present very succinct little work from the opinions of many fathers and called it the *Speculum clericorum*, especially to inform those who, on account of the scarcity of books, are not able to learn those things which will be necessary for them' ('Ut autem ignorantia tam nociva supplantetur per clerum, idcirco ego albertus canonicus regularis in dyssen licet minimus presens opusculum quamvis compendiosum ex multorum sententiis patrum collegi et speculum clericorum intytulavi, ad informationem illorum specialiter qui propter penuriam librorum ea que ipsis necessaria forent discere non valent'). On fol. 3r, Albert has a paragraph on the importance of proclaiming holy days to the people of the parish: 'On every Sunday, the priest ought to proclaim to the people of the parish entrusted to him the mandated vigils and feasts of the saints, one by one' ('Omnibus dominicis diebus debet sacerdos parrochialis populo sibi commisso pronuntiare vigilias statutas et festa sanctorum singulariter exprimendo'). On fols. 3v–4r we see another reference to service in a parish: 'After having demonstrated how priests ought to take care of the people entrusted to them through preaching, it follows to see in what manner they ought to take care of them through the performance of [sacramental] work' ('Postquam ostensum est qualiter sacerdotes debeant preesse populo sibi commisso per verbum predicationis, consequenter videndum est quomodo preesse debeant per effectum operationis'). The assumption is that the canons to whom he is writing serve the people of the parish.

38 On the education of German Augustinian canons during this period, see U. Köpf, 'Bildung im Leben und Wirken der Regularkanoniker', in *Studien zum Bildungswesen der Bayerischen Augustiner-Chorherren in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, ed. G. Melville and A. Schmid, Publikationen der Akademie der Augustiner-Chorherren von Windesheim 8 (Paring, 2008), pp. 53–82, and R. C. Schwinges, *Deutsche Universitätsbesucher im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert: Studien zur Sozialgeschichte des Alten Reiches* (Stuttgart, 1986), pp. 656–7.

clericorum in a way that broke with the dominant trend of the thirteenth century. Instead of organizing his work according to the books and titles of canon law collections or Raymond of Penyafort's or John of Freiburg's adaptation of them, Albert proceeded according to the more practical needs of parish priests. His book began with a reflection on the dangers of priestly ignorance and his intention to rectify the problem with a clear guide for those with priestly duties. He gave an overview of sacramental theology and the priest's role in it, and then went on to provide a guide to each sacrament in turn, beginning with baptism. He borrowed both content and the *questio* format from John of Freiburg's *Summa confessorum*, but he was very selective about how he incorporated John's material into his own text.

Albert abandoned the shape of what had become the standard 'juridicized' pastoral manual, and in doing so, he broke the structural, categorical link between Jews, Muslims, and heretics. He allotted no space to consider the legal notion of 'crimes against God' as a category, or to consider infidelity as a shared characteristic of 'those who sin against God'. Instead, Albert placed comments about Jews wherever they fit into the discussion, essentially reverting to what had been the status quo at the time of Gratian. About Saracens and heretics, Albert had virtually nothing to say, especially not in his initial 1369 version of the work. The one reference to heretics, Jews, and Muslims together is found in a discussion of communion. In response to the question of who ought to be excluded from communion, Albert provided a tremendously long list of some fifty categories of individuals, organized in groups separated with rubrication. 'Jews, pagans, and heretics' were listed first, and that joining is the single place in his text where he acknowledged a relationship between them. But while they might have come first in the list, Jews, pagans, and heretics were hardly alone or distinctive. He went on to list pythonesses ('phitonisse', that is, female diviners) and sorcerers ('sortilege'),[39] adulterers and concubines, perjurers and those who bear false witness, those who have committed capital crimes, those who have harmed clerics or widows or orphans, those who have committed violent crimes, rapists and arsonists, those who have committed sacrilege or who are mad, usurers, those who are not obedient to the teachings of the Church, traitors, those who have been publicly excommunicated, those who violate Sundays or holidays, those who do not make proper satisfaction for homicide, those who have not completed assigned penance, those who have not properly confessed, those who curse and blaspheme, those who are servants to Jews, and those who kill Jews without legal process.[40] The list of those to be excluded from communion

[39] A near-contemporary reader was concerned that the distinction between 'phitonisse' and 'sortilegi' might not be clear, and so he wrote above the word 'phitonisse' '*zaüberin*' and above 'sortilege' '*zaüberer*'. Clm 12781, fol. 28r.

[40] Clm 12471, fol. 28r–v. In later versions of the text, Albert would change this to read 'those who kill Jews or pagans'.

is so long that even if Jews, Muslims, and heretics are given first place, they are hardly distinguishable from the (sinning) body of the Church.

In the first version of the *Speculum clericorum*, Albert mentioned Jews in three different chapters related to the sacrament of baptism, once in his discussion of the Eucharist, twice in the section devoted to the sacrament of penance, twice in the section on homicide, and once in his discussion of usury. While the reader can see that Jews are in some sense unlike Christians, there is very little here that would point to the Jews as first among sinners against God. Albert's reader learned that Jews were permitted to receive usury from gentiles, that Jews as well as pagans could baptize Christians,[41] and, through the example of a Jew who supposedly attempted it, that individuals cannot baptize themselves. They learned that Christians should not interact indiscriminately with Jews in daily life, but also that Christians who kill Jews outside of licit judicial process are culpable as homicides and excommunicate. Albert communicated little about Jews as infidels. There is a reference to Jewish stubbornness in the section on the sacrament of baptism through the instruction that Jews intending to convert should remain catechumens for eight months, and a short paragraph just after a warning about extrajudicial violence against Jews explains in brief how Christians should properly interact with them. In sum, Albert discussed Jews occasionally, seemed to presume that his readers would have some familiarity with them and possibly live alongside them, and did not characterize them in an especially negative way.

Apart from his reference to 'pagans' being, along with Jews and heretics, among those who ought to be excluded from communion, Albert included just one brief reference to Muslims, when he included the statement that what applied to Jews in a particular passage applied also to Saracens.[42] Perhaps guidance on Muslims did not seem relevant to the needs of an audience unlikely to encounter them in the course of their pastoral duties. Heretics were likewise of little interest to Albert, and that seems perhaps more surprising. In the first edition of the manual, he referred to heretics just four times, always in the context of some other discussion. The first reference was in the list of those excluded from communion discussed above. The second asked whether in certain circumstances it might be appropriate for a Christian to confess to someone other than his own priest, and one allowable

41 In cases of necessity, baptism could be performed by anyone: man, woman, layperson, Jew, pagan, or, according to most, even a heretic. See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.67.5, and Guido of Monte Rochen [de Monte Rocherii or Rotherii], *Handbook for Curates: A Late Medieval Manual on Pastoral Ministry*, ed. A. Thayer and K. J. Lualdi, trans. A. Thayer (Washington DC, 2011), p. 22.

42 'Understand that what is said about the Jews in all respects concerns pagans as well, except that Christians may eat the food of the Saracens in a time of preaching' ('Quod dictum est de iudeis per omnia intellige de paganis excepto quod tempore predicationis christiani possunt vesci de cibis sarracenorum'). Clm 12471, fol. 76r.

circumstance would be if one knew one's priest to be 'a heretic, or a seducer into evil, or weak', or given to sin himself.[43] The third occurred in a chapter asking whether a priest must always keep the secrecy of the confessional. What should a priest do if information gleaned through confession revealed a clear future danger, such as a heretic hidden in the community? Albert allowed that under such circumstances, it would be appropriate for the priest to take action, even consulting with his bishop, as long as he did not reveal any particulars.[44] The final reference appeared in a chapter exploring the possibility of absolution or excommunication after death. Heresy provided an exception to the general rule that neither absolution nor excommunication was possible in this circumstance.[45]

43 'Concerning a heretical priest and such. It is asked if a subordinate knows his own priest to be a heretic, or a seducer into evil, or weak, so that he would be prone to the same sin confessed to him, or if it is judged that he is probably a revealer of confession, or if the sin was committed against the one to whom he should confess. About this Thomas Aquinas said that in these cases and similar, in which it is likely that a penitent fears danger to himself or to the priest from the confession made or to be made to him, he ought to return to the superior and confess to him, or ask from him permission to confess to another' ('De sacerdote heretico et huiusmodi. Queritur si subditus scit sacerdotem proprium esse hereticum, aut sollicitatorem ad malum, aut fragilem, quod ad peccatum confessum sibi sit pronus, vel si probabiliter revelator confessionis estimatur, aut si peccatum contra ipsum commissum sit de quo quis debet confiteri. Super hoc dicit Thomas de Aquino quod in hiis casibus et similibus in quibus probabiliter timet penitens periculum sibi vel sacerdoti imminere ex confessione ei facta vel facienda, debet recurrere ad superiorem et illi confiteri, vel ab eodem petere licenciam alteri confitendi'). Clm 12471, fol. 37v.

44 'If, however, some future danger is known through confession, as concerning a heretic who might intend to corrupt the faith of the people, or else concerning some future temporal harm, or about consanguinity or affinity between some persons wishing to contract marriage, then the priest ought to provide some remedy insofar as possible without revelation of the confession, such as by admonishing those confessing so that they desist, and by other means taking care so that there would be no harm. A subordinate may also say to his prelate that he ought to look diligently after his flock, in such a way, however, that he would not say anything by word or gesture to reveal the one who has confessed' ('Si tamen aliquod periculum futurum sciretur per confessionem, ut de heretico qui intenderet corrumpere fidem populi, vel etiam de dampno aliquo temporali futuro, vel de consanguinitate aut affinitate inter aliquas personas volentes matrimonium contrahere, tunc sacerdos debet adhibere aliquod remedium quantum potest, sine revelatione confessionis, scilicet monendo confitentes ut desistant, et aliis diligentiam apponendo ne dampnificentur. Potest etiam subditus dicere prelato quod diligentius invigilet super gregem suum, ita tamen quod non dicat aliquid per quod verbo vel nutu prodit confitentem'). Clm 12471, fol. 39r.

45 'There are certain crimes concerning which even after death it is possible to be accused or punished, like heresy. From which the Gloss says if a certain person were a heretic who by law might have been excommunicated but was never denounced or treated accordingly, and where in death this person according to public knowledge had been a heretic, that person may be denounced as such after his death' ('Sunt enim quedam crimina de quibus etiam post mortem accusari possit quilibet vel dampnari veluti heresis. Unde dicit Glossa, Si aliquis esset hereticus hic a iure esset excommunicatus licet numquam

In each of these instances, the matter at hand was not actually heresy; rather, the heretic was invoked to consider some other problem. In the first instance, the exclusion of the heretic protects the sanctity of Christian communion; in the second, the imperative to confess to one's own priest is reinforced; in the third, the seal of the confessional is marked as inviolable; and in the fourth, the limits of the sacrament of penance are established. Each reference has its source in John of Freiburg's *Summa*, specifically in the moral theology John drew from Aquinas. In none of the cases did Albert give any indication that his priestly reader should know something about heresy or heretics as a practical matter.

In his revision and expansion of the *Speculum clericorum* in 1373, Albert added many additional paragraphs on Jews and Christian–Jewish relations. There were eight chapters referencing Jews in the first version, compared with eighteen in each of the two later revisions. Some, though not all, of this additional material came from John of Freiburg or canon law collections of the *Compilationes antique*, and it tended to address pragmatic concerns (Can a Christian eat Jewish food? Can a Christian share a bathhouse with Jews? How much should a Christian interact with them? What happens if a Christian has illicit sex with them?). Albert also added emphasis to his early warnings about extra-judicial violence here, and one has the sense that he was as concerned about Christian mistreatment of Jews as about Jewish danger to Christians.[46]

Albert added a few new references to Muslims in the two later revisions, but they are not substantial. For example, in the first version of the *Speculum*, he included those who kill Jews outside the law among those Christians to be excluded from communion. In the second edition, he named those who kill Jews *or* pagans. The additional references to Muslims are always tied to references to Jews and appear when he is quoting a new source from the canon law tradition of the *Compilationes antique*.[47] Beyond these few limited references, Albert brought no new material on Muslims from the *Summa confessorum* or elsewhere into the text.

Albert added three new chapters specifically on heresy and heretics to the second version of the *Speculum*, but the emphasis was overwhelmingly on heresy as a historical phenomenon. The first chapter, imported from John of Freiburg's *Summa,* asked 'who may be called a heretic and on what grounds?' Like John, Albert began by citing Augustine: 'Concerning this Augustine said that a heretic is one who, erring in faith, holds on to or follows a false

denunciaretur nec constaret de hoc cuiquam, quo obeunte et publice intellecto quod fuerat hereticus, hoc denunciari post obitum eius posset'). Clm 12471, fol. 87r–v.

46 On Albert's concern regarding extrajudicial anti-Jewish violence, see Klepper, 'Pastoral Literature'.

47 See Stantchev, 'Apply to Muslims'.

opinion'.[48] But instead of following John's long discussion of heresy and how to handle heretics, deal with issues of inheritance and property, reconcile a repentant heretic, and so on, Albert abruptly turned to the related category of schismatics, citing Isidore of Seville: 'a schismatic is one who acts as if he adheres to the correct faith, but treats the traditions of the holy fathers with prideful contempt, and with a certain malevolence rips himself from the unity of the Church, and he is called a schismatic because he does not follow the catholic peace'.[49] The second, and by far the longest, new chapter on heresy is a passage from Isidore's seventh-century *Etymologies*. Asking 'How many sects of heretics there are and under what name they have been received', Albert reproduced Isidore's description of early Christian heresies faithfully, adding no more recent material to the text.[50] The third new chapter on heresy was a brief excerpt from John of Freiburg's long discussion of the four ways in which heretics may be punished – by excommunication from the Church ('excommunicatione'), by removing them from positions of power ('depositione'), by confiscating their property ('rerum ablatione'), and by military force ('militare persecutione') – but Albert skipped completely over John's related question about how to identify heretics in the first place – through the methods of 'accusation' ('accusatio'), 'inquiry' ('inquisitio'), and 'denunciation' ('denunciatio'). A reader of Albert's pastoral manual would be hard pressed to know how to respond to heresy if he encountered it.[51]

Since Albert did not seem to view heresy as a problem Augustinian canons were likely to face, it is worth noting that he was very interested in providing his readers with guidance on other forms of theological or ritual deviance. Albert included numerous chapters on correcting superstitions (belief in werewolves and other shape-changers, belief in the Germanic 'fates' called *Gaschepfen*) and on enchantments, sorcery and divination, conjuring demons, and forms of sacrilege.[52] He ended a long chapter detailing types of divination with the canon law dictum that diviners, magicians, sorcerers, and all similar practitioners must be eliminated from the Church and permanently excommunicated.[53] The immediacy with which Albert addressed these forbidden

48 'Queritur quis dicatur hereticus et propter quid. Super hoc patet Augustinus hereticus dicitur errans in fide qui falsam oppinionem gignit vel sequitur'. Clm 5668, fol. 128v.

49 'Ysidorus: Scismaticus est qui quidem rectam fidem confiteri se simulat, sed sanctorum patrum traditiones superbe contempnit, et aliqua malivolentia ab unitate ecclesie se scindit. Et dicitur scismaticus quia non sequitur katholicam pacem'. Clm 5668, fol. 128v.

50 Clm 5668, fol. 129r. Isidore's *Etymologiarvm sive originvm libri XX* are available online: http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/isidore.html. See also the recent English translation, *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, trans. S. A. Barney (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 175–8.

51 Clm 5668, fol. 132r. Cf. John of Freiburg, *Summa confessorum* 1.5.3.

52 Clm 12471, fols. 72v–73v.

53 Clm 5668, fols. 114v–116v. 'And so according to many authorities soothsayers, diviners, enchanters, sorcerers, and other followers of this kind [of practice] are to be cast out of the Church and permanently excommunicated unless they repent' ('Ex multis

practices, like the immediacy with which he addressed Jewish questions, contrasts markedly with his limited interest and distant stance on heresy.

Conclusion

Albert's Augustinian, parish-based perspective viewed 'infidelity' and its dangers in a manner quite different from friars like Raymond of Penyafort or John of Freiburg. Writing a century earlier, Raymond and John had operated within an increasingly standardized framework of canon law and moral theology. By placing a long and detailed description of how to handle all manner of 'unchristian' behavior at the very start of their manuals, they used error to mark out the boundary of orthodoxy. Albert's relative disinterest in Muslims and heretics stands in notable contrast to his avid interest in Jews and Christian–Jewish relations, which concerned him a great deal.

Elsewhere I have discussed the connection between Albert's repeated warnings about extrajudicial anti-Jewish violence and the reality of Christian anti-Jewish violence in southern German lands during the outbreak of plague in 1349. Albert wrote his first version of the *Speculum clericorum* twenty years after those upheavals, but within months of his completing it, the plague returned to the region in 1369. His revised version of the work, completed in 1373, emphasized even more strongly the necessity of lawful Christian–Jewish coexistence. It is reasonable to conclude that Albert may have worried about a repeat of extrajudicial violence.[54] Regardless of that particular context, Jews lived in Albert's diocese of Augsburg and in towns in which the convent held land, and it made sense for Albert to include information on Jews in a guide for priests with responsibility for local pastoral care.

On the other hand, there were no Muslims to speak of in the region, and Albert was clearly not interested in writing an exhaustive guide that could travel and remain relevant across the breadth of Latin Christendom. And while there likely were various groups in the region who would have been deemed heretics if they had come to the attention of inquisitors such as those sent to the whole of Germany by Urban VI in 1364, there was no public uproar of the sort that would have caught Albert's attention. By the 1390s, there would be a large scale inquiry into Waldensian heresy in Augsburg, as well as in Mainz, seat of the region's archdiocese. But when Albert wrote his pastoral guide, that was in the future.[55] Whether, from his perch in the small market

itaque auctoritatibus colligitur quod arioli, aruspices, incantatores, sortilegi, atque ceteri huiusmodi sectatores ab ecclesia sunt eliminandi et nisi resipuerint perpetuo excommunicandi'). Clm 5668, fol. 116v.

54 Klepper, 'Pastoral Literature', pp. 716–19.

55 On the inquisitions of the 1390s see J. Kolpacoff Deane, 'Archiepiscopal Inquisitions in the Middle Rhine: Urban Anticlericalism and Waldensianism in Late Fourteenth-Century

town of Diessen, he would have felt the need to provide Augustinian canons with the tools necessary to deal with Waldensian heretics and the inquisitors who came to search for them, we will never know.

Pastoral manuals claimed as their purpose the education of priests in their function as ritual experts and guardians of Christian faith and practice. While authors drew from a common set of theological and canon law sources, they exercised independence in selecting material to include, exclude, and adapt. Albert's *Speculum* is similar in many ways to the more widely circulated, earlier works by Raymond of Penyafort and John of Freiburg, but there is much in Albert's work that is distinctive. His greater-than-usual interest in the place of Jews in his community and his less-than-expected interest in heresy as a threat reflect his place in space and time. As a genre, pastoral manuals can illuminate the nexus between a Christian ideal constructed in the *studium*, the university, or the papal curia and the practical application of that ideal in an ordinary community. Albert's approach to heretics, Jews, and Muslims differs from the models he employs so thoughtfully because he was operating within a local framework. That local orientation is itself characteristic of a late medieval religious environment. Albert's *Speculum clericorum* is in many ways representative of a fourteenth-century shift away from the universalizing impulse of thirteenth-century scholasticism toward increasingly diverse expressions of Christianity. With the independence characteristic of authors in the late medieval pastoral genre, Albert systematically disentangled the knot that had come to bind heretics with Muslims and Jews over the course of the thirteenth century.

Mainz', *Catholic Historical Review* 92 (2006), 197–224, and E. Smelyansky, 'Urban Order and Urban Other: Anti-Waldensian Inquisition in Augsburg, 1393', *German History* 34 (2016), 1–20.

8

New Frontiers in the Late Medieval Reception of a Heretical Text: The Implications of Two New Latin Copies of Marguerite Porete's *Mirror of Simple Souls*[*]

Justine L. Trombley

The *Mirror of Simple Souls*, one of the most important mystical treatises of the late Middle Ages, was also one of the most resilient. Written in Old French by a laywoman, Marguerite Porete, at the end of the thirteenth century, it was condemned as heretical twice shortly after it was written: first in Valenciennes sometime between 1297 and 1305, and again in Paris in 1310, when its author was also condemned and burned at the stake.[1] Yet the *Mirror* escaped destruction and continued to circulate anonymously, surviving not only in French but also in English, Latin, and Italian translations.

In the conclusion to his 2010 article 'New Light on the *Mirror of Simple Souls*', Robert E. Lerner, commenting on this resilience, posited that rather than being relatively thin, the *Mirror of Simple Souls*'s late medieval circulation was instead quite robust. Tallying up the surviving French, Middle English, Latin, and Italian manuscripts, and noting evidence for several other now-lost copies, he observed in his closing sentence that 'it appears as if dozens of copies of the *Mirror* were bobbing up continually in the seas of late medieval western Europe like unsinkable corks'.[2]

This remark remains entirely on point. Evidence for further copies drifting around Europe in the fifteenth century has continued to appear in the years since Lerner's article.[3] But while plenty of rumors of these *Mirror*s' existence have been found, one thing which has remained elusive for over thirty years

[*] I am grateful to Sylvain Piron and to the editors for several helpful comments and suggestions.

1 On Marguerite see S. L. Field, *The Beguine, the Angel, and the Inquisitor: The Trials of Marguerite Porete and Guiard of Cressonessart* (Notre Dame IN, 2012), and the essay by Michael Bailey in the present volume.

2 R. E. Lerner, 'New Light on the *Mirror of Simple Souls*', *Speculum* 85 (2010), 91–116 (p. 116).

3 Z. Kocher, 'The Apothecary's *Mirror of Simple Souls*: Circulation and Reception of Marguerite Porete's Book in Fifteenth-Century France', *Modern Philology* 111 (2013), 23–47; J. L. Trombley, 'New Evidence on the Origins of the Latin *Mirror of Simple Souls* from a Forgotten Paduan Manuscript', *Journal of Medieval History* 43 (2017), 137–52.

is a new, full manuscript copy of the *Mirror*, in any of its linguistic versions.[4] A few fragments and excerpts from lost *Mirror*s have surfaced here and there, but new full copies have long been absent.[5]

This long drought has now broken, however. Proving once again the aptness of Lerner's observation, not one but two new corks have bobbed to the surface in the Latin manuscript tradition of the *Mirror* (*Speculum simplicium animarum*), offering crucial new insights into the *Mirror*'s fortunes in the 'seas' of late medieval Europe.

The new copies are found in Bautzen, Domstiftsbibliothek Sankt Petri, MS M I 15 and Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS Conv. soppr. G.3. 1130. Neither has previously been known to scholars of the *Mirror*. This essay introduces these manuscripts into the corpus of surviving *Mirror* codices, giving brief descriptions and discussing the important new frontiers they open up in the history of the *Mirror*'s late medieval circulation and reception. The two codices reveal new geographic areas of circulation and new audiences for the *Mirror*. More broadly, they provide insight into the spread and use of heretical texts, and even suggest a reconsideration of what 'heretical' means in such a context.

New Geographic Frontiers: Bautzen, Domstiftsbibliothek Sankt Petri, MS M I 15

The discovery of the Bautzen copy comes from the meticulous work of Ulrike Spyra, who identified the text in 2012 as part of her entry for M I 15 in the *Katalog der Domstiftsbibliothek Bautzen*; this entry has recently been made available on the 'Manuscripta Mediaevalia' website.[6] Spyra observed that

4 Paul Verdeyen's identification of a Latin *Mirror* in Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana [BAV], MS Chigianus B IV 41 marks the last time that a new complete copy of the *Mirror* was found. See P. Verdeyen, 'La première traduction latine du *Miroir* de Marguerite Porete', *Ons Geestelijk Erf* 58 (1984), 388–9.

5 Fragments of the *Mirror* have been found embedded in other texts, as for example the French fragments discovered by Geneviève Hasenohr: see G. Hasenohr, 'La tradition du *Miroir des simples âmes* au XV^{e} siècle: de Marguerite Porete († 1310) à Marguerite de Navarre', *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* (Paris, 1999), pp. 1347–66, discussed also in eadem, 'La seconde vie du *Miroir des simples* âmes en France: *Le Livre de la discipline d'amour divine* (XV^{e}–XVIII^{e} s.)', in *Marguerite Porete et le* Miroir des simples âmes*: Perspectives historiques, philosophique, et littéraires*, ed. S. L. Field, R. E. Lerner, and S. Piron (Paris, 2013), pp. 263–317, and the Latin excerpts noted in Trombley, 'New Evidence'.

6 C. Mackert, B. Mitzscherlich, A. Scholla, and U. Spyra, *Katalog der Domstiftsbibliothek Bautzen* (Leipzig, 2012) [hereafter *Katalog*], pp. 67–72; the web entry is available at http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/. I am very grateful to the staff of the Bautzen *Domstiftsbibliothek* for allowing me to view this manuscript, and especially Dr Birgit Mitzscherlich for her help both during my visit and in acquiring photographic

the copy was 'to date an unknown textual witness' ('bislang unbekannter Textzeuge'), but this discovery has until now gone unnoticed by scholars of Marguerite Porete and her *Mirror*.

M I 15 contains twenty folios of a Latin *Mirror*, spanning roughly two hundred pages of Verdeyen's critical edition, or about seventy-four chapters of the chapter division used in the edition.[7] Although this copy is incomplete – it begins at the end of chapter 51, and finishes near the end of chapter 126 – it is nevertheless a significant amount of text, about 60% of the entire work.

The manuscript is mixed paper and parchment comprising 197 folios, and appears to be in its original leather-and-wood binding. It contains various religious texts making up ten different fascicles, written in various hands, and ranging in date from about 1370 to 1440 as demonstrated by watermark evidence. Many of the works are incomplete, missing quires and pages, some containing the stubs of pages which have been torn off; Spyra suggests that they are the remains of codices which had been otherwise damaged or destroyed.[8] The other works bound with the *Mirror* are mostly sermons, some anonymous, some from figures such as Jacobus of Voragine, the English vicar John Felton, and Henry of Friemar. A few other works are mixed in, such as short passages on the passion of Christ, a homily of Gregory the Great, and a *Cisio janus*, a verse calendar marking the feast days of saints.[9] The *Mirror* forms the tenth and final fascicle in the manuscript, on folios 178r–197v, comprising two quires of ten folios each; the last three folios of the second quire appear to have been torn off, as there are three stubs. The *Mirror* is written on paper, in two columns per page in a single *bastarda* hand, and appears after a copy of Gregory the Great's *Homiliae XL in evangelia*.[10] After the *Mirror* fascicle there are the remains of another quire of ten folios, represented now only by stubs; this fact is not noted in the catalog entry. Whether this was a different text or more of the *Mirror of Simple Souls* is impossible to say, as there are no textual fragments left on the stubs.

The emergence of this codex forges a completely new path in the *Mirror*'s reception history. It seems to have originated not in western, but in central Europe: watermark evidence indicates that this *Mirror* was copied in Bohemia, either in the last two decades of the fourteenth century or the first two decades of the fifteenth; the rest of the works in the manuscript also appear

reproductions. I also thank Dr Richard Meyer Forsting for his help in preparing my visit to the library. I am equally grateful for funding from the Medieval Academy of America's Olivia Remie Constable Award, which allowed me to visit Bautzen in order to view the manuscript.

7 See *Margaretae Porete Speculum simplicium animarum / Le Mirouer des simples* âmes, ed. P. Verdeyen and R. Guarnieri, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 69 (Turnhout, 1986) [hereafter *Speculum*], pp. 153–367.

8 *Katalog*, p. 67.

9 For the full list of works, see *Katalog*, pp. 67–72.

10 *Katalog*, p. 72.

to have Bohemian origins.[11] The kingdom of Bohemia in the fifteenth century included the modern eastern German region of Lusatia – which included Bautzen – and Silesia in modern western Poland. The region of Bohemia itself within the kingdom comprised most of what is today the Czech Republic, and this is where the watermarks probably originated.[12] Furthermore, in its single, bound form, the codex appears to have circulated in Lusatia, specifically in the small towns around Bautzen and in Bautzen itself, as is made clear by lines written on the inside of the manuscript's front cover, which, among other names, note that the book was bequeathed to a church in Wittichenau by a certain Peter Szuscgk, a vicar of Bautzen.[13] Bautzen, the historical capital of upper Lusatia, lies almost directly east of Dresden. In the fifteenth century, the border with Saxony and the rest of the Holy Roman Empire lay just to its west, while just to its east was Silesia. In addition, the border with Bohemia lay almost immediately to its south.

This provenance is entirely unique in the *Mirror*'s history. The geographic distribution of *Mirror* manuscripts has long been confined to France, England, and Italy. These three have also, naturally, formed the linguistic boundaries of its manuscript traditions: Old/Middle French, Middle English, and Italian. The Latin, while technically international in its character, has also remained mostly within Italy, as almost all of the other Latin codices have their origins there.[14] The one exception is Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Latin 46, which appears to have been copied in southern Germany.[15] This manuscript, however, has largely been neglected in scholarship, and no other *Mirror* copy until now has had ties to German-speaking areas.[16] This fact, combined with the Italian provenance of all other Latin *Mirror* copies, has meant that discussion of the Latin *Mirror of Simple Souls* has been almost exclusively

11 The watermarks in the *Mirror* copy are two variants of a Moor's head (Piccard, nos. 20494 and 20492, *c*. 1387) and a horn (Piccard, no. H II 296–297, *c*. 1399–1402). *Katalog*, p. 72.

12 See the useful map at the beginning of F. G. Heymann, *John Žižka and the Hussite Revolution* (Princeton, 1955).

13 See *Katalog*, p. 67. This is discussed further below.

14 See the descriptions in Verdeyen, 'Introduction' to *Speculum*, pp. viii–xii, and in M. Sargent, 'Medieval and Modern Readership of Marguerite Porete's *Mirouer des simples âmes anienties*: The Continental Latin and Italian Tradition', in *The Medieval Translator/ Traduire au Moyen Age* 15: *In principio fuit interpres*, ed. A. Patrina (Turnhout, 2013), pp. 85–96 (pp. 85–9) [hereafter Sargent, 'Latin and Italian Tradition']; also in J. L. Trombley, 'The Latin Manuscripts of the *Mirror of Simple Souls*', in *A Companion to Marguerite Porete and* The Mirror of Simple Souls, ed. W. R. Terry and R. Stauffer (Leiden, 2017), pp. 186–217 (p. 187).

15 There has been some debate over the origins of this manuscript. See Sargent, 'Latin and Italian Tradition', pp. 87–8 n. 8, and Trombley, 'Latin Manuscripts', p. 187 n. 3.

16 A detailed study of this manuscript forms a chapter in the monograph which I am developing based on my doctoral thesis (Trombley, 'The Mirror Broken Anew: The Manuscript Evidence for Opposition to Marguerite Porete's Latin *Mirror of Simple Souls* in the Later Middle Ages', Ph.D. dissertation, University of St Andrews, 2014).

Italo-centric.[17] Now, with the Bohemian origins of the Bautzen text, and its circulation in Lusatia, new frontiers in the *Mirror*'s late medieval reception are open for exploration.

The *Mirror* perhaps came to Bohemia from northern Italy. We know that it had made its way to Italy by the fourteenth century, as some of the Latin manuscripts can be roughly dated to the late fourteenth century, and the Italian version, translated from the Latin, was possibly made then as well.[18] The *Mirror* seems to have been particularly popular in the province of Venice, especially in Padua and Venice itself.[19] Northern Italy, particularly Venice, had strong ties to central European centers like Prague and Breslau (Wrocław), in terms of trade, politics, and intellectual and cultural exchange.[20] Prague was also at this time a major hub of intellectual and cultural exchange that drew texts from all over Europe.[21] Any number of networks – university students, monastic and mendicant communities, diplomats, merchants – could have carried a copy of the *Mirror* northward.

Where exactly in Bohemia the *Mirror* or any of the other texts were copied is difficult to say. The first fascicle comprises a *Cisio janus* which was perhaps copied in or around Prague around 1412, as it records the feast days of Prague saints, but there are no more specific geographic indicators for any of the other works, including the *Mirror*.[22] As noted above, the codex contains an array of works, most of which are fragments of once-complete texts. Their watermarks vary widely in their date range, some separated by a span of almost eighty years, indicating that they were not all produced together. A second codex, Bautzen, Domstiftsbibliothek Sankt Petri, MS M I 16, which was also owned by Peter Szuscgk and has a similar binding, also contains miscellaneous works from Bohemia. For instance, it contains one work copied by a scribe in Leipa (Česká Lípa), a city north and slightly east

17 See Sargent, 'Latin and Italian Tradition', pp. 85–96; Trombley, 'Latin Manuscripts', pp. 206–16.

18 See Verdeyen, 'Introduction' to *Speculum*, pp. viii–xii; also D. Falvay, 'The Italian Version of the *Mirror*: Manuscripts, Diffusion and Communities in the 14th–15th Century', in *Companion to Marguerite Porete*, ed. Terry and Stauffer, p. 219.

19 See the overview of the *Mirror*'s Italian circulation in R. Guarnieri, 'Il movimento del libero spirito', *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà* 4 (1965), 466–76; Sargent, 'Latin and Italian Tradition', pp. 93–6; Trombley, 'Latin Manuscripts', pp. 206–17.

20 See for example G. Myśliwski, 'Venice and Wrocław in the Middle Ages', in *Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages: A Cultural History*, ed. P. Górecki and N. van Deusen (London, 2009), pp. 100–15, and M.-L. Favreau-Lilie, '"*Devotio moderna*" in Italien?: Kontakt zwischen Prag und Venedig im 14./15. Jahrhundert und die Suche nach neuen Wegen der Frömmigkeit in Venetien', in *Die 'Neue Frömmigkeit' in Europa im Spätmittelalter*, ed. M. Derwich and M. Staub (Göttingen, 2004), pp. 301–30.

21 M. Van Dussen, *From England to Bohemia: Heresy and Communication in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2012), p. 2.

22 *Katalog*, p. 67.

of Prague.[23] In the introduction to the Bautzen *Katalog*, it is suggested that the miscellaneous nature of Szuscgk's codices, and the fact that many of them are missing either their beginning or their end, raises the possibility that the remains of destroyed or damaged books had been collected and preserved in the Bautzen vicinity.[24] This indicates that fragments of works were traveling north from Czech Bohemia into German Lusatia. The Bautzen area is perhaps where these texts eventually washed up and were bound into their present codex. Given that the latest watermark which appears in M I 15 is from roughly 1440, it seems reasonable to take that date as the *terminus post quem* for when the works were bound together.

The *Mirror* in M I 15 does not seem to have been damaged as a result of suspicion or condemnation, since many of the texts in the codex are similarly incomplete or torn. But the damage and partial destruction of works could possibly have been a result of war. The Hussite wars raged roughly from 1420 to 1431, across both Bohemia and Lusatia. Hussite armies sacked many churches and monasteries, including monasteries in Prague, Zittau, Oybin, and others.[25] It is not impossible that those fleeing these institutions may have salvaged texts from them, and that the *Mirror* copy in M I 15 eventually came to Lusatia via that route.[26] Lusatia itself was overrun by the Hussites in 1429–30, with several towns and prominent monasteries being sacked.[27]

Though the initial trajectory of M I 15's various texts is for now murky, it is more certain that in its bound form it circulated in and around Bautzen itself. This is demonstrated by several lines written on the inside of the front cover. The lines are quite faded and certain sections are indiscernible, but appear to read:

> *Johannes patre di*[*cto*](?) *math*
> *Nyße inter*(?)*dic*[*to*](?) … *Bergo*
> *Clara uxoris Rewmanns de Lugk*
> *Istum librum legavit dominus Petrus Szuscgk de Budissin ad ecclesiam S. Georgii in Witchenaw.*[28]

23 See the description of M I 16 in *Katalog*, pp. 73–5.

24 *Katalog*, p. 51.

25 See *Geschichte der Oberlausitz: Herrschaft, Gesellschaft und Kultur vom Mittelalter bis zum Ende des 20 Jahrhunderts*, ed. J. Bahlke (Leipzig, 2001), p. 124; Heymann, *John Žižka*, pp. 68–9; H. Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley, 1967), pp. 298, 367, 372; A. Spruck, *Wittichenau und die Länder der böhmischen Krone: Geschichte einer Nachbarschaft über 760 Jahre* (Bad Schussenried, 2010), pp. 15–16.

26 All but one of the texts in M I 15 were likely copied prior to 1420, meaning they were in existence well before the campaigns began.

27 T. A. Fudge, *The Crusade against Heretics in Bohemia, 1418–1437: Sources and Documents for the Hussite Crusades* (Burlington VT, 2002), pp. 278–81; Spruck, *Wittichenau und die Länder*, pp. 15–16.

28 M I 15, inside cover. See *Katalog*, pp. 67, 200. The 'dicto' in the first line is my suggestion, as is 'interdicto' as one word in the second line; the *Katalog* has 'dictus(?)' and 'inter(?)

Spyra suggests that *Nyße* is Neschwitz, an area just north of Bautzen; *Bergo* might either be Horka, a district in Crostwitz (northwest of Bautzen), or Bergen, a district in Neuwiese about twenty-five miles north of Bautzen; *Lugk* is identified as Luga, about seven miles northwest of Bautzen; and *Witchenaw* is Wittichenau, about nineteen miles north of Bautzen.[29]

These inscriptions raise interesting points. At least four names can be clearly identified: Johannes, Clara, Clara's husband Rewmann, and Peter Szuscgk. Whether there is a name attached to the line mentioning Neschwitz or Bergen is uncertain, given how illegible the writing is. At present, the identities of Johannes, Clara, and Rewmann, and their links to the book, remain obscure. Notably, the first three lines containing their names are written in the same hand. Does this perhaps indicate that the book was shared between them? Do Johannes, Clara, and Rewmann represent a group separate from Peter, or was he connected to them in some way? Or are these lines merely a record of something else entirely, unconnected to the book itself?[30] These questions are for now unanswerable, but these lines show that the codex was connected to multiple people and, through them, to multiple places in the area around Bautzen.

Rather more can be said about Peter Szuscgk. Along with M I 15 he bequeathed M I 16 to the church of St Georg in Wittichenau.[31] M I 16 has the same *legavit* note on its inside cover, although with the additional description of Peter as a *vicarius* of Bautzen.[32] This small detail allows for a slightly clearer picture of Peter. As a *vicarius*, Peter would have been a cleric who served both in the choir and at the altar in the church, and participated in the canonical hours and the celebration of High Mass; he would also have occasionally heard confessions in the cathedral at certain times of the year such as Advent.[33]

To date, there is little other concrete information on Peter.[34] It is possible that he is the same 'Petrus Schusck' who matriculated at the University of Leipzig in the winter term of 1440, who is noted as being from Wittichenau and was

dic...(?)'. Given their partly illegible state, any translation of the first two lines would be highly conjectural. But the last lines can be translated as: 'Clara, wife of Rewmann of Luga' / 'The lord Peter Szuscgk of Bautzen bequeathed this book to the Church of St Georg in Wittichenau'.

29 See *Katalog*, p. 67.

30 I thank Sylvain Piron for this suggestion. The format does suggest a record with witnesses, perhaps to a debt or some other exchange.

31 *Katalog*, p. 73.

32 Ibid.

33 H. Kinne, *Das (exemte) Bistum Meissen: Das Kollegiatstift St. Petri zu Bautzen von der Gründung bis 1569* (Berlin, 2014), p. 306.

34 The catalog notes that Szuscgk is 'sonst nicht nachweisbar' ('otherwise not traceable'). *Katalog*, p. 67.

counted amongst the *nacione Saxonum*.[35] This strengthens the case for identification, as Arnold Spruck notes that many of those from Wittichenau looking to pursue a religious life would begin their careers as vicars in Bautzen, and if the Peter who owned M I 15 and M I 16 is the same 'Wittichenauer' as that recorded at Leipzig, then it would explain why he might bequeath some of his books to a church there.[36]

This is only the briefest of forays into the Bautzen codex, one which simultaneously presents new information and raises new questions. Most importantly, the Bautzen copy demonstrates that the *Mirror of Simple Souls*, already well known for its ability to cross national and linguistic boundaries, had an even further international reach than previously thought. The Latin copy present in M I 15 provides not one but two new geographic and cultural contexts for the *Mirror*, Czech Bohemia and German Lusatia. A connection to Bohemia also appears with the Florentine manuscript, MS Conv. soppr. G.3. 1130, though, as we shall see, in a very different context.

New Frontiers in Reception: Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS Conv. soppr. G.3.1130

In the Latin tradition, one thing which is often almost as elusive as a new copy of the *Mirror* is a copy with an identifiable owner. One Latin copy does have a note indicating that it was made at the Benedictine Sacro Speco monastery in Subiaco, but no specific individual can be linked to it.[37] None of the other complete *Mirror* copies in the Continental Latin tradition can be linked to a specific group, let alone an identifiable individual.[38] Though the Bautzen codex carries the name of Peter Szuscgk and others, these individuals are for the moment almost entirely unknown.

But in Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS Conv. soppr. G.3.1130, the ownership of this *Mirror* is, for once, perfectly clear.[39] It was copied by John-Jerome of Prague (*c*. 1368–1440), a monk of the monastery of Camaldoli in Tuscany. Far from being an anonymous figure, John-Jerome had a long

35 G. Erler, *Die Matrikel der Universität Leipzig: Band I: Die Immatrikulationen von 1409–1559* (Leipzig, 1895), p. 132. Arnold Spruck also lists Peter amongst several 'Wittichenauer' students recorded at Leipzig, in *Wittichenau und die Länder*, p. 194.

36 On vicars getting their start in Bautzen, see Spruck, *Wittichenau und die Länder*, p. 83.

37 For the Subiaco attribution see Verdeyen, 'Introduction' to *Speculum*, p. xi.

38 BAV, MS Vat. lat. 4953, has a note on its flyleaf showing that it once belonged to Cardinal Guiglelmo Sirleto (1514–85), the librarian of the Vatican Library from 1572 to 1585; but this manuscript only contains a list of errors taken from the *Mirror*, not an actual copy of the *Mirror* itself.

39 I thank the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale's reproductions staff for providing me with photos of this manuscript. I also particularly thank Dr Giovanni Gasbarri for his help during the process.

and varied career that connected to some of the most important events and currents of the early fifteenth century.[40] Educated at the University of Prague at the same time as Jan Hus, he was first the royal confessor to the Polish king Władisław Jagiełło in Kraków, then a missionary to pagans in Lithuania, then an abbot of a Premonstratensian house at Nowy Sącz (near Kraków), until he left in 1412 to become a Camaldolese hermit.[41] There he became the *major eremi*, a position which involved various pastoral and administrative duties, including participating in the penitential rites of the community and hearing confession from his fellow monks. He also became *visitator* to several Venetian Camaldolese houses, ensuring that monastic life was properly observed.[42] He preached on church reform at the Council of Pavia-Siena in 1423–24, traveled in the Holy Land and the Greek Islands, and was summoned to the Council of Basel in 1432 to speak on Hussitism.[43] After being prevented from returning to Camaldoli from Basel due to a quarrel with the Camaldolese prior Ambrogio Traversari, John-Jerome resided in the monastery of San Michele di Murano in Venice until his death in 1440.[44] Given his extensive career, John-Jerome's copying of the *Mirror* sheds new light on its reception history, and provides important commentary on the history of condemned texts in general.

The most readily accessible description of MS Conv. soppr. G.3.1130 is found on MIRABILE, a website maintained by the Società Internazionale per lo Studio del Medioevo Latino and the Fondazione Ezio Franceschini; the description was done by Eugenia Antonucci.[45] This fifteenth-century parchment manuscript of 124 folios contains two sections, which were brought together as a single codex by John-Jerome himself. The first section (fols. 1r–26v) comprises works in the hand of an unknown scribe, and

40 William P. Hyland has done the most extensive work on John-Jerome's life and career. For a summary of John-Jerome's life, see W. P. Hyland, 'John-Jerome of Prague: Portrait of a Fifteenth-Century Camaldolese', *American Benedictine Review* 46 (1995), 308–34.

41 Hyland, 'Portrait', pp. 314–21, and idem, 'John-Jerome of Prague and Monastic Reform in the Fifteenth Century', *American Benedictine Review* 47 (1996), 58–98 (pp. 67–8). Hyland suggests two reasons for John-Jerome's move to Camaldoli. The favorable attitude of the Polish court toward the Hussites at this time may have played a role, as he was an outspoken opponent of Hussitism. He may also have been drawn to the stricter eremitical life at Camaldoli, as he had a 'penchant for asceticism' (Hyland, 'Portrait', p. 322).

42 Hyland, 'Portrait', p. 323.

43 Ibid., pp. 322–9.

44 Ibid., p. 329. John-Jerome's struggle with Traversari is discussed further below.

45 The entry for the manuscript can be found at http://www.mirabileweb.it/manuscript/firenze-biblioteca-nazionale-centrale-conv-soppr-g-manuscript/21786#. The list of works in the second section, however, is not in numerical order. The correct order can be found at http://www.mirabileweb.it/search-manuscript/firenze-biblioteca-nazionale-centrale-conv-soppr-g-manuscript/15/21786. The following description of the manuscript's contents, layout, hands, and date of composition is taken from Antonucci's descriptions on these sites.

contains Hugo de Balma's *Theologia mystica*, Bonaventure's *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, and an epistle of Peter Damian. The second (fols. 27r–124r) was copied by John-Jerome himself, and includes various works by Bernard of Clairvaux, Ambrose of Milan, Isidore of Seville, William of Saint-Thierry, and one of John-Jerome's own compositions, the *Linea salutis heremitarum*; the *Mirror* is also found in this latter section. The manuscript was assembled probably in or shortly after 1425, which John-Jerome notes at the end of the codex as the date when he finished copying the second section; he also notes that it was copied in Camaldoli.[46] This may indicate that another *Mirror* was already in Camaldoli which served as the exemplar, or perhaps John-Jerome acquired an exemplar from an institution in Venice during his travels there as *visitator* from 1420 to 1422, since we know the *Mirror* was circulating there.

A complete copy of the *Mirror* is found on folios 103r–115v, the penultimate work in a codex which was clearly aimed at guiding fellow monks in penitence, contemplation, and mystical experience. Both the *Theologia mystica* and the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, like the *Mirror*, lay out 'stages' or 'statuses' which one goes through in order to ascend into union or knowledge of the divine.[47] In a similar vein, John-Jerome's *Linea salutis heremitarum* was a guide for hermits that detailed several stages necessary for achieving spiritual perfection; the Soul's journey to annihilation laid out in the *Mirror* easily accords with this genre.[48] It is worth noting that John-Jerome also had an interest in female mystics, as in the same year, 1425, he also made 'epilogi' of the revelations of Angela of Foligno and of the life of Catherine of Siena, which were essentially 'abbreviated transcriptions' of their works which included his own prologues.[49]

But, though he was known for producing texts which could be easily read and understood by most monks regardless of their level of education,

46 'Explicit iste liber. Finitus in eremo Camalduli per fratrem Ieronimum reclusum. Sub anno Domini M°CCCC°XXV die XVIII octobris', fol. 124r.

47 See J. Hopkins, *Hugh of Balma on Mystical Theology: A Translation and an Overview of his* De theologia mystica (Minneapolis, 2002), and *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, trans. and ed. Z. Hayes (St Bonaventure NY, 2002).

48 While there is no edition of the *Linea*, a description of its contents can be found in W. Hyland, 'The Climacteric of Late Medieval Camaldolese Spirituality: Ambrogio Traversari, John-Jerome of Prague, and the *Linea salutis heremitarum*', in *Florence and Beyond: Culture, Society, and Politics in Renaissance Italy: Essays in Honour of John M. Najemy*, ed. D. S. Peterson and D. E. Bornstein (Toronto, 2008), pp. 107–20. Robin Anne O'Sullivan has shown how the *Mirror* was written and used as a spiritual guidebook (albeit in a beguine context); see R. A. O'Sullivan, 'The School of Love: Marguerite Porete's *Mirror of Simple Souls*', *Journal of Medieval History* 32 (2006), 143–62. Additionally, Marleen Cré has discussed how the Middle English *Mirror* was used in a Carthusian context as a didactic text that fit into a broader itinerary of contemplation. See M. Cré, *Vernacular Mysticism in the Charterhouse: A Study of London, British Library, MS Additional 37790* (Turnhout, 2006).

49 W. P. Hyland, 'Reform Preaching and Despair at the Council of Pavia-Siena (1423–1424)', *Catholic Historical Review* 84 (1998), 409–30 (p. 425 n. 54).

John-Jerome does not seem to have intended a broad audience in this case, at least for the *Mirror*.[50] This is revealed in the rather intriguing incipit. Written in red, it reads, 'Incipit Speculum animarum in voluntate et desiderio morancium. Caute legendus et non ab omnibus' ('Here begins *The Mirror of Souls Remaining in Will and Desire*. To be read cautiously, and not by everyone'). Several things catch the eye here. First, this makes the third Latin manuscript which adds *voluntate et desiderio morancium* to the title, joining BAV, MSS Rossianus 4 and Chigianus C IV 85.[51] Second, the *simplicium* is missing from the title, not because it was not originally included but because it has been erased from where it appeared after *animarum*; why is not entirely clear. It is possible that it was erased as an attempt to conceal the work, perhaps done a few years later once denunciations of the *Mirror* began to pick up steam in the 1430s.[52] Or it is possible that *simplicium* itself was the issue. Were it to be interpreted as 'foolish' or 'simple-minded', this would obviously be problematic.[53] It may also have had a bearing on who the intended audience was thought to be: it was not a work meant for 'the simple'. This leads us to the particularly interesting post-title note: 'To be read cautiously, and not by everyone'. This caveat clearly indicates an acknowledgment on John-Jerome's part that the *Mirror* is a difficult text which must be interpreted in a certain way in order to avoid error, a work which required an advanced level of understanding and discretion in order to be beneficial to the reader. This type of warning about the *Mirror*'s content occurred in a number of other cases, most notably in the appraisals of Godfrey of Fontaines, Franc of Villiers, and John of Quiévrain appended to the end of the *Mirror*. Both Godfrey and John note that it is difficult to understand and counseled that few should see it. It is quite possible that John-Jerome's note is based in part upon these comments.[54]

But his reservations did not deter John-Jerome from including the *Mirror* in this spiritual guidebook. His belief in the *Mirror*'s usefulness can be seen not only in its inclusion here, but also in another remarkable aspect of this copy: the historiated initial that John-Jerome himself drew to begin the *Mirror*'s

50 On John-Jerome's concern with easily understood texts see Hyland, 'John-Jerome of Prague and Monastic Reform', pp. 85–6, and W. Hyland, '*Forma perfeccionis heremitarum*: A Fifteenth-Century Primer for Hermits', *Studia Monastica* 37 (1995), 395–404.

51 See the various titles of all the manuscripts in *Speculum*, p. 11.

52 Thanks to Sylvain Piron for pointing this out. More on these denouncements below.

53 It does not seem likely that John-Jerome was the one who erased it, as the 'simple' aspect of the *Mirror* may have been one of the main things which appealed to him, as is discussed below.

54 See *Speculum*, pp. 405–9 for the text of the appraisals. Other warnings about the *Mirror*'s content include the Middle English translator of the *Mirror* noting its difficulty and how some 'mistook' some of its words, and one Latin copy, MS Chigianus C IV 85, containing a note saying the *Mirror* was too scandalous for printing. See 'Margaret Porete, "The Mirror of Simple Souls": A Middle English Translation', ed. M. Doiron, *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà* 5 (1968), 243–382 (pp. 249–50), and *Speculum*, p. xi.

text. Within the large blue 'A' of 'Anima' is a picture of a monk – perhaps John-Jerome himself – reading the *Mirror*, identifiable by its opening words written across the two open pages of the book: *Anima tacta a deo et*.[55] The monk is contemplating the text, with a finger held thoughtfully to his mouth, and he has a small but undeniably pleased smile on his face. It is a quite delightful picture, the first and so far only illustration found in a *Mirror* copy. It further suggests that, whatever reservations John-Jerome may have had about who should read it, he nevertheless considered the *Mirror* a beneficial piece of spiritual writing.

What can we make of all this? It is of course not remarkable to find the *Mirror* getting a positive reception, nor is it unusual to find it appearing in an 'orthodox' monastic context, as the English Carthusians clearly appreciated it, as well as the Benedictines of the Sacro Speco monastery in Subiaco. But its specific appeal to John-Jerome of Prague offers unique insight because we know so much about him as an individual and because his life connects to so many broader currents of the early fifteenth century. As a lens, his life reveals new aspects of the *Mirror*'s reception, and shows how it may have been interpreted in ways that have not been considered previously.

John-Jerome of Prague distinguished himself in a number of roles. One was as a proponent of 'holy simplicity' or 'rusticity' (*sancta simplicitas/rusticitas*), primarily grounded in the use of a simple literary style and an emphasis on Scripture and patristic texts, but also in a life rooted in asceticism and stripped of worldly attachments.[56] As William Hyland has shown, John-Jerome rejected reliance on pagan philosophers and the humanist emphasis on elaborate Latin rhetoric in the course of spiritual education, viewing them as worldly distractions and sources of confusion which obscured the pathway to spiritual perfection.[57] This outlook propelled him into conflict with the renowned humanist Ambrogio Traversari, elected prior of Camaldoli in 1431 and a famous champion of *docta pietas*, the 'learned piety' centered on classical authors which coupled patristic piety with eloquent rhetoric and literary style.[58]

John-Jerome's life as an eremitical monk and his dedication to *sancta simplicitas* is perhaps the first and most obvious indication of why the *Mirror* might have appealed to him. His *Linea salutis heremitarum*, a copy of which is bound up in MS Conv. soppr. G.3.1130, provides a useful case study in

55 MS Con. soppr. G.3.1130, fol. 103r.

56 The concept comes from St Jerome's Letter 52, *Ad Nepotianum presbyterum*. See *Jerome: Select Letters*, trans. and ed. F. A. Wright (Cambridge MA, 1933), pp. 188–229.

57 See Hyland, 'John-Jerome of Prague and Monastic Reform', pp. 80–7, and idem, 'Climacteric', *passim*.

58 On Traversari's career as a humanist and reformer see C. L. Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance* (Albany NY, 1977).

the contact points between John-Jerome's thought and the content of the *Mirror*. The *Linea* follows a straightforward format consisting of a dialogue between a hermit and his guardian angel.[59] In it John-Jerome lays out his views described above: he disparages pagan philosophers and describes how a hermit must detach himself completely from worldly things, even in terms of his own thoughts, in order to achieve spiritual perfection.[60]

While it is clearly not an easy-to-follow text, the *Mirror* nevertheless connects to the main sentiment of John-Jerome's *Linea*. A common enough exhortation, particularly in a monastic context, the separation of oneself from both worldly possessions and thoughts is also the core message of the *Mirror*. The *Mirror*'s portrayal of the 'simple' annihilated Soul, stripped of all worldly attachments, thoughts, will, and desire, and guided toward the divine by nothing other than Love, accords well with both the eremitical lifestyle and the idea of *sancta simplicitas*. While Marguerite expresses herself in more extreme terms at points – such as her claim to have departed from practice of the Virtues – this overarching message would have appealed to John-Jerome's ascetic and eremitic sensibilities, just as it did to the Carthusians in the Middle English version.[61] Additionally, the lack of sophistication implied in *sancta rusticitas* fits into the *Mirror*'s rejection of Reason: Reason in the *Mirror* is an impediment to spiritual perfection, and the realm of worldly learning, to which pagan philosophers and the stylistic flourishes of *docta pietas* could be linked, would undoubtedly belong to the realm of Reason.[62] Thus the *Mirror*'s advocacy of the Soul triumphing over Reason through divine Love was probably attractive to someone who advocated a spiritual life divested of worldly and intellectual distraction in the search for perfection.

There are other, more specific parallels as well. The *Linea* discusses how the desire to be a prelate and to teach and preach to others, while good in itself, is for the hermit a temptation and a form of pride to be avoided.[63] This echoes the *Mirror*'s portrayal of excessive attachment to pious activities – fasting, sermons, charitable works – which, though good, are 'creaturely' things to be divested from, elements of the self which impede the Soul's advancement toward annihilation.[64] There is even a similarity in how John-Jerome and

59 The discussion of the *Linea*'s contents here is based on the descriptions in Hyland, 'John-Jerome of Prague and Monastic Reform', pp. 83–7, and idem, 'Climacteric'.

60 See Hyland, 'John-Jerome of Prague and Monastic Reform', p. 84, and idem, 'Climacteric', pp. 112–13.

61 Cré, *Vernacular Mysticism*, 36.

62 See for example the passage from chapter 9 of the *Mirror*, where it states that 'masters in the natural sense' (*magistri in sensu naturali*) and 'doctors of Scripture' (*doctores scripture*) are among those who will not understand the state of the annihilated Soul. *Speculum*, p. 35. See also the general disparagement of Reason in *Speculum*, pp. 133, 193–5.

63 Hyland, 'Climacteric', p. 113.

64 See for example Marguerite's description of 'The Lost' who 'possess such great pleasure in their works that they have no understanding that there might be any better being'.

Marguerite talk about those who do not achieve the perfection they describe. John-Jerome, in having his rhetorical hermit ask the guardian angel what happens to those who fail to achieve perfection, declares that no one who repents of his sins and attempts to live a good and moral life will be cut off from salvation. But, he then adds, 'Nevertheless such a man is less in comparison to that perfect man who separated himself (*ipsum segregavit*) and found in his own soul the secret of beatitude and grasps the thing for which the Son came into the world'.[65] Compare this with Marguerite's words in Chapter 62 of the *Mirror*, concerning those who are not annihilated:

> [Soul]: Such folk are little on earth and lesser in heaven.
> O, Lady Soul! says Reason, watch what you say! We would not dare to say that any are little who will see God unendingly.
> Certainly, says Love, but their littleness could not be described with regard to the greatness of those who die the death to nature and who live by the life of the spirit![66]

Though again Marguerite's language is sharper than John-Jerome's, both show a belief that those who do not achieve their respective ideals of perfection are still saved in a 'lesser' way.

The spiritual affinities between John-Jerome and the *Mirror* are perhaps easy to spot. But there is another dimension to the *Mirror* which John-Jerome may also have found meaningful, one which does not immediately seem like a positive point in its favor: its portrayal of the Church. The *Mirror* is famous for its disparagement of the institutional Church, which it labels 'Holy Church the Lesser' (*sancta ecclesia minor*), and which is ruled by Reason. This is in contrast to 'Holy Church the Greater' (*sancta ecclesia maior*), which is the 'Church' of the Simple Souls who are governed by Love.[67] Taken at face value, this ridicule seems like a highly provocative element of the *Mirror*, one which perhaps contributed to the work's condemnation. And, indeed, two texts which refute extracts from the *Mirror* – one from the early fourteenth century and one from the fifteenth – explicitly use the passages mentioning *ecclesia minor* as proof of the *Mirror*'s heresy.[68] The idea is that by mocking the Church

English from Marguerite Porete, *The Mirror of Simple Souls*, trans. E. Babinsky (New York, 1993), p. 132; for the Latin see *Speculum*, p. 161.

65 English and Latin taken from Hyland, 'Climacteric', p. 114.

66 My translation. I have used the Latin as it appears in MS Conv. soppr. G.3.1130, fol. 109r, which differs slightly from the readings in *Speculum*, pp. 181–3: 'Tales sunt parvi in terra et minimi in celo. O domina anima, dicit Racio, videatis quid dicitis! Nos dicere non audemus quod aliquis parvus esset qui deum sine fine videbit. Utique, dicit Amor, non posset describi eorum parvitas respectu eorum qui moriuntur morte nature et qui vivunt vita spiritus'.

67 See Porete, *Mirror*, trans. Babinsky, pp. 101, 122–3; *Speculum*, pp. 75, 133–5.

68 These texts are found in Padua, Biblioteca universitaria, MS 1647 (a fifteenth-century copy of a fourteenth-century text), fols. 215v–221v, and BAV, MS Vat. lat. 4953, fols.

and placing the annihilated Souls above the institutional Church, the *Mirror* is rejecting the Church outright and setting up its own Church, advocating for the superiority of its own 'congregation' of Simple Souls.[69]

But another element of John-Jerome's career – and of the early fifteenth century in general – casts the *Mirror*'s statements in a very different light: that of Church reform. John-Jerome was an ardent supporter of reform, in the midst of both the Observant reform movement that influenced most major religious orders in the first half of the fifteenth century and the broader push for reform evident within the major councils held in the aftermath of the Great Schism.[70] John-Jerome was a fierce advocate, offering scathing critiques of the Church in his calls for reform. A good example comes from his attendance at the Council of Pavia-Siena (1423–24). In two sermons that he gave there – both on reform – John-Jerome decried what he saw as the rife 'pomp, vanity, and excesses of prelates' which 'cause the destruction of the universal Church'.[71] He lambasted the council Fathers as being 'Epicureans' sunk in luxury and indulgence, and, borrowing a passage from Birgitta of Sweden's *Revelations*, characterized modern bishops, abbots, and prelates as 'investitured pigs' (*porci infulati*).[72] He criticized the Church's intellectual culture for being overly fond of pagan philosophical texts and ideas, describing the learning of Aristotle and other philosophers as being of no use to salvation and as lacking in *caritas*.[73] The overall picture he painted was of a heavily flawed and corrupted Church desperately in need of correction and purgation through penance and *sancta rusticitas*.[74]

Seen in this light, the *Mirror*'s (comparatively gentle) chiding and mocking of the Church might have sat quite well with John-Jerome. From his perspective, *ecclesia maior* might represent those practicing the 'holy simplicity' which formed John-Jerome's ideal life and which set an example for the rest of the Church. Consider this passage from the *Mirror*:

29r–32r. On the Paduan text, see Trombley, 'New Evidence'; for a transcription of the Vatican text, see Guarnieri, 'Il movimento', pp. 649–60.

69 MS 1647 even goes so far as to call the *Mirror*'s *ecclesia maior* the 'synagogue of Satan' from Revelation 3. 9. Trombley, 'New Evidence', p. 145.

70 On John-Jerome's involvement in reform see Hyland, 'John-Jerome of Prague and Monastic Reform'; idem, 'Reform Preaching and Despair'; and W. P. Hyland, 'Giovanni-Girolamo da Praga al Concilio di Basileo: varietà del discorso di riforma', in *Camaldoli e l'ordine Camaldolese dalle origini alla fine del XV secolo*, ed. C. Caby and P. Licciardello (Cesena, 2014), pp. 473–84. On Observant reform in general see *A Companion to Observant Reform in the Late Middle Ages and Beyond*, ed. J. D. Mixson and B. Roest (Leiden, 2015).

71 *Annales Camaldulenses*, ed. J.-B. Mittarelli and A. Costadoni, 9 vols. (Venice, 1755–73), IX, 725. English taken from Hyland, 'Reform Preaching and Despair', pp. 418–19.

72 *Annales Camaldulenses*, ed. Mittarelli and Costadoni, IX, 736.

73 Ibid, 741–2; Hyland, 'Reform Preaching and Despair', p. 426.

74 Hyland, 'Reform Preaching and Despair', p. 429; idem, 'John-Jerome of Prague and Monastic Reform', p. 83.

> [Love]: Now then, Holy Church. What do you wish to say about these [Souls] who are distinguished above you, you who do everything according to the counsel of Reason?
> We wish to say about Holy Church the Lesser that such Souls are above us in life, because Love dwells in them and Reason dwells in us. But this is not against us; no indeed, for we recommend them by way of the glosses of our Scriptures.[75]

Ecclesia minor, dominated by Reason, could well have fit with John-Jerome's view of the institutional Church as one which was diminished, in part by being overly fond of the realm of Reason. In this sense the Church would also be deserving of mockery and criticism, as he criticized it in his sermons, and as Marguerite mocked it in the *Mirror*. In contrast is *ecclesia maior*, ruled by Love, unconcerned with worldly things, and purified of self-oriented thoughts and desires. This might represent those within the Church working for its betterment through 'holy simplicity'. Reformers want to improve, not destroy, the Church – thus those of the 'greater' Church are still part of the same Church that 'recommends' them according to Scripture, but they are 'above' that part of the Church which has not been renewed and converted to their higher way of life. Important to remember is that at the very beginning of its text the *Mirror* states that the book has been written 'for you children of Holy Church … in order that you may hear to your great advantage of the perfection of life and being of peace, to which the creature is able to arrive through the virtue of perfect charity'.[76] Thus improvement of the Church is stated at the outset of the work itself, with charity – *caritas* – as the primary conduit for such improvement.

While this is speculation, the manuscript evidence lends some support. Someone – whether John-Jerome himself or another monk – drew attention to the passage quoted above. A cross in the right hand margin is placed precisely next to the line stating that *ecclesia minor* does everything by the counsel of Reason, and another next to the one stating that *ecclesia minor* recommends *ecclesia maior* with its glosses on the Scriptures.[77] Thus at least one reader of this passage felt that it was worthy of attention. Whether this attention was due to an interest in reform is open to debate, but it is worth considering that the *Mirror*'s mocking of the Church, rather than being taken as dangerous,

[75] My translation, from Conv. soppr. G.3.1130, fol. 107v. 'Nunc igitur, sancta ecclesia. Quid vultis dicere de istis quia ita sunt supra vos commendate vos, qui penitus utimini consilio rationis? Nos volumus dicere de sancta ecclesia minori quod tales anime sunt in vita supra nos, quia amor manet in eis et ea ratio manet in nobis. Sed istud non est contra nos, ymmo ipsas comendamus mediantibus nostrarum scripturarum glosis'. Compare to *Speculum*, p. 133.

[76] My translation, from Conv. soppr. G.3.1130, fol. 103v. 'Vos sancte ecclesie pueri … pro vobis hunc librum scribi feci ut audiatis ad utilitatem vestram magnam vite perfectionem et esse pacis ad quod creatura atingere potest per virtute, caritatis perfecte'. *Speculum*, p. 15.

[77] MS Conv. soppr. G.3.1130, fol. 107v, col. 2.

could have fit right in with certain fifteenth-century reformers' perception of the state of the Church.

John-Jerome, a lifelong monk, enforcer of monastic discipline, advocate of reform, fierce opponent of heresy, and critic of the humanistic curriculum, is in many ways the opposite of what one would expect a reader of the *Mirror* to be. Over the years, the *Mirror* has mostly been interpreted as a representative of radical spiritual currents which either transgressed or hovered near the edges of acceptability: heresy, beguine spirituality, and 'Free Spirit' or 'Eckhartian' mysticism.[78] But in MS Conv. soppr. G.3.1130, we find the *Mirror* incorporated into a fairly moderate and far less marginal spiritual environment and agenda, copied and owned by a monk known not for daring innovation but rather for his production of simple, clear Latin texts and his theological conservatism.[79] The brief textual analysis above suggests that the *Mirror*, rather than always clashing with such an environment and outlook, could in fact fit into it – as long as it was read 'cautiously', as John-Jerome recommended.

Furthermore, other evidence shows that Camaldoli was not the only reform-minded Italian monastic community in which the *Mirror* found a receptive (or initially receptive) audience: a ban on the *Mirror* in the Paduan Benedictine Congregation of Santa Giustina in 1433 suggests it had been circulating within that community, and MS Chigianus C IV 85 was copied in the Sacro Speco monastery at Subiaco.[80] The *Mirror*'s themes of turning away physically and mentally from the world and losing the self in God would certainly have appealed to an audience of monks looking for a stricter, more detached form of life. Marleen Cré has noted this in the Carthusian context of the Middle English *Mirror*, but much work remains to be done on its circulation in this Latin monastic context.[81]

John-Jerome's possession of the *Mirror* does not show that it had achieved 'orthodoxy' in its later reception, or that the *Mirror* was not considered highly dangerous by other medieval readers. John-Jerome's copying of the *Mirror* immediately precedes the numerous denouncements and condemnations to

78 See e.g. J. Marin, 'Annihilation and Deification in Beguine Theology and Marguerite Porete's *Mirror of Simple Souls*', *The Harvard Theological Review* 103 (2010), 89–109; B. McGinn, *The Flowering of Mysticism: Men and Women in the New Mysticism, 1200–1350* (New York, 1998), pp. 244–65; K. Kerby-Fulton, *Books Under Suspicion: Censorship and Tolerance of Revelatory Writing in Late Medieval England* (Notre Dame IN, 2006), pp. 272–96; A. Hollywood, *The Soul as Virgin Wife: Mechthild of Magdeburg, Marguerite Porete, and Meister Eckhart* (Notre Dame IN, 1995); M. Lichtmann, 'Marguerite Porete and Meister Eckhart', in *Meister Eckhart and the Beguine Mystics*, ed. B. McGinn (New York, 1994), pp. 65–86.

79 Hyland, 'Portrait', p. 313.

80 The ban in Santa Giustina is recorded in *Congregationis S. Iustinae de Padua O.S.B. ordinationes capitulorum generalium*, parte I (1424–1474), ed. T. Leccisotti (Montecassino, 1939), p. 36; discussed in Guarnieri, 'Il movimento', pp. 468–9, and Trombley, 'Latin Manuscripts', pp. 208–9.

81 Cré, *Vernacular Mysticism*.

which it was subjected in the 1430s, and roughly coincides with the Franciscan preacher Bernardino of Siena's first denouncements of the *Mirror* in his sermons.[82] Against this backdrop, it is important to remember that another role John-Jerome assumed was that of a fierce opponent of both heresy, particularly the Hussites, and the 'errors' of the Greeks; he was not particularly indulgent of doctrinal controversy.[83] Yet he took a considerably different view of the *Mirror* than did many of his contemporaries in the Church. In this sense, MS Conv. soppr. G.3.1130 perhaps provides the best example so far of how arbitrary and ambiguous the *Mirror*'s 'heresy' or 'orthodoxy' could be in late medieval Europe.

Conclusion

MS M I 15 and MS Conv. soppr. G.3.1130 present exciting new avenues of inquiry into the history of the *Mirror of Simple Souls*. Not only do they provide significant amounts of new text for comparison; they also point to new aspects of its circulation. For M I 15, the interest lies in the discovery of the *Mirror* travelling to Bohemia, further afield than scholars have previously thought and well outside the boundaries of Italy where the Latin translation has up until now been mostly confined. Conv. soppr. G.3.1130 shows a different side to the *Mirror*'s reception, one rooted in eremitic monasticism, Church reform, and anti-humanism. The emergence of these two codices brings the count of Latin copies of the *Mirror* up to seven, and the total number of Latin *Mirror*-related manuscripts up to nine. This is a useful reminder that, though the *Mirror* originated and is most often thought of as a vernacular text, it is the Latin version which appears to have reached the furthest. It is this reach, and this very versatility of the *Mirror*, which is perhaps what so worried the work's medieval critics. The evidence, both from the controversies surrounding the *Mirror* in Italy and its other manuscripts, reveals it to have reached the hands of monks, priests, women, and others; the Bautzen codex, bearing the names of three men and a woman and showing evidence of possession by a vicar, further demonstrates how diverse its readership was, encompassing not just those whom its critics may have considered 'vulnerable' to heresy, but also some within their own ecclesiastical ranks. Therefore, in the eyes of its opponents, it would appear all the more dangerous.

The appearance of these two copies might also point to the necessity of rethinking what a 'heretical text' is. As Barbara Newman, among others, has pointed out, heresy did not exist in a vacuum; it was assigned to a person or

[82] For Bernardino's mention of the *Mirror* and the events in the 1430s see Guarnieri, 'Il movimento', pp. 466–76; Sargent, 'Continental Latin and Italian Tradition', pp. 93–6; Trombley, 'Latin Manuscripts', pp. 206–16.

[83] Hyland, 'Portrait', p. 313.

a text by various figures of authority.[84] To build upon this observation, it is clear from the example of the *Mirror* that this assignment did not constitute an overarching, permanent, and all-encompassing 'stamp' of heresy, knowable at all times and in all places. The *Mirror* was a 'condemned' text in the sense that it had at some point been condemned; but these earliest condemnations did not cause subsequent suspicions or condemnations, and neither were these condemnations knowingly 'ignored' by those who later accepted the *Mirror*. Rather the heresy or orthodoxy of a text could be assigned and re-assigned at each moment of reception, within individual contexts that often differed from place to place, person to person, and which lacked definitive guidelines.[85] Thus a monk deeply involved in anti-heretical activities against the Hussites could, seemingly without conflict, copy a text which had been condemned both a century earlier and again by his contemporaries at the time he copied and possessed it. This does not mean that a broader consensus over a text could not emerge, but rather that such a consensus did not necessarily become an overarching, enforceable judgment.[86] This observation in turn points to the diversity of late medieval intellectual life and the difficulties of policing texts and readership in manuscript culture.[87]

The two manuscripts studied in this essay demonstrate the versatility and diversity of the *Mirror of Simple Souls*, showing it to be a text which continues

84 B. Newman, *God and the Goddesses: Vision, Poetry, and Belief in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2003), pp. 305–6.

85 This can be seen with other controversial texts as well, such as John of Morigny's *Liber florum celestis doctrine*, Jean Gerson's condemnation of Jan van Ruusbroec, Nicholas Eymeric's condemnation of Ramon Llull, or the condemnation of Peter John Olivi's works and related Olivian writings. None of these prevented other readers from copying and reading these texts. On the *Liber florum* and Olivian texts see the essays in this volume by Michael Bailey and Sylvain Piron respectively. The lack of control in manuscript culture has also been pointed out in Kerby-Fulton, *Books Under Suspicion*; Van Dussen, *From England to Bohemia*, pp. 7, 87. This can be seen even within the context of Wycliffite texts, which, unlike individual condemned texts, could be linked to a larger identifiable 'sect' of heretics. See for example E. Poleg, 'Wycliffite Bibles as Orthodoxy', in *Cultures of Religious Reading in the Middle Ages: Instructing the Soul, Feeding the Spirit, and Awakening the Passion*, ed. S. Corbellini (Turnhout, 2013), pp. 71–91.

86 Examined alongside the *Mirror*, the examples of the *Liber florum* and Olivian writings (studied by Bailey and Piron in this volume) show the complexity of the issue and raise important questions about textual condemnation. The *Liber florum* and the *Mirror*, both publicly condemned and burned, attracted opposition again much later in their circulations, but seemingly with no knowledge of their earliest condemnations. By contrast, knowledge of Olivi's condemnation seems to have endured long after the original controversy.

87 As Daniel Hobbins has pointed out in regard to the book trade, readers did not have 'perfect knowledge' of the existence of works available; in the same vein, perfect knowledge of which works had received condemnation and which had not seems just as unlikely. D. Hobbins, *Authorship and Publicity in the Age Before Print: Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning* (Philadelphia, 2009), pp. 213–14.

to surprise and which cannot be pigeonholed into any particular category or assigned to any one area or audience. Like Robert Lerner's bobbing 'corks', the *Mirror* was not only unsinkable, but also unconfined to any single wave or current.

Appendix: New Textual Frontiers

With two new copies of the *Mirror*, a brief word must be said about their text and variants, though a full comparison remains a future project. The sigla which Verdeyen assigned to each manuscript in the introduction to his edition are as follows: **A** represents Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana [BAV], MS Vat. lat. 4355, **B** is BAV, MS Rossianus 4, **C** is BAV, MS Chigianus B IV 41, **D** is BAV, MS Chigianus C IV 85, **E** is Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Latin 46, and **F** is BAV, MS Vat. lat. 4953, which is a list of extracts from the *Mirror* listed as errors.[88] It is perhaps now time to assign three more sigla: **G** for Padua, Biblioteca universitaria, MS 1647 (another list of errors), **H** for Bautzen, Domstiftsbibliothek Sankt Petri, MS M I 15, and **J** for Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS Conv. soppr. G.3.1130. In general, **H** and **J** agree more closely with the readings of **B**, **C**, **D**, and **E** than with **A**, which served as the base text for Verdeyen's Latin edition. As the Latin fragments found in the two *Mirror* error lists also more closely match **B**, **C**, and **D**, it is now clear that this group was the dominant one, and that **A**'s tradition is an outlier, other copies of which have not survived to the modern day (that we know of).[89]

Within this larger group, **H** and **J** favor slightly different sub-groups. **H** more often aligns with **B** and **D** (more often with **B** than **D**), whereas **J**, though so far seeming to be fairly equally agreeable with **BCDE**, seems to agree more often with the variants of **C**, at certain points even agreeing with it in terms of erasures.[90] Since, when **A** does agree with the other codices, it more often matches **C**, and since **B** and **D** more often agree with one another, with the addition of **H** and **J** the two main sub-groups now appear to be **ACJ** and **BDH**, though **C** and **J** have a closer relationship with each other than with **A**. A full transcription and comparison of **H** and **J** should further clarify these groupings.

88 See Verdeyen, 'Introduction' to *Speculum*, pp. vii–xii. Verdeyen does not include **F** in the critical apparatus, saying that its excerpts essentially match the readings of **B**, though they do contain their own variants. See the text in Guarnieri, 'Il movimento', pp. 649–60.

89 Robert Lerner has noted **A**'s divergence from the other Latin readings and the need for further research. Lerner, 'New Light', pp. 114–15. A detailed study of all the Latin variants and their relationship to one another remains to be carried out.

90 On fol. 107v of Conv. soppr. G.3.1130, in the phrase 'nec non vult ullum', the 'non' has been erased; the same 'non' is also crossed out in MS Chigianus B IV 41, on fol. 59v. See *Speculum*, p. 131, for the note of MS Chigianus B IV 41's erasure.

Naturally, **H** and **J** contain their own unique variants, too numerous to discuss here. Neither contains any chapter divisions, with the exception of one section in M I 15. When it comes to the *Mirror*'s recounting of the seven stages of the Soul in its journey to annihilation, the Bautzen codex inserts headings denoting each status and, occasionally, 'ca.' denoting *capitulum* after these headings.[91] 'Headings', though, is merely a term of convenience, as they are not separated from the text but appear in the midst of it with no discernible break. In fact neither **H** nor **J** have any breaks at all, presenting just solid blocks of text the entire way through.

The addition of two new textual witnesses to the Latin *Mirror* presents interesting new variants and further highlights how little we still know about the relationships between the Latin codices and the different characteristics of each one. A fresh examination of the text in its various forms will no doubt yield important results.

[91] For example the first heading reads *De septem statibus anime ca*[*pitulum*]. M I 15, fol. 194r. For the seven stages see *Speculum*, pp. 317–33.

9

Disputing Prophetic Thought: The 1466 *Questio quodlibetalis* of Johannes of Dorsten

Frances Kneupper

In August of 1466, the Augustinian Hermit and doctor of theology Johannes Bauer of Dorsten delivered a public *questio quodlibetalis* at the University of Erfurt.[1] Each year a member of the faculty was chosen as *dominus quodlibetarius* to engage a question of general interest, and the ensuing public discussion was meant to establish the orthodox answer to the question posed and to showcase the erudition of the lecturer. The spoken *questio* was afterward expanded in writing.[2] As Christopher David Schabel has noted, 'in many cases the questions deal with current events and as such have precise historical significance both for the information they provide and for the perspectives of major

[1] The dating of this *questio* is, in fact, in doubt. Two copies exist in Trier, Stadtbibliothek, MS 2064, and Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 696. The Giessen manuscript gives the date of 1466 in its introduction, but the body of the text cites the year as 1465. The copy in Trier gives the date as 1465. Erich Kleineidam suggests that the date of August 1466 is correct, arguing that Dorsten did not complete his doctorate until October 1465, which would have been too late for the 1465 quodlibet. See E. Kleineidam, *Universitas Studii Erffordensis: Überblick über die Geschichte der Universität Erfurt*, 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1969), II, 106. Even more persuasive is the timeline of events regarding the heretics who were the subjects of Dorsten's *questio*. On the timeline of the investigation of the Wirsbergers, see A. Patschovsky, 'Die Wirsberger: Zeugen der Geisteswelt Joachims von Fiore in Deutschland während des 15. Jahrhunderts?', in *Il profetismo gioachimita tra Quattrocento e Cinquecento: Atti del III Congresso Internazionale di Studi Gioachimiti S. Giovanni in Fiore, 17–21 settembre 1989*, ed. G. L. Potestà (Genoa, 1991), pp. 225–57, esp. pp. 228–33. On Dorsten's participation in an earlier quodlibet, see L. Meier, 'Die Rolle der Theologie im Erfurter Quodlibet', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 17 (1950), 283–302 (pp. 292–3). See also P. Zimdars-Swartz, 'John of Dorsten's Response to Apocalyptic Prophecy in the 1466 Erfurt Quaestio: A Prelude to an Apocalyptic Theology of Papal Grace', in *Il profetismo gioachimita*, ed. Potestà, pp. 259–71.

[2] According to Meier, the statutes of the quodlibet limited it to the arts faculty and students, but in Erfurt in the fifteenth century theologians frequently were asked to participate, as was the case with Johannes of Dorsten. Meier has supplied an inventory of quodlibets from Erfurt in the fifteenth century. Their topics vary widely, including philosophical questions, but several deal with more pastoral topics concerning indulgences: see Meier, 'Die Rolle der Theologie', p. 296.

thinkers with respect to such events'.[3] Dorsten's *questio* was a case in point, because it addressed an unorthodox topic of local, contemporary interest.

The question which Dorsten posed was 'Whether the Third Status Envisioned by Joachim of Fiore and Extrapolated by the Conventicle of Heretics … will arrive in 1471?'[4] He introduced the topic by explaining, 'In these days … some dangerous and poisonous heretics have emerged from their lairs and vomited forth the venom of their errors into the Church of God, namely that the Third Status will come before 1471, eradicating the New Testament'.[5] With such a scandalous subject, this promised to be an engaging lecture.

It would be nice to know who chose the topic of Dorsten's *questio*. Ludwig Meier suggests that since Dorsten was not a member of the arts faculty (he was on the theological faculty), there would have been no pre-assigned question, 'and therefore we may assume that the topic and its formulation comes from Dorsten himself, but perhaps through a previously posed student question'.[6] Meier speculates that the topic of the *questio* could have been a spontaneous reaction to current events, which is certainly possible. As I will discuss below, there were in fact heretics not too far away disseminating predictions for the year 1471 – although they were not quite as Dorsten described them. These heretics were the Wirsberger brothers, Livin and Janko, who were members of the lower nobility from the area of Eger (now the Czech city of Cheb). Concern about the Wirsbergers' orthodoxy was first publicized by the papal legate Rudolf of Rüdesheim in a letter of 11 June 1466.[7] This letter prompted the bishop of Regensburg to action. On 12 July, a committee of leaders from the Regensburg Minorite orders met and created a report on the brothers' heretical beliefs.[8] In August 1466, Livin Wirsberger wrote letters in his own defense to the city of Eger.[9] The case took on political dimensions, and

3 C. D. Schabel, 'Introduction', in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages: The Fourteenth Century*, ed. Schabel (Leiden, 2007), pp. 1–16 (p. 15).

4 'Utrum tertius mundi status quem joachim abbas ymaginatur et hereticorum conventiculum minatur catholice venturus astruatur postquam annus domini millesimus CCCCLXXI compleatur'. I cite from the edition by J. B. Trapp in the Appendix of R. Kestenberg-Gladstein, 'The Third Reich: A Fifteenth-Century Polemic against Joachimism, and its Background', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 18 (1955), 245–95 (p. 267) [hereafter Trapp, Appendix]. This edition is not critical, and does contain errors and deletions, but I have compared it to the text in both extant manuscripts and found it to be generally sound.

5 Trapp, Appendix, p. 267.

6 Meier, 'Die Rolle der Theologie', p. 297.

7 This denunciation letter was published in J. G. Schelhorn, *Acta Historico-ecclesiastica Saeculi XV et XVI*, Part 1 (Ulm, 1738), pp. 67–9; and also in I. von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1890), II, 625, and N. Glassberger, *Chronica fratris*, Analecta Franciscana 2 (Florence, 1887), p. 422.

8 Published in Glassberger, *Chronica fratris*, pp. 423–5.

9 See H. Gradl, 'Die Irrlehre der Wirsperger', *Mittheilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 19 (1880–81), 270–9 (p. 274).

arguments continued through the fall over the involvement of the city of Eger and its Franciscan convent in the Wirsbergers' heretical ideas. It appears highly plausible that individuals at the University of Erfurt might have heard of these proceedings and expressed interest in the heresy du jour. In August 1466, Dorsten's topic would have been timely.

When Dorsten delivered his *questio*, he was near the beginning of what would be a long and eminent career. One of his students later wrote that Dorsten was 'the best theologian in Germany'.[10] He also became an extremely successful preacher, whose sermons disputed prophetic knowledge, as well as false miracles and popular pilgrimages. But in 1466, he had just received his degree in theology and entered the theological faculty. Dorsten's *questio* might be viewed as a first step in his pursuit of a career as an expert on popular spirituality. Perhaps as a way of enhancing his reputation, he chose topics which were bound to be show-stoppers: heresy and prophecy.

The *questio* had two very different aspects. On the one hand, Dorsten discussed Joachim of Fiore's (*c*. 1135–1202) concept of the Third Status.[11] On the other hand, he addressed the assertions of a conventicle of heretics claiming that the current status of the world would end, and the Third Status would begin, in 1471.[12] Dorsten perceived these two topics as connected because he believed the heretics had been influenced by Joachim's ideas.

I intend to consider the *questio* of Johannes of Dorsten as evidence of a contest between a professional theologian and a group of non-professionals who were judged to be heretics. The contest was waged regarding authority over a certain kind of knowledge. It engaged related issues of professional mastery and access. Who can know about the future of the world? What can they know? How does their education, profession, and linguistic competence affect their ability to correctly anticipate the End Times? How do such divisions contribute to accusations of heresy? These questions formed the disputed grounds of the contest.

While scholars have observed that late medieval heresies frequently involved the rejection of clerical authority, this aspect of heresy has not been emphasized enough. In fact, the challenge to clerical authority became one of the most important aspects of heresy in the late Middle Ages. In my analysis of Dorsten's *questio*, I will view the heretics primarily through the lens of

[10] Cited in A. Zumkeller, 'Der Religiös-sittliche Stand des Erfurter Säkularklerus am Vorabend der Glaubensspaltung', *Augustinianum* 2 (1962), 267–84, 471–506 (p. 473 n. 79). From Nicolaus of Siegen, *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, ed. F. X. Wegele (Jena, 1855), p. 117–18. Nicolaus is himself citing a 'certain doctor', presumably Johannes of Paltz.

[11] For an overview of Joachim of Fiore, his concept of the Third Status, and its influence, see B. McGinn, *The Calabrian Abbot: Joachim of Fiore in the History of Western Thought* (New York, 1985).

[12] Trapp, Appendix, p. 267.

authority: as non-professionals attempting to combat traditional authority and making their own claims to knowledge.

The stakes of the contest rose when prophecy and eschatological thought became involved. Those who prophesied or elucidated the end of the world were claiming knowledge of divinely pre-ordained events. They asserted their access to special insight or enlightenment that allowed them to see the future God had planned for his people. When non-professional, unauthorized laypeople made such claims, the Church's monopoly on spiritual authority was threatened. Indeed, the whole structure of scholastic thought was made of ladders of knowledge, with each rung a traditional authority. Individuals who rejected this ladder of knowledge, or worked outside of it, threatened the entire scholastic structure.

The challenge to and critique of the Church was the most important aspect of the heretical thought of Dorsten's 'conventicle of heretics', the Wirsbergers. Certainly, the Wirsbergers held beliefs that contradicted the tenets of the Church. They also espoused heretical interpretations of Scripture. But these stood far in the background. The main thing that they wished to do was to delegitimize the current Church and its professional knowledge-makers. By contrast, Johannes of Dorsten's main goal was to undermine the position of the heretics as knowledge-makers.

The Professional Stance

Dorsten's work is one of numerous texts written in the fifteenth century with the express purpose of combating prophetic thought. Such texts drew from an earlier tradition of literature written to dispute Joachim of Fiore and his predictions. This tradition began with William of Saint-Amour and was taken up by a number of important theologians. The goals of the anti-Joachite texts were manifold, but they generally had the purpose of refuting the idea of a Third Status and any claims by the new Minorite orders that they represented this Status. These anti-Joachite texts were not directed at the lay public.

A significant shift occurred in the second half of the fourteenth century, when laypeople began to read and create prophecies of their own. These prophecies foresaw the events of the Last Days and in some cases even the dates that these events would occur. Beginning in roughly the last quarter of the fourteenth century and continuing into the sixteenth, prophecies began to circulate among a wider and more diverse reading audience. Knowledge of the future became a space for laypeople to express spiritual and intellectual dissent. The response of clerical authorities was to delimit the rules for prophetic knowledge and to expressly deny the access of laypeople to this knowledge.[13]

[13] These responses are the subject of my current research. To give a sense of the popularity

Dorsten's work exemplifies this type of response. Specifically, he attempted to define the ways in which prophetic knowledge could be received and expressed. By giving a professional, scientific framework for such knowledge, he virtually excluded the possibility of laypeople claiming prophetic insights. Although he directed this attack at a specific group of heretics, his words also served to create general boundaries.[14]

Dorsten's response to the heretics' claims was three-pronged. First, he showed himself as an indisputable authority, with professional mastery of the appropriate texts and skills of interpretation. Second, he exposed the errors of the heretics and their lack of skills at building scholastic arguments, interpreting scripture, and discerning the 'proper' way to use Joachim. Finally, he offered a set of rules by which knowledge of the future could legitimately be acquired. Here I will focus mainly on the first two approaches, and compare this to the heretics' own claims to authority. By doing so, I will shed light on the conflicting positions in the contest over knowledge.

As a properly-trained scholastic, Dorsten approached the 'heretical news' of his day through a historical lens – he sought its origins. He identified what he deemed to be the root of the heretical belief that the current world would soon end. This root, according to him, was Joachim of Fiore's concept of the Third Status. By identifying the root in this way, Dorsten was able to deliver a long report on Joachim and his idea that a Third Status, associated with the Holy Spirit, would supersede the current Status, associated with the Son. The substance of his report demonstrated his expertise regarding the late twelfth-century thinker.

Whether Dorsten's expertise on Joachim had much relevance to the heretical predictions for 1471 is a question that I will consider below. What I first wish to emphasize is that Dorsten's expertise was his weapon in the contest for authority. The newly minted theologian had done his homework, and he positioned himself as an intellectual authority on Joachim's Third Status. He was an expert in possession of wide literary knowledge. He had clearly read Joachim's works, at least in an excerpted form, and he

of the topic, I offer here a non-comprehensive list of texts devoted to the subject of future knowledge written in the German empire in the mid- to late fifteenth century: in 1440s Basel, an anonymous treatise on Antichrist; in 1452, Nicolas of Cusa's *Coniectura de ultimis diebus*; in 1452, Jacobus of Paradiso's *De potestate demonum*; Jacobus of Paradiso's *De cognitione eventuum* (date unknown); in 1454, an anonymous Carthusian commentary on a vision; *c.* 1454, an anonymous *Speculum de ultimo antichristo magno et manifesto iam diu in mundo nato*; in 1460, a lost work by Johannes Hagen 'contra prophecias'; in 1466, Dorsten's *Questio*; in 1473, Dorsten's sermon on prophetic knowledge; in 1486, Johannes Paltz's *Quaestio determinata contra triplicem errorem de Antichristi revelatione*; in 1486, Bartholomäus Friso's *Contra Johannes Annius Viterbo*.

14 Dorsten revisits the topic in a sermon of 1473. I discuss this sermon in some detail in my current book project, tentatively titled *'Future things are hidden from mankind and ought not be known': Contesting Knowledge of the Future in Late Medieval Europe*.

understood Joachim's thought.[15] As Paul Zimdars-Swartz has noted, 'while Dorsten had no sympathy for the apocalyptic views that were presumably circulating in Germany at that time, he seems to have had access to a text which up to a point accurately presented Joachim's own understanding of history', and moreover, 'he appeared to be captivated by the logic of Joachim's thought'.[16]

This portion of Dorsten's *questio* took a conventional approach to Joachim's work. In scholastic fashion, Dorsten's consideration of Joachim's thought and its errors drew from a ladder of historical authorities, including (among others) Jerome, Origen, Augustine of Hippo, Gregory the Great, Caesarius of Heisterbach, William of Auvergne, Thomas Aquinas, Augustine of Ancona, Heinrich of Langenstein, and Jean Gerson.[17] As an Augustinian, Dorsten would be expected to lean especially on the writings of St Augustine, and he did. Put another way, Dorsten's own authority derived from his place at the top of the ladder of previous authorities.

The Errors of Non-Professionals

In the first part of his *questio*, Dorsten elegantly repeated the work of others regarding Joachim and the Third Status. The *questio* became more exciting (and original) when he turned to the 'conventicle of heretics', whose errors he enumerated. (Dorsten's text alternated between the singular 'heretic' and plural 'heretics', which is not uncommon in scholastic anti-heretical writing. Dorsten mentioned one heretic, whom he described as the author and sower of the heretical ideas, but he also referred to 'they', the followers of these ideas, whom he never named.) Dorsten had built his authority in the preceding discussion of how to properly understand Joachim. He then focused on undermining the heretics, whom he believed had misunderstood the late twelfth-century thinker. Now his superior knowledge and understanding allowed Dorsten to state that 'certain scandalous heretics revive this dangerous material of Joachim as if it were scripture, even adding many heretical things; they are ruined so long as his prophecy has not manifested'.[18] Dorsten wished to imply that the heretics lacked the competence to make distinctions in spiritually complicated matters.

15 Dorsten also cited from the 1326 condemnation of Peter John Olivi, but treated the ideas as Joachim's rather than Olivi's. I intend to consider the reception of Olivi in fifteenth-century Erfurt in a separate article. My gratitude to Robert E. Lerner and Sylvain Piron for aiding me in identifying this citation.

16 Zimdars-Swartz, 'John of Dorsten's Response', p. 259.

17 On Augustine of Ancona, see W. L. Anderson, *The Discernment of Spirits: Assessing Visions and Visionaries in the Late Middle Ages* (Tübingen, 2011), pp. 73–8, and Zimdars-Swartz, 'John of Dorsten's Response'.

18 Trapp, Appendix, p. 274.

Dorsten next attacked the heretics' ability to gloss scripture. He accused them of improperly twisting and distorting scripture in their attempts at interpretation. He offered abundant examples of their misconstructions. According to Dorsten, the heretics understood Joachim to have said that a Third Age or Status would emerge, and with it a new rite, which would be marked by the fall of the current Church. As reported by Dorsten, the heretics took Joachim's teaching on the Third Age and construed every bit of scripture that spoke of three days as referring to the Third Status. He gave as examples Hosea 6. 2 (Osee 6. 3 in the medieval Vulgate), 'After two days he will revive us; on the third day he will restore us, that we may live in his presence'; John 2. 19, 'Jesus answered them, "Destroy this temple, and I will raise it again in three days"'; and Luke 13. 32, 'He replied, "Go tell that fox, I will keep on driving out demons and healing people today and tomorrow, and on the third day I will reach my goal"'.[19] Dorsten claimed the heretics glossed all of these passages as referring to Joachim's Third Status. They further compounded their mistakes – and this revealed their lack of interpretive sophistication – by eliding the 'third day' and the 'last day', interpreting all scripture on the Last Day as likewise applying to the Third Status. In Dorsten's opinion, it was their lack of textual precision that was responsible for these misapprehensions.

Dorsten additionally accused the heretics of construing all scriptural passages on 'the signs and tribulations preceding the second advent to judgment as referring to the tribulation which they say will shortly come over the Church before the beginning of the Third Day'. For example, following Joachim, the heretics understood Jeremiah's rebuke of the Jews as referring to present Christians. But they lacked Joachim's subtlety of interpretation. Dorsten added, 'From this, these evil ones seize the occasion; they twist all the refutations, proofs, and condemnations made by the prophets against the Jews to apply to the Holy Church in its present state'.[20]

Dorsten again reminded his listeners that the trouble was the heretics' poor skills of interpretation. They (mis)construed scripture 'so very broadly and inappropriately, in so vague and disorderly a manner, that to recite it all would be most tedious, and to refute and condemn them with orthodoxy and understanding is quite easy, therefore I will let it pass'.[21] Instead of letting it pass, however, he made sure that his audience understood that the heretics were no match for a professional theologian.

Dorsten also undermined the authority of the man he called the author of the heresy by pointing out his lack of Latin and his improper translation and interpretation of Church authorities. Dorsten offered this criticism not once, but several times. He emphasized the heretical author's flawed understanding, for example, in his discussion of 'Error Six': the heretical belief that

19 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
21 Ibid.

those who consumed the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament were in fact idolaters. Dorsten was quick to contend, 'Thus he mangles the apostolic text [of I Corinthians 10, on the Lord's Supper]. … And he does violence and injury to scripture, frequently [and] in all ways'. The heretic's contortions were so complete that it no longer seemed amazing 'when he is seen to bend another writing to suit his proposition'.[22]

I will not repeat Dorsten's every accusation that the heretical author misconstrued sacred texts. But he criticized the author's faulty scriptural interpretation twice more; that is, he mentioned the problem five times in a list of ten errors. The final time was in the discussion of 'Error Ten', which at last dealt with the dating of the Third Status. According to Dorsten, the heretical author predicted that the current status must be completed by 1471. Dorsten explained, 'As conjecture directs, [he says] that in the future year [1471] the number of the years of the world will be 6666 … He estimates therefore, perhaps, that in that illustrious and notable number, composed of four groups of six, that is millennia, centuries, decades, and units … the sum of all things is comprehended. And because they make a uniform group of six, which is the perfect number arithmetically, because it is equal to the sum of its divisors, and theologically, because God completed all creation in it, he estimates finally the future *persona* to be in this [number]'. Presumably this 'future *persona*' represented the Holy Spirit of the Third Status, because Dorsten added, 'The status of the third day, according to his commentary, he says is the consummation and perfection of all statuses'.[23]

Dorsten did not bother to refute this complicated reckoning. Instead, he charged the heretical author once again with misunderstanding Latin. This time, he elaborated on the threat that the heretical author posed. Dorsten complained, 'He teaches much more in a confused way and envelops it intricately, wherein he is greatly deranged.' It was the seeming cleverness and intricacy of the heretic's words that constituted the risk. These allowed him to persuade and mislead not only himself, but the 'simple people'. Peril lurked also in the heretic's choice of language. As Dorsten charged, the heretic 'arranges his fantasies in vulgar German so that he may deceive the simple and the laypeople, when he advances some condemnation or malediction of the clergy and spiritual status, for which he has the greatest hatred'. Thus, although Dorsten did not directly state that German was an inappropriate language for discussing the future of the world, it would appear that the use of the vernacular was suspect because it could be used to delude laypeople. Finally, and perhaps most heinously, the heretic committed the crime of imitating an educated man. He too cited authorities to make his arguments, which impressed and persuaded the uneducated. But, in Dorsten's view, the

22 Ibid., p. 276.
23 Ibid., p. 277.

heretic cited these authorities 'inappropriately, falsely, and inconsistently, so that those not understanding Latin judge him to sufficiently and truthfully support his claims, by the crafty fraud of the worst heretic'.[24]

Overall, while the heretical author and his conventicle of followers held many censurable beliefs and views, Dorsten instead emphasized the danger of their non-professional knowledge-making. He painted their linguistic skills as clumsy, their translations as treacherous and misleading, and their interpretive skills as bending or distorting texts to fit their claims. They were fraudulent, poor imitations of learned knowledge-makers, but their attempts at imitation were clever enough to fool laypeople. All of these accusations implicitly contrasted with Dorsten's professionalism – his smooth Latin, facile citation of authorities, and discernment in the matter of Joachim.

In conclusion: Dorsten refuted the heretical author primarily on scholarly grounds, attacking his knowledge-making abilities and lack of university training, rather than his spiritual failings. It must be pointed out that Dorsten's approach to such blatantly heretical beliefs was unusual. What we might have perhaps expected was for him to have claimed that the heretic was under diabolical influence. And he did that too, in a much briefer fashion. He concluded his discussion of the heretical errors by suggesting that the heretical author 'might be deceived due to a mental illness which amounts to a diabolical illusion'.[25] But in a time when concern about the discernment of spirits was high, and attempts to distinguish between true and false revelations were relatively common, Dorsten chiefly held the heretics accountable for not meeting professional standards of knowledge. Dorsten chose to emphasize his professional academic skills and to discredit the heretical author's lack of same because he was responding to the position taken by the heretics. He believed that a contest over authority was taking place, and that the heretics were attempting to assert their superior authority on matters of scripture and salvation.

The Non-Professionals: The Conventicle of Heretics

What of the individuals whose ideas Dorsten troubled himself to refute at such length – Janko and Livin Wirsberger from the manor of Höflas bei Eger?[26] The Wirsberger brothers had made themselves known to Church authorities by circulating heretical eschatological writings in the 1450s and 1460s. These writings mostly took the form of epistles sent to various important entities:

[24] Ibid., pp. 277–8.

[25] Ibid., p. 278.

[26] In the fifteenth century, Eger was situated in a politically and religiously significant area of the German empire, as it lay on the border between orthodox Germany and Hussite Bohemia.

members of the German nobility; cities of the Reich; the Franciscan provincial minister of Saxony; and the theological faculties of the universities of Erfurt, Leipzig, and Vienna. The Wirsbergers also mentioned having written a 'register to the emperor', a phrase used by Dorsten to describe the writings of the heretics whom he refuted.[27]

Many aspects of the Wirsbergers' thoughts and actions remain unknown. The most serious difficulty is that almost all of their writings have been destroyed. Two extant letters were discovered in 2001 by Günter Hägele in the manuscript collection of the University of Augsburg.[28] These were copied by an unknown scribe in 1465 from originals held in the archives of the Nuremberg city council. One was addressed to 'my friend from the East', later named 'Hans from the East', and the other was addressed to the city of Nuremberg itself. The letters were anonymous, but appear to have been composed by Janko Wirsberger. I refer to these letters in what follows, as they comprise our best evidence for the writings of the Wirsberger brothers.[29]

One of the biggest lacunae in our knowledge pertains to the relationship between the Wirsbergers and a cleric named Johannes of Castro Coronato. Johannes was a Dominican friar and the envoy for middle and northern Germany commissioned by the king of Cyprus to promote an indulgence against the Turks. He visited the city of Erfurt in 1454 to promulgate that indulgence, and then traveled through northern Germany, where he seems to have experienced a bout of madness that caused him to be detained. During this time, he made fantastic claims, such as that he was the son of God, and that a reform of the clergy would occur in the near future. Some connection seems to have existed between the Wirsberger brothers and this man. Janko Wirsberger's letter to Nuremberg mentioned him by name, stating that the city and university of Erfurt had previously received the teachings and godly revelations of Johannes of Castro Coronato, but had not welcomed them. It is possible that Johannes was the 'Hans from the East' addressed in one of the Wirsbergers' letters. Both manuscript copies of the *questio* also refer to Johannes of Castro Coronato in connection with the 'conventicle of heretics', stating that Johannes came to Erfurt and was overcome with madness,

27 On the Wirsbergers, see F. Kneupper, *The Empire at the End of Time: Identity and Reform in Late Medieval German Prophecy* (Oxford, 2016); eadem, 'The Wirsberger Brothers: Contesting Spiritual Authority Through Prophecy', in *Peoples of the Apocalypse / Völker der Endzeit*, ed. W. Brandes, F. Schmieder, and R. Voß (Berlin, 2016), pp. 257–69. See also G. Hägele, 'Wirsberger-Prophezeiungen', in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, ed. K. Ruh et al., 2nd edn, 14 vols. (Berlin, 1978–2007), XI, cols. 1672–81, and Patschovsky, 'Die Wirsberger'. I am very grateful to Alexander Patschovsky for his generosity in sharing his notes and thoughts about the Wirsberger brothers.

28 Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek, previously Wallerstein-Öttingen, Cod. II, 1 2˚85, fols. 190r–220v. For the manuscript catalog, see G. Hägele, *Lateinische mittelalterliche Handschriften in Folio der Universitätsbibliothek Augsburg* (Wiesbaden, 1996), p. 326.

29 On the hostile sources, see Gradl, 'Die Irrlehre der Wirsperger'.

claiming that he was the son of God.[30] Thus, some link existed between Castro Coronato's declarations of a decade before and the Wirsbergers' writings, but the nature and extent of this connection is unknown.

In my earlier work on the Wirsberger brothers, I dismissed the identification of the Wirsbergers as the heretics described by Dorsten, because so much of what Dorsten described did not match their thoughts.[31] However, I wish to renounce my former position and conclude that, upon closer examination, the Wirsbergers should in fact be identified as the heretics of Dorsten's *questio*. The issue is that the general premise of Dorsten's commentary – that the heresy was derived from Joachim – is unfounded. Yet Dorsten cites details that correspond exactly to the Wirsbergers' letters to Nuremberg. Indeed, enough points match to oblige me to surmise that Dorsten had access to the Wirsbergers' writings. One reason to believe this was that the letter to Nuremberg repeatedly referred to epistles sent to Erfurt. The author explained, 'And I have written first in the year of the earthquake … After this I wrote to Nuremberg and you have had my conclusions by you, with a writing that I sent to Erfurt in the year before the comet's approach'.[32] This suggests that epistles were sent to Nuremberg and Erfurt in the year 1455, since 1456 witnessed both Halley's Comet and an earthquake. The author frequently expressed impatience that he had been waiting so long for a reply.

Having written about the Wirsberger brothers in some detail elsewhere, I will not here discuss their entire eschatological world view. Their thought has also been covered to a degree by Günther Hägele, Alexander Patschovsky, Heinrich Gradl, and Otto Schiff.[33] Here I will consider some aspects of the Wirsbergers' writings as they contrasted to Dorsten's. I will also show that the heretics' negative outspokenness towards clerics and learned scriptural authorities indeed made the battle for knowledge a two-way contest.

Like Dorsten's *questio*, the Wirsbergers' letters were focused on the issue of prophetic knowledge and its control. The Wirsbergers not only understood their status as non-professionals, but seemingly embraced it. They wrote in a hybrid of Latin and German. They mentioned repeatedly that they had sought the approval of educated authorities, revealing, of course, that they did not belong to this category. Yet, woven into their letters were assertions of a competing authority. The author of the epistles – contemporaries identified him as Janko – asserted his authority by offering his own competing glosses of scripture and using his glosses to confidently predict future events such as the arrival of Antichrist. In fact, he practically deluged his reader with biblical

30 Best on this is Hägele, 'Wirsberger-Prophezeiungen'.

31 Kneupper, *Empire at the End of Time*, p. 109 n. 4.

32 Cod. II, 1 2ˆ85, fol. 193r.

33 For Hägele and Patschovsky, see n. 27 above. For Gradl, see n. 9. Otto Schiff, 'Die Wirsberger: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der revolutionären Apokalyptik im 15. Jahrhundert', *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* 26 (1931), 776–86.

citations, as if to allow no doubt about his mastery of scripture. Notably, he cited no other kinds of text. And finally, he produced what he viewed as an unassailable competitor to clerical authority: a new 'witness' who alone could teach a new understanding of the gospels.

If more proof is needed that the Wirsbergers were in fact the unnamed heretics of Dorsten's *questio*, here are some examples. First, Dorsten accused the heretics of citing Hosea (Osee) 6. 3, and of conflating the 'third day' with the 'last day'. True. The letter to Nuremberg did in fact cite this passage in Hosea, 'He will revive us after two days: on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight'. Conflating the 'third' and 'last day', the author asserted that the passage meant that on the last day 'there will be no one to doubt the lamentations and witness from the godly mouth, because they will all be dead and buried'.[34] Second, Dorsten suggested that the unknown heretics objected to the wording of the Pater Noster, insisting that it should say only, 'Our father who is sanctified in heaven', because our 'heavenly father is not yet sanctified on earth'.[35] Guilty again. The letter to Nuremberg stated, 'It is not enough that we have believed in God and yet have not done as he taught … I believe, I believe, but where is in us the fruit and the result? Why should we believe that we experience his kingdom on earth? And our own blessedness? Why is it taught and prayed, "Our father who is in heaven, blessed be your name, may your kingdom come, may your will be done, as in heaven?"'[36] The author's meaning was that God's kingdom did not seem to be perceptible on earth because of the evil doings of humans. However, Dorsten appeared to have (perhaps willfully) missed the point, because he was so caught up in the heretic's theological and grammatical mistakes, criticizing, 'He sins in grammar because that combination is inconsistent [that says], "Our father who is in heaven, may he be sanctified … May your name come, may your will be done"'.[37] It appears that the heretic's most flagrant error was the inconsistent use of the second and third person.

Perhaps the most obvious evidence that the Wirsbergers were indeed Dorsten's heretics was their use of dates. One of Dorsten's stated goals was to refute the claims of the conventicle of heretics that the Third Status of the world would begin in 1471. Dorsten explained that the heretics believed that the year 1471 would be 6,666 years from the beginning of the world. We find these reckonings in Janko's letter to Nuremberg, which declared, 'Hear when, not before or after, the year 6, after the 600, after the 60th year [666] … the number of years remaining will last over four years and will end before the year 71 begins'. The letter further explained that 6,666 years from the beginning of the world should be understood as the end of the forty

34 Cod. II, 1 2ˆ85, fol. 192r.
35 Trapp, Appendix, p. 275.
36 Cod. II, 1 2ˆ85, fol. 194r.
37 Trapp, Appendix, p. 275.

'unfruitful' years in Psalms 95. 10–11 (94. 10–11 in the Vulgate): 'Forty years long was I offended with that generation and I said: These always err in heart. And these men have not known my ways: so I swore in my wrath that they shall not enter into my rest'.[38]

Thus, Dorsten was correct about the significance of 1471, but what was to happen in that year? The Wirsbergers' epistles were not entirely clear. Instead, the letters alternated between two predictions. One was the approaching open reign of Antichrist, and the other was the arrival of a new witness of truth. The bulk of the letters was taken up with warnings of the approach of tribulations, God's wrath, and the reign of Antichrist. The author explained that for some time he had been writing letters that 'told of the number of years on which you should reckon not the spiritual, but the carnal affliction, and look for Antichrist the betrayer who will be born to the world in a few years and some weeks, and who will afterwards rule'.[39] The letters repeated again and again that Antichrist approached and could already be seen to be at work in the world.

If Dorsten's weapon was his superior training, the Wirsbergers' was the approach of Antichrist. They used their conviction that Antichrist approached to criticize learned clerics. They did this by portraying the teachers and professors within the Church as the seducers, liars, and false prophets predicted as signs of the Last Days. At least twenty times in Janko's letter to Nuremberg, he attacked the clergy for false interpretations. For example, he lamented, 'Woe, woe, and woe! See here how we allow ourselves to be made fools with blind, senseless interpretations, sayings, and deeds. How one after the next has incorrectly spoken the bad text, and still today we dogs and we swine do this. How we let ourselves be blindly tricked and confused into eternal damnation. God laments that his words are not accepted, recognized, or fulfilled'.[40] Moreover, 'Truly, truly, truly God warns how we took up and followed their testimony, false, unrighteous, and damnable explanations of his words'.[41] Furthermore, the letters implied that the clergy were actually part of the being of Antichrist, declaring, 'In the birth, deeds, and character of Antichrist they will not recognize themselves, and yet by their harsh, unyielding manners they may bring down the holy community and the head of St Peter'.[42]

Other passages in the letter to Nuremberg also explicitly linked the End Times and the false teachers ruling the Church. The author adroitly linked biblical passages to create a new, anticlerical narrative. He deployed these scriptural passages first to argue against the false teaching of the clergy, then

38 Cod. II, 1 2ˆ85, fol. 193r.
39 Ibid., fol. 193v.
40 Ibid., fol. 198r.
41 Ibid., fol. 197v.
42 Ibid., fol. 199v.

to show that these false teachings were signs of the apocalypse, and finally to threaten the clergy with destruction. For example, he cited Matthew 24. 3–4, 'And when he was sitting on Mount Olivet the disciples came to him privately, saying: "Tell us when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of your coming and of the consummation of the world?" And Jesus, answering, said to them: "Take heed that no man seduce you".' He followed this warning of seducers in the Last Days with a quote from Psalm 146. 4 (145. 4 in the Vulgate), 'in that day all their thoughts shall perish'. He then explained, 'Cursed is all their seeing and hearing and speaking of salvation … and their speechmaking, studying, teaching, understanding, and recognizing'.[43] He continued, citing Matthew 23. 34, 'Therefore behold I send to you prophets and wise men and scribes: and some of them you will put to death and crucify: and some you will scourge in your synagogues and persecute from city to city', and Luke 21. 16, 'And you shall be betrayed by your parents and brethren and kinsmen and friends: and some of you they will put to death'. He concluded with his own words, 'They will be strangled by the noose of evil and deceit that they have made, to their eternal death!'[44]

The letters also attempted to undermine professional knowledge-makers by pointing out that they had failed to recognize the one true witness. This witness was the cryptic figure named 'Hans from the East' in the letter, which might have been a reference to Johannes of Castro Coronato. At any rate, this 'witness' was championed in the letters as the bearer of true knowledge and revelation – presumably the message of wrath that constituted the body of the letter. The rejection of his message was the error of the learned. The letter to Nuremberg bemoaned, 'It is well to wonder and to sorrow that no virtue, reason, nor prescience is found in anyone, whether in the lands, cities, universities, orders, or chapters, not in all of humanity from the highest to lowest, nor among the powerful. From no one has yet come acknowledgment, instruction, or answer to this wonderful and godly revelation. Now it must be that all the world must come under one belief, and all the testimony of the mouth of God into one voice. The witness is appointed from the people to drive, will, exhort, defend, and warn'.[45]

Thus, the position of the Wirsbergers vis-à-vis the learned clergy was declared. Everyone in their time was guilty of blindness, of not heeding the message of tribulation sent by the witness. But the learned were the guiltiest of all. They were not only blind to the truth of revelation and the true understanding of scripture, but they led the world astray with their false glossings and teachings. They misled the people, and because of this, they were actually part of Antichrist.

[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid., fol. 197r.

The perspicacious reader will note that I have made no mention of the Third Status in the writings of the Wirsbergers. That is because it is not there. At no point did the letters refer to a Third Status. At no point did they make any direct reference to Joachim of Fiore or his ideas. The closest that the letters, at least the extant ones, came to any idea of a new age was the suggestion that a fuller understanding would soon be reached, because such understanding was possible only in the Last Days. For example, the letter to Nuremberg introduced the topic of reckoning by asking, 'And do you not wonder why the matter has been hidden until now, until the time remains?'[46] This can hardly be inferred to suggest that the world would have a Joachite Third Status. One might argue here that most of the Wirsbergers' writings have disappeared. Perhaps they mentioned Joachim elsewhere? We shall never know with full certainty. Nevertheless, I state with confidence that what remains of the Wirsbergers' writings seem internally consistent and repetitive enough to suggest that they did not veer off into Joachite thought.

One must conclude that Dorsten either imagined or invented the connection between Joachim of Fiore and the Wirsberger brothers. Why would he do this? He likely took his inspiration from other Church authorities. Rudolf of Rüdesheim's denunciation letter, for example, claimed that the brothers believed that one 'whom they called the anointed of the savior had been born from the woman clothed in the sun'. According to Rudolf's inaccurate assessment, the Wirsbergers believed this anointed one would 'introduce the third and final testament and bring to all who believed in him the light of spiritual and inner illumination, to the understanding of the holy trinity'.[47] Rudolf also accused 'friars' of being members of the Wirsberger sect. Following this lead, the committee of Minorite leaders who met in Regensburg and reported on the Wirsbergers' errors also accused the brothers of teaching that an 'anointed one' would 'introduce the third and final testament'.[48] The concept of a third testament was an extrapolation of Joachite thought, which imagined the Third Status of the world – the age of the Holy Spirit – would also be accompanied by a third holy text: the Third Testament. This was a heresy, of course, one which had been associated with zealous Franciscan Joachites since the thirteenth century, when Gerardino of Borgo San Donnino

46 Ibid., fol. 193r.

47 Schelhorn, *Acta Historico-ecclesiastica*, pp. 67–8. It would be enlightening to compare the accusations of various Church authorities with the writings of the Wirsbergers, but for now I will consider this point only.

48 A German from the vicinity of Regensburg did make precisely this heretical claim of an approaching Third Testament, some years before the Wirsberger brothers began their letter-writing campaign. This was Nicholas of Buldesdorf, whose heretical ideas resulted in his execution by fire by the rump of the Council of Basel in 1446. Might some memory of Nicholas have prompted the accusations that the Wirsbergers expounded a Third Testament? On Nicholas, see R. E. Lerner, *The Feast of Saint Abraham: Medieval Millenarians and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 2001), pp. 111–17.

was found guilty of this error in 1255, as Robert E. Lerner described in *The Feast of Saint Abraham*.[49] Hence, although there is no evidence of a third testament in the extant writings of the Wirsbergers, Church authorities accused them of promulgating this old Joachite error. Most likely, it was these accusations which inspired Dorsten to charge the Wirsbergers with misusing Joachim, in spite of the fact that Dorsten seems to have read the Wirsbergers' own writings, which did not refer to a Third Testament or Status, and were not influenced by Joachim.

Dorsten might also have felt obliged to include a description of Joachim's work in order to fit his *questio* into the intellectual tradition of combating prophetic thought which focused on the rebuttal of the Joachite Third Status. By including a discussion of the Third Status in his *questio*, Dorsten could place himself within a tradition that included William of Saint-Amour, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventure of Bagnoregio. After all, what was a scholastic to do with the genuine writings of the Wirsbergers? They offered little room for scholastic debate, as they cited no authorities and provided no sophisticated readings of scripture. In any case, Dorsten's own inability to grasp the ideas of the Wirsbergers – and notably his invention of a connection with Joachite thought – was as least as poor an example of critical reading as anything that the heretics were guilty of.

Conclusions

The *questio* of Dorsten and the letters of the Wirsbergers offer an evocative comparison because they exemplify so well the two sides of the knowledge contest. Dorsten's side was based on history, literature, and a scholastic tradition of authorities. It was expressed in the language of the educated. His critiques of his opponents referenced a learned, professional world whose rules they consistently ignored. In many cases, he objected less to the content of his opponents' thoughts than to their unprofessional form. All in all, his approach could be seen as an attempt to frame the contest in a way that gave the advantage to the theology professor. He had professional training, as demonstrated by his title, he had the 'facts' on his side, and he had the traditional authorities to back up his claims.

By comparison, the Wirsberger brothers had no professional training, no degrees, and no authorities. Their epistles were inelegant and raw. They used the vernacular rather than Latin. They relied on their own non-professional skills to interpret scriptural passages. They included no references to traditional authorities, whom they reviled, but referred instead to a shadowy figure as their witness. Stylistically, they hammered away at their points.

[49] Lerner, *Feast of Saint Abraham*, pp. 43–8.

They were repetitive, inarticulate, and angry. Yet, in many ways, the heretical letters of the Wirsbergers held their own. Their truth was not the truth of facts and learning, but the truth of emotion. In some ways, we can even view their emotional, iconoclastic, anti-clerical, vernacular letters as precursors to the rhetoric of the Reformation.

Dorsten's myopia and the Wirsbergers' fury were evidence of a larger problem in late medieval Germany. It is fairly evident that the gap between these two perspectives made the knowledge contest nearly impossible to resolve. What makes this case so important is that, while it had unique aspects, it was not an isolated incident. Claims to knowledge of the future proliferated in the fifteenth century. As they did, more and more clerical professionals felt compelled to refute non-professional predictions and to establish the proper rules by which knowledge of the future could be acquired. Accusations of heresy were one way of repudiating non-professional knowledge. Thus, while the followers of the Wirsbergers might have been very few (or virtually none), similar expressions of religious dissent were numerous.[50] A whole crop of self-convinced prognosticators made their own assertions about the future. The lines that Dorsten attempted to draw between professional and non-professional knowledge-makers were urgent for individuals in the late Middle Ages. This is demonstrated by the energy with which they grappled over the territory. This contest was also prophetic. In the approaching Reformation, the lines were about to be redrawn, and the ownership of truth reconsidered. Not only that, but similar questions continue to resonate today, as professional and non-professional knowledge-makers again grapple over the ownership of knowledge and truth.

[50] As noted by Robert E. Lerner in his seminal article, 'Medieval Prophecy and Religious Dissent', *Past & Present* 72 (1976), 3–24. This article provided the inspiration for my book on the subject, Kneupper, *Empire at the End of Time*.

10

Heretics, Allies, Exemplary Christians: Latin Views of Ethiopian Orthodox in the Late Middle Ages

Samantha Kelly

Thirty years after its initial publication, it seems safe to say that R. I. Moore's theory of the 'formation of a persecuting society' in Latin Christendom by the mid-thirteenth century has withstood the test of time. As the essays within and beyond the present collection confirm, in the subsequent two centuries heresy came to be applied to an increasingly large and diverse collection of individuals, groups, and practices, and was investigated and prosecuted by clerical authorities in an increasingly efficient manner.[1]

In at least one case, however – that of Ethiopian Orthodox Christians – the Latin Church became not more eager to perceive and root out heresy over the course of the late Middle Ages, but less. Certainly the ultimate goal of Latin policy toward Ethiopian Orthodox, and indeed toward all eastern Christian communities from Byzantium to India, remained constant: to bring them into ecumenical union with Rome. It was the language with which Ethiopian Christians were depicted, and the concrete ways in which union was pursued, that altered over time. At first seen as heretics toward whom the preferred policy was proselytization and conversion, Ethiopian Orthodox gradually came to be viewed as relatively proximate to Latin Christians, their deviations downplayed and their Christian virtues lauded. At the same time, the papacy largely abandoned missionary efforts in favor of diplomatic negotiation and the generous treatment of Ethiopian visitors to the West. There were, of course, exceptions to this general arc of development, and the diversity of Latin views throughout the late medieval centuries should not be underplayed. But until the last decades of the fifteenth century, what we may call a dominant view, shared by popes and by those clerics most concerned with Ethiopian Orthodox, followed this increasingly tolerant course.

1 Beyond the present volume, see inter alia D. Elliott, *Proving Woman: Female Spirituality and Inquisitional Culture in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton, 2004); C. Caldwell Ames, *Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2009); I. Bueno, *Defining Heresy: Inquisition, Theology, and Papal Policy in the Time of Jacques Fournier*, trans. I. Bolognese, T. Brophy, and S. R. Prodan (Leiden, 2015).

As I hope to demonstrate in what follows, this shift was not caused by an increase or change in Latin knowledge about Ethiopian Orthodoxy itself. Latin observers did improve their understanding of Ethiopia's geographical location, political circumstances, and distinctions from other eastern Christian communities over time, but from the beginning their knowledge of Ethiopian Orthodoxy's most salient features was fairly accurate. The shift was caused rather by changes in Ethiopia's perceived utility to the Latin West, first militarily (and this remained, throughout the late Middle Ages, its most compelling feature), and then intellectually as well. Aided by the Latin legend of Prester John that made of the Ethiopian ruler an exemplary Christian, this utility permitted and indeed recommended an altered vision of Ethiopian Orthodox as Christian brothers and equals to be courted, despite their known deviations in doctrine and practice, and despite, one might add, the geographical and physiognomic 'otherness' represented by their dark skin.

Between the 1480s and 1517, Latin views seem to have splintered. At the papal curia, and thus in official Latin Church policy, the benign view of Ethiopian Orthodox increased to its highest medieval level, marked by the hosting of an Ethiopian Orthodox community on Vatican property and by a new vision of Ethiopian Orthodox as preservers of the early Church's apostolic practice. Among missionary-minded friars in the Holy Land, however, the same decades saw a resumption of the language of heresy and conversion. These opposing views represented different expressions of the reform movement of the later fifteenth century, and help illuminate the origins of the conflicting Latin attitudes and policies toward Ethiopian Orthodox that characterized the age of Reformation.

In tracing the arc of Latin opinion and policy from the thirteenth century to 1517, I confine myself principally to clerical views as expressed in two kinds of documentation. The first is papal letters and directives concerning Ethiopia, which best express official Latin Church policy, as well as other, occasionally more evaluative texts produced at the papal curia. The second is Latin descriptive literature regarding the Holy Land, including pilgrims' accounts, crusade treatises, and histories. It was in the Holy Land that Latin Christians first encountered Ethiopian Orthodox (who maintained pilgrim communities in Jerusalem, Cairo, and other eastern Mediterranean locations), and it quickly became customary for Latin visitors to offer sketches of the Ethiopian and other eastern Christian communities to be found in the region, making this literature the richest vein of discursive assessments of Ethiopians and their faith. For both kinds of documentation I have benefited from the thorough compilations of relevant texts assembled by Enrico Cerulli, with regard to medieval Latin literature on the Holy Land, and Osvaldo Raineri, with regard to papal correspondence.[2] As a first attempt to bring the known

[2] E. Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina: storia della comunità etiopica di Gerusalemme*, 2 vols. (Rome,

evidence to bear specifically on the question of Ethiopians' 'heresy' in Latin eyes, what follows should be considered a point of departure for further discussion.

Thirteenth-Century Origins: Ethiopian Orthodox as Heretics

Our survey must begin with Jacques of Vitry, the famous crusade advocate and bishop of Acre from 1216 to 1227, whose *Historia orientalis* offered the first substantive Latin account of Ethiopian Orthodox and, due to its wide influence in its own time and upon later Latin writers about the Holy Land, did much to cement the view of them as heretics. In the Holy Land, he wrote, are 'other barbarous nations who dissent from the Greeks and Latins, of whom some are called Jacobites … long ago excommunicated by the patriarch of Constantinople and divided from the Greek church'. While some Jacobites lived together with Muslims, he continued, others occupied their own regions, 'that is, Nubia, which borders Egypt, and a great part of Ethiopia, and all regions as far as India. All are Christian, converted by St Matthew the Apostle and other apostolic men. But afterward, through weeds sown by the Enemy, they were blinded by lamentable and miserable error'. Jacques then listed their particular errors: circumcision, confession directly to God rather than to a priest, branding on the forehead with the sign of the Cross (which they 'perversely' justified via John the Baptist's words in Matthew 3. 11, 'He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire'), crossing themselves with a single finger, and most notably their belief in Christ's single nature, whence 'they had fallen into a damned and most terrible heresy', and 'were thus excommunicated and condemned at the Council of Chalcedon as heretics'.[3]

On one hand, Jacques's portrait illustrates the confusion among diverse eastern Christian communities that would only slowly be disentangled by later writers. Though 'Jacobite' was a Greek term generally applied to the Syrian Christian community under the authority of the Antiochene patriarch, Jacques extended it to include the Christian communities of Africa, which in fact looked to the patriarch of Alexandria. As for the errors Jacques listed, some applied to the Coptic, Nubian, and Ethiopian Churches in this period (circumcision), some to Nubia and Ethiopia ('branding' with the

1943–45); O. Raineri, *Lettere tra i pontefici romani e i principi etiopici (secoli XII–XX): versioni e integrazioni* (Vatican City, 2005), which offers additional letters, and Italian translations, compared to his similarly titled volume of 2003. Wherever possible the full texts of works extracted by Cerulli are cited below. Except where noted, all translations from original languages are my own.

3 Jacques of Vitry, *Libri duo quorum prior orientalis … historiae nomine inscribitur*, ed. F. Moschus (1597; reprint Farnborough, 1971), pp. 144–7; excerpts in Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 59–60.

sign of the Cross), some to 'monophysite' or non-Chalcedonian Christians generally (emphasis on Christ's single nature).[4] On the other hand, Jacques's knowledge of eastern Christian practices was rather detailed and, despite its conflations, not inaccurate with regard to Ethiopian Orthodoxy. Jacques was also aware that Nubia and Ethiopia were independent Christian-ruled kingdoms – Nubia would fall to Muslim domination in the early fourteenth century but was in Jacques's time still ruled by a Christian king – which would become an important consideration for later Latin writers. Jacques himself, however, placed no particular importance on this political autonomy. Instead he stressed the line dividing Latins and Greeks from non-Chalcedonian Christians generally, and characterized the latter as heretical, formally excommunicated, and abounding in errors of both doctrine and practice.

A second, contemporaneous account of the Ethiopians was offered by Oliver of Cologne (also known as Oliver of Paderborn, after the bishopric he held in his final years), who participated in the Fifth Crusade of 1217–19 and recounted his experiences in the *Historia Damiatina*. Oliver paused in his military narrative to offer brief descriptions of various Christian communities in the Holy Land, including the 'Nubians' of Ethiopia. They 'are like the Jacobites in the sacrifice of the altar and other divine offices, with this exception, that the Nubians alone brand their children on the forehead with a hot iron in the sign of the cross, and also baptize them. Both these and those [i.e. Jacobites and Nubian-Ethiopians] use Chaldean letters, use leavened bread [in the Mass], and cross themselves with a single finger; they say the two natures of Christ are united in single nature, perhaps equivocating on the term "nature", as they accept "nature" for "person" in the second place'.[5] In assessing Ethiopian Orthodoxy, Oliver employed more neutral language than did Jacques of Vitry; he was also more knowledgeable, being able to differentiate Ethiopian from 'Jacobite' practice and to explain better their Christological stance.[6] Nonetheless, it is unlikely that Oliver's view of or preferred policy toward the Ethiopians differed much from those of Jacques.

4 What Latin Christians describe as branding, but was more likely scarification, is attested in Nubia from the twelfth century (see the Virgin and Child painting now in the National Museum of Khartoum, KH24362; I thank Robin Seignobos for this reference). In Ethiopia it is attested in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, but may have begun earlier: see R. Pankhurst, *A Social History of Ethiopia* (Trenton NJ, 1992), p. 71.

5 Oliver of Paderborn, *Historia Damiatina. The Capture of Damietta of Oliver of Paderborn*, trans. J. J. Gavignan (Philadelphia, 1948), pp. 77–80 on the various communities. For the passage on the Ethiopians I translate from the Latin text cited in Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 58.

6 The Ethiopian and other non-Chalcedonian Churches were and are miaphysite, holding that Christ's divine and human natures were united in a single nature (*mia physis*) rather than in a single person (*hypostasis*). Most medieval Latin commentators focused on the latter part of this formulation and called them 'monophysite'. T. Hainthaler, 'Monophysitism', in *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, 5 vols. (Wiesbaden, 2003–14), III, 1006–9 (p. 1007).

The two were collaborators in pro-crusade advocacy both before and after the Fifth Crusade, and both men, 'convinced that the reunion of the eastern churches with Rome was essential for combating Islam … used the public preaching and debates which characterized anti-heretical efforts in Europe in the eastern areas under Latin control, with the goal of converting eastern Christians and Saracens from their heresy'.[7]

That eastern Christians were to be classed alongside Muslims as targets of conversion was also certainly the view of the contemporary papacy. Indeed in northeastern Europe, eastern Christians were legitimate targets of crusade, as the military attacks against Russian Orthodox in Novgorod during and after the pontificate of Gregory IX illustrate.[8] In the Mediterranean, conversion was sought rather by the word than by the sword, but was similarly targeted at infidels and eastern Christians indiscriminately. In 1258 Alexander IV authorized the missionary activity of the Franciscans to effect conversions in the east; in 1288 Nicholas IV did the same for the Dominicans. Both bulls included Ethiopia among the lands to be missionized, clearly in the interests of thoroughness and doubtless with little firm grasp of its location or the route to reach it.[9] Nicholas's letter of 1289, too, though addressed specifically to the 'emperor of Ethiopia', was merely one of several addressed generically to various Asian potentates, urging that 'you strive fervently and effectively to the pursuit of this union of the church'.[10] These letters were entrusted to the Franciscan missionary John of Montecorvino, who was to take them on the proselytizing odyssey that famously culminated in China. None of these thirteenth-century missionaries reached, or perhaps even tried to reach, Ethiopia. But if they had, their aim would certainly have been to approach the Ethiopian Orthodox in the same manner as Muslims or pagans and convert them to the true (i.e. Latin) faith. Thus although there was at least one dissenting voice in this first century of Latin commentary on Ethiopian Christianity – the German Burchard of Mount Sion opined in the 1280s that some eastern Christians, whose doctrinal errors could be attributed to ignorance, even 'surpass by far the religious of the Roman Church' in their devout practice, and he seems to have classed the Ethiopians in this group – the more numerous and influential voices, which conformed to papal opinion, carried the day.[11]

7 J. Bird, 'Crusade and Conversion after the Fourth Lateran Council (1215): Oliver of Paderborn's and James of Vitry's Missions to Muslims Reconsidered,' *Essays in Medieval Studies* 21 (2004), 23–48 (p. 26).

8 E. Christiansen, *The Northern Crusades* (New York, 1997), pp. 126–31, 182–91.

9 R. Lefevre, 'Riflessi etiopici nella cultura europea del medioevo e del Rinascimento', *Annali lateranensi* 9 (1945), 331–444 (p. 366).

10 Raineri, *Lettere*, pp. 18–19.

11 Without explicitly endorsing their view, Burchard did report the Ethiopians' self–conception, as well as their reputation in the Holy Land: 'they say that they know themselves to be better in their understanding of the faith, which, they contend, they

The Fourteenth-Century Discursive Shift: From Heretics to Good Christian Allies

After the fall of Acre to Muslim control in 1291 and the surge of renewed crusading interest it spawned, a novel element was added to Latin perceptions of Ethiopia: its potential as an ally in future attempts to retake the Holy Land. Eventually, Ethiopia's perceived utility as a crusading ally would become its single most compelling feature in Latin eyes, and play a pivotal role in shifting attitudes toward the country and its people. When the idea was first bruited, however, it was still paired with the conception of Ethiopian Orthodox as heretics to be converted.[12] Among the first to suggest a Latin-Ethiopian crusade alliance was Marino Sanudo the Elder, a Venetian nobleman and frequent resident in the eastern Mediterranean whose *Liber secretorum fidelium crucis*, first written at the behest of Pope Clement V between 1306 and 1309, was later expanded and presented to Pope John XXII. Believing Egypt to be the key to the Holy Land, Sanudo recommended a two-pronged attack on the country, the Latins coming by sea, while 'the black Christians of Nubia and from other countries above Egypt … will descend upon their enemies from their part', in the south. The Tartars, meanwhile, were to attack Syria, 'on account of which it will be useful to have friendship with the Tartars and to attend to them solicitously with gifts, sweet words, and mutual greetings'.[13] Such gifts and sweet words were not, however, recommended for the African allies. Indeed, in a later chapter, describing the various Christian communities of the east, Sanudo made clear his view of their heresy, borrowing heavily from Jacques of Vitry's language on the Jacobites. Like Jacques, he noted the Jacobites' presence in Nubia and a large part of Ethiopia, the chasm dividing them from the Latins and the Greeks, their excommunication at Chalcedon, and their conversion by the apostle Matthew but subsequent descent into 'lamentable error'; he also offered a similar list of those errors, whence 'they indulge in condemned and evil heresy'.[14] In the same decades, the

observe inviolably to this day … And these are held to be the more devout among the Oriental [Christians]'. Cited in Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina,* I, 85, from the edition of Canisius, *Thesaurus monumentorum, ecclesiasticorum et historicorum sive Henrici Canisii lectiones*, 4 vols. (Amsterdam, 1725), IV, 24.

12 A rather more positive portrait of Ethiopian Orthodox was offered by the Armenian nobleman Hethum [Hayton] in 1307, in what was indeed the first crusade tract to propose a Latin–Ethiopian (and Armenian) alliance; but as Hethum was not himself a Latin Christian, his work falls outside our purview. See Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 91–2, 98–9.

13 Marino Sanudo Torsello, *The Book of the Secrets of the Faithful of the Cross:* Liber secretorum fidelium crucis, trans. P. Lock (Farnham, 2011), p. 71. For the Latin see *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. J. Bongars, 2 vols. (Hanover, 1611), II, 36 (in the numeration that starts over after p. 1208).

14 In the translation of Lock (see previous note), pp. 292–4; in the Latin edition of Bongars, pp. 184–5.

English Dominican William Adam also proposed a Latin-Ethiopian crusade alliance, in this case focused on strategic blockade of the Gulf of Aden. In his *Directorium ad passagium faciendum* (1332), he specified that the Latins' allies in this project would be the 'Christian Ethiopians, a great and powerful people', who, according to a prophecy, were destined to destroy the Muslim holy city of Mecca.[15] Though this terse description may seem to suggest a less 'heretical' view of the Ethiopians than Sanudo's, Adam's earlier crusade treatise, *De modo Sarracenos extirpandi* (1317), made his own position clear: himself a missionary assigned to Persia, he had first gone to the Gulf of Aden in the 1310s, precisely in the hope of reaching Ethiopia to convert its people.[16]

As in the thirteenth century, these writers' views of Ethiopia closely matched those of the papacy. John XXII, who knew of both Sanudo's and Adam's proposals, was a vigorous supporter of missionary conversion, including in Ethiopia. In 1316, at the start of his pontificate, he dispatched eight Dominican friars to evangelize in Ethiopia.[17] Thirteen years later he sent another Dominican, Jourdain Catalani of Sévérac, to bring a papal letter to the Ethiopian ruler. Like John of Montecorvino before him, however, Jourdain was a missionary whose principal destination was Asia (he was the newly-appointed bishop of Quilon in India); Ethiopia was thus no more than a potential digression, and one which he would have approached in the traditional fashion as a target of conversion.[18] Indeed the papal letter Jourdain carried made this fairly clear. 'In order that the fog of errors may cease … and the perfidy of false faith may not cover the eyes of believers in Christ', wrote the pope, 'we warn, ask, and exhort Your Excellency … that you and the people entrusted to your authority return to the catholic and universal church, outside of which there is no grace nor salvation'.[19]

It was a short step, however, from recognition of Ethiopia's potential as a Christian ally in crusade to identification of its ruler with the legendary Prester John. Ever since Otto of Freising's universal chronicle of the mid-twelfth century, the Prester had been touted in Latin Christendom as a distant Christian ruler ('beyond Persia and Armenia') intent upon ousting the Muslims from the Holy Land. He was also known for his enormous wealth and – despite being a Nestorian – devout piety, exemplified by his ardent desire to go on pilgrimage to Jerusalem and by a lineage that traced back to the magi.[20] Latin travelers' failure to locate the Prester in Asia, combined with

15 Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 99–100.

16 As he wrote in his *De modo Sarracenos extirpandi*, he had first visited the lands bordering the Indian Ocean 'for the purpose of preaching in Ethiopia', and expressed his compassion for its 'perishing' population: cited in Cerulli, *Etiopia in Palestina*, I, 99.

17 Lefevre, 'Riflessi etiopici,' p. 367.

18 See Cordier's biographical material in Jourdain Catalani de Sévérac, *Mirabilia descripta. Les merveilles de l'Asie*, ed. H. Cordier (Paris, 1925), pp. 32–41.

19 Raineri, *Lettere*, pp. 20–1.

20 Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 AD*, trans.

a common geographical conflation of Ethiopia with India, now suggested that the Prester was none other than the Ethiopian ruler or *nəguś*. This connection seems to have affected Latin assessments of Ethiopian faith. Already in 1323 the Irish Franciscan Simon, gathering his information in Egypt, claimed that Prester John was reached by ascending the Nile 'from the Mediterranean to Greater India', suggesting a location consonant with Ethiopia.[21] According to Jacques of Vitry, it will be remembered, the region from Egypt through Ethiopia to India was inhabited by Jacobites, and when discussing the Jacobites' faith Simon repeated Jacques's list of their errors. He also, however, added a comment of his own: 'though they err in many ceremonies with respect to the rite that the Roman Church now observes, nevertheless in other, essential articles of the faith they err very little, but rather believe well'.[22] Simon thus made a first, tentative connection between Ethiopia and the Prester's land, and simultaneously viewed their doctrine as very proximate, albeit not identical, to Latin norms.

This more positive image of Ethiopian power and piety grew in detail in following decades. The Augustinian friar Jacopo of Verona, who made his trip to the Holy Land in 1335, was among the first to locate the Prester unambiguously in Africa, combining established features of the Latin portrait of Ethiopia, for example its conversion by St Matthew, with evocative features of the Prester's realm, such as the passage of one of the four rivers of Paradise through his land. He also added a new and influential datum about the African Prester: he 'has the power to divert the river Nile from the sultan. The sultan therefore greatly fears him, since this river irrigates all of Egypt'. As for the Prester's and his people's faith, Jacopo observed only that 'they are devout men, though they observe three baptisms: of circumcision, of branding, of water'.[23] A decade later Niccolò of Poggibonsi, a Franciscan, made his own pilgrimage and wrote an Italian account of it much cited by later Latin travelers to the Holy Land. Though he did not explicitly identify the *nəguś* as Prester John, he repeated Jacopo's claim that the sultan feared him because of his power. He also linked that power more explicitly to Ethiopia's reputed utility for crusade, observing that the sultan sought to prevent contact between Ethiopians and Latin Christians lest they make war on him together. And like Simon and Jacopo, he recognized the deviations of Ethiopian Christianity but in rather accommodating terms. 'Their faith is not perfect, and they baptize with a hot iron', he conceded, but 'all these [eastern

C. Mierow, ed. C. Knapp and A. Evans (New York, 2002), pp. 443–4. See also C. Rouxpetel, 'La figure du Prêtre Jean: les mutations d'une prophétie,' *Questes* 28 (2014), 99–120, and *Prester John: The Legend and its Sources*, compil. and trans. K. Brewer (Farnham, 2015).

21 G. Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente francescano*, 3 vols. (Florence, 1919), III, 264; cited in Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 105.

22 Golubovich, *Biblioteca*, III, 259; cited in Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 106–7.

23 Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 131.

Christian] peoples lack something of our faith: there are, first, the Greeks, who lack regarding the Credo; others lack regarding circumcision, others regarding baptism, and thus every people lacks in some regard'. He also noted that the Ethiopians 'love us Franks more than any other people, and would gladly join with us Latins' – an affection that could be understood as signifying their openness to military alliance, to religious union, or to both.[24]

In the second half of the fourteenth century, the Prester's reputation became both more exalted and more widely known in Latin Christendom, thanks to such popular works as *Mandeville's Travels* and John of Hildesheim's *Book of the Three Kings*. According to the author of *Mandeville's Travels*, Prester John ruled over seventy-two kings, his land abounded in precious stones and other marvels, and 'this emperor Prester John is Christian, and a great part of his country also. But yet, they have not all the articles of the faith as we have. They believe well in the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost. And they be full devout and right true with one another'.[25] John of Hildesheim similarly stressed the familiarity of Christianity in the Prester's land. In ecclesiastical organization it was comparable: 'The Indians from the realms of Prester John are good Christians, and have the patriarch Thomas, whom they obey as we obey the pope, and they obey Prester John as we obey emperors and kings'. It was linked to Christianity's origins, here via the Prester's residence 'where the three magi died'. Even its divergent practices, such as branding (by now a regular feature in Latin portraits of Ethiopian Orthodoxy), were described without criticism as done 'with a fervent blessing … which they do as a sign of the Holy Spirit that descended unto the disciples'.[26] Indeed, John made a notable change in the Prester's Christian identity: instead of a Nestorian Christian himself, as in Otto of Freising's work, he was now an indefatigable defender of the true faith against those 'terrible heretics', the Nestorians.

These two popular works in turn affected subsequent Latin literature on the Holy Land, the genre in which Prester John's identification with the *nəguś* had been born. Ludolph of Sudheim, who traveled to the Holy Land in the later 1330s but whose text, as it has come down to us, was composed some decades later, clearly drew from the *Book of the Three Kings*, for his work cites some data found only there.[27] Regarding the Indians' (i.e. Ethiopians') Christian rites, for instance, he echoes John of Hildesheim: 'they behave almost like the Latins, but they obey not the pope but their own patriarch and

[24] Niccolò da Poggibonsi, *Libro d'oltramare*, ed. A. Bacchi della Lega (Bologna, 1881), pp. 209–11, cited in Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina,* I, 132–3.

[25] *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville*, ed. D. Price (New York, 1900), pp. 178–80, quotation at p. 179.

[26] Translated from the Latin text in *The Three Kings of Cologne. An Early English Translation of the* Historia trium regum *of John of Hildesheim … together with the Latin Text*, ed. and trans. C. Horstmann (London, 1886), p. 279.

[27] P. Kaplan, *The Rise of the Black Magus in Western Art* (Ann Arbor, 1985), p. 65

bishops; and when they ordain presbyters, they brand them on the forehead with a hot iron in the shape of a cross'. To this borrowed data Ludolph added information he had gleaned from firsthand experience, for instance that 'their monks follow the Rules of Anthony and Macarius, and wear black cloaks and hoods like [Latin] lords', here accurately citing Ethiopian monastic tradition and clothing (the Ethiopian *barnos*). Finally, he mentioned the sultan's efforts to prevent contact between Latin Christians and the Prester, thus echoing both earlier accounts of Ethiopia and John of Hildesheim's claims for the Prester's India.[28] In the 1380s, a pair of Florentine pilgrims, Simone Sigoli and Giorgio di Messer Guccio, echoed these themes again. Simone reiterated Jacopo of Verona's claims for the Prester, such as his power to destroy Egypt by controlling the Nile and the Egyptian sultan's fear of him; Giorgio, speaking of the 'Indians' he observed in Cairo, noted that they baptized with fire, and 'although our church does not approve them as good and true Christians, nevertheless, according to what we have heard and seen, they are devout men of great abstinence and observance, and great officiants'.[29]

The fourteenth century thus witnessed a key shift in Latin conceptions of Ethiopian Orthodox Christians. While many of the above writers acknowledged the differences of Ethiopian Orthodoxy, none described them as heretics. The Ethiopians were instead 'almost like the Latins', with a similar ecclesiastical structure and monastic organization, and in their religious practice 'fervent' and 'devout'. This shift was clearly tied to a perception of Ethiopia's military power and utility for crusade, though that perception in itself, when first expressed, was not sufficient to shake off the label of heretic. The identification of the *nəgusś* as Prester John seems to have been an important catalyst to change, perhaps in lending Ethiopia an aura of familiarity (for the Prester had been 'known' in Latin Christendom for centuries) and the basis for a more idealized image. One could also say, however, that the *nəgusś*'s new identity as the Prester was itself spurred by a desire to familiarize and idealize Ethiopia, to make it not only a useful but a religiously acceptable ally.

The Fifteenth Century: A Shift in Policy

How this perceptual shift affected Latin policy toward Ethiopia became clear only in the fifteenth century. After John XXII, whose dispatch of missionaries and papal missives had yielded no result, papal outreach to Ethiopia stalled. It was the Ethiopians who solved the evident difficulties of communication by traveling to the West themselves, both as formal ambassadors and as pilgrims. The response of Latin secular powers, though not central to our

[28] The Latin text of Ludolph's *De itinere Terre sancte*, with useful analysis, is in Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 147–53.

[29] Both texts are cited in Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 170–1.

subject, well illustrates the general tenor of the Ethiopians' fifteenth-century reception. Reaction to the embassies sent by *nəguś* Dawit II to Venice in 1402, and by his successor Yəṣḥaq to Alfonso of Aragon in 1427, illustrate that the Ethiopian ruler was understood to be Prester John, to possess great wealth, and to be a critical military ally in the east, whom Alfonso in particular sought to cultivate via a double marriage alliance between their royal families.[30] Though neither the Venetian nor the Aragonese documents reflect on Ethiopians' faith, it appears that the Prester's reputation for exemplary piety, too, affected Latin opinion. Candido of Gagliano, a sacristan of the cathedral chapter of Aquileia, met three Ethiopians in Rome in 1404, where they were being hosted by Cardinal Antonio Gaetani in his Roman *palazzo*, all expenses paid. Judging them 'good Christians', he noted that regarding 'the catholic faith that they observe there [and] the celebration of the divine offices … their accounts agree in everything with what is narrated in the *Book of the Three Kings*'.[31]

Official Latin Church policy followed suit. The papacy, too, now took a new tack in its approach to Ethiopia, more in line with the 'gifts, sweet words, and mutual greetings' once proposed by Sanudo for dealings with the Tartars. Eugenius IV, who convened the ecumenical council of Ferrara-Florence in 1437, was the first pope to extend an invitation to Ethiopian Orthodox representatives, and sent a trusted envoy in 1439 to fetch them.[32] The tone of the council's proceedings was, naturally, not that of conversion of heretics but rather negotiation among fellow Christian communities. Indeed, the very presence of non-Latin delegates was a victory for the pope, for it affirmed his international recognition as true head of the Latin Church against the rival claims of the conciliar movement, then meeting at its own council in Basel. When the Ethiopian delegates arrived in 1441, therefore, Eugenius's first act was to send them on a guided tour of Rome's holy places, and eventually to have the visit immortalized on new bronze doors commissioned for St Peter's basilica itself.[33] The next step was to discuss religious union. Though

30 These embassies have been reviewed many times. See C. Conti Rossini, 'Un codice illustrato eritreo del secolo XV', *Africa italiana* 1 (1927), 83–97 (pp. 86–8); Lefevre, 'Rifessi etiopici', pp. 379–81; C. Marinescu, *La politique orientale d'Alfonse d'Aragon, roi de Naples (1416–1458)* (Barcelona, 1994), pp. 18–23; and the recent discussion, with further bibliography, in M. Salvadore, *The African Prester John and the Birth of Ethiopian–European Relations, 1402–1555* (London, 2017), pp. 24–6, 39–44.

31 V. Lazzarini, 'Un'ambasciata etiopica in Italia nel 1404', *Atti del Reale Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti* 83 (1923–24), 839–47; K. Lowe, 'Representing Africa: Ambassadors and Princes from Christian Africa to Renaissance Italy and Portugal, 1402–1608', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6th s. 17 (2007), 101–28 (pp. 101–5).

32 For a recent analysis of this meeting, with relevant bibliography, see S. Kelly, 'Biondo Flavio on Ethiopia: Processes of Knowledge Production in the Renaissance', in *Routledge History of the Renaissance*, ed. W. Caferro (New York, 2017), pp. 167–82.

33 S. Tedeschi, 'Etiopi e Copti al Concilio di Firenze', *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 21 (1989), 380–407 (pp. 396–7).

the Ethiopian delegates (who had been fetched from Jerusalem, not Ethiopia) made clear that they had no mandate to act on their ruler's behalf, they were nonetheless interviewed by a papal commission headed by three cardinals. The cardinals seem to have been among those who remained suspicious about Ethiopian Orthodoxy. Accounts of the interview do not record what they made of the delegates' openly acknowledged non-Latin practices, but on the issue of monophysite belief they pressed the delegates repeatedly, being unconvinced of their stated acceptance of Christ's two natures and even intimating that they lied.[34] Biondo Flavio, however, a noted humanist who, as papal secretary, attended and recorded the interview, stressed rather the Ethiopians' proximity to Latin norms. He conceded that circumcision was an 'abuse', but he also noted the Ethiopians' recognition of the same biblical books, their similar Christian rites, even their superiority to Latin practice regarding their strict observance of monogamy.[35]

Moreover, for both Biondo and the cardinals, and certainly for Eugenius himself, ecumenical union was only one of the council's aims. The other, for which religious union was to pave the way, was pan-Christian military alliance, now more pressing than ever as the Ottomans advanced into Byzantine territory. On this point Ethiopia's long-touted military utility and association with Prester John clearly affected the papal curia's approach as it had those of secular rulers. The cardinals questioned the delegates closely on the power, territory, and army of 'Prester John'; in the final moments of the interview they asked the delegates directly if their ruler would, at the pope's command, use his forces to oust the Muslims from the Holy Land. On these questions the delegates, though objecting to the title 'Prester John' and giving their ruler's proper name, Zär'a Ya'əqob (1434–64), offered answers that pleased Biondo and the cardinals alike.[36]

After the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453, the popes seem to have considered military alliance more pressing even than religious union, and therefore adopted a yet more conciliatory approach to the Ethiopians.

34 Kelly, 'Biondo Flavio on Ethiopia', pp. 174–5.

35 Ibid., p. 175. The relevant passage is found in *Scritti inediti e rari di Biondo Flavio*, ed. B. Nogara (Rome, 1927), pp. 25–6. Interestingly, Vittorio Peri observes a similar change in Latin attitude and policy toward Greek Orthodox Christians resulting from the Council of Florence and lasting (albeit not uniformly, and with difference of opinion among Latin authorities themselves) until and in some cases beyond the conclusion of the Council of Trent. Peri credits the change to the Greeks' formal acceptance of union at the Council of Florence. The parallels with the Ethiopians, who did not sign the bull of union, may suggest the influence of other factors common to both Greek Orthodox and Ethiopian Orthodox. V. Peri, 'L'union della Chiesa Orientale con Roma. Il modern regime canonico occidentale nel suo sviluppo storico', *Aevum* 5 (1984), 439–98, esp. pp. 449, 452, and for examples of the more accommodating attitude post-Florence, 457, 461–2, 464.

36 *Scritti inediti*, ed. Nogara, pp. 23 (size of realm, military force), 26–7 (assurance of Ethiopian willingness to join in crusade).

In March 1454, Pope Nicholas V conceded privileges (renewed the following year by Nicholas's successor Calixtus III) to the layman Ludovico of Bologna, then in Jerusalem, to travel to Ethiopia and India. His mission can be deduced from the remit Ludovico was given three years later: to identify local religious leaders in the Caucasus around whom Christian communities could be rallied, and create a network of alliances, including with Ethiopia, to confront the Ottomans in the east.[37] In between Ludovico's first and second missions, Calixtus sought to reach the Ethiopian *nəgúś* via other messengers, but with the same purpose. Leaving the question of religious difference aside, Calixtus opened his 1456 letter to the *nəgúś* by offering his many blessings to the emperor, his wife, his family, and his people, and recalling the friendship initiated between Ethiopia and Latin Christendom by his predecessor Eugenius IV. Then he simply asked for his help. 'We, trusting in God … seek to call your Serenity to this holy work, for if your sublime power will join with our armies, and will aid the Church of God with your deeds, we will have the strength to rout the impious Turk, and will have no less hope to be able to redeem Jerusalem, a land consecrated by the spilt blood of our savior Jesus Christ, from the impiety of the infidel. God indeed has wished to place under your sublime imperium not only great armies but the river Nile, whose flooding nourishes the land of the enemy, which you can prevent of your own volition'.[38] To sweeten the request, Calixtus sent, along with his letter, the gift of four apostolic relics. The difference in tone compared to John XXII's letter is notable. No longer urging the Ethiopians to return like errant sheep to the Roman fold, the pope now beseeched Ethiopian aid, stressing the Christian brotherhood obtaining between Ethiopia and Latin Christendom and couching their potential alliance as a sacred mission on behalf of God.

1480–1515: Cleavage between Papal and Mendicant Views

The events surrounding an Ethiopian embassy that reached Pope Sixtus IV in 1481 seem to mark the beginning of a fissure in Latin attitudes to Ethiopian Orthodoxy. The embassy's mission to the pope was almost certainly unofficial, even fraudulent. According to witnesses in Egypt, the envoys had first gone to Cairo on what was doubtless their official mission: to request a new Egyptian metropolitan for Ethiopia from the Coptic patriarch, as had been established practice in the Ethiopian Church for centuries.[39] From there the envoys went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, as was also traditional for such embassies. As a result of conversations with Latin Christians there, to which I will return

[37] P. Evangelisti, 'Ludovico da Bologna', in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, vol. 66 (Rome, 2006), pp. 403–6 (p. 403).
[38] Raineri, *Lettere*, pp. 35–6.
[39] Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 282–3.

below, they ended up traveling to Rome, where they announced to the pope a startling mandate. They were, they said, to communicate the desire of their new ruler (Ǝskəndər, 1478–94) to submit to the pope's authority and join the Ethiopian Church to Rome; to request that a papal delegate travel to Ethiopia to crown the new *nəguś*; and to ask for missionaries who would instruct the Ethiopians in the true, Latin faith.[40]

Such news would have fulfilled the wildest hopes of even a John XXII. Yet Sixtus IV's response was markedly moderate. He hosted the envoys in a manner befitting imperial ambassadors for three months, and sent them home with gifts for their ruler.[41] He also observed, according to witnesses then at the papal court, that 'the undertaking, if successful, would bring undoubted security, since the aforesaid lord [of Ethiopia] was very powerful and able to combat the Turks'.[42] He refused, however, to send a papal representative to Ethiopia, requesting instead, and doubtless to guarantee the truth of the envoys' report, that the *nəguś* send his paternal uncle to the papal court. Nor did Sixtus send the promised twelve friars to instruct Ethiopians in the true faith.[43] In short, rather than resuming the missionizing policy of his predecessors in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, even when assured by Ethiopians it would be welcome, he hewed to the diplomatic strategy and military priorities of the fifteenth-century popes.

What is more, sometime during the next fifteen years the popes took their fifteenth-century policy of 'gifts, sweet words, and mutual greetings' to a new level by according Ethiopians in Rome a special privilege: use of the small church of Santo Stefano Maggiore (soon to be known as Santo Stefano degli Abissini), located immediately behind the apse of St Peter's, as a pilgrim hostel. Throughout the fifteenth century the popes had cast a benevolent eye on the many Ethiopian pilgrims who made their way to Rome, supplying them with certificates of pilgrimage or letters conceding indulgences to any who helped them on their return voyage.[44] In 1482, Sixtus IV had his chamberlain pay two hundred gold florins to the 'Indians living here', and an earlier cameral entry makes clear that he had disbursed other funds to them previously.[45] Provision of lodging may have seemed a logical next step. Sixtus's renovations of the Santo Stefano complex, which had long since been abandoned as a residence and fallen into disrepair, may have been intended to render it usable again, though whether he did so specifically with the

40 These requests are reflected in Sixtus IV's reply, oddly addressed to 'Prester John, king of India': Raineri, *Lettere*, pp. 42–4.

41 Lefevre, 'Riflessi etiopici', p. 431.

42 From a Milanese ambassador's report, cited in P. Ghinzoni, 'Un'ambasciata del Prete Gianni a Roma nel 1481', *Archivio storico lombardo* 2nd s. 6 (1889), 145–54 (pp. 152–3).

43 Raineri, *Lettere,* p. 43; Lefevre, 'Riflessi etiopici', p. 410.

44 R. Lefevre, 'Documenti pontifici sui rapport con l'Etiopia nei secoli XV e XVI', *Rassegna di studi etiopici* 5 (1946), 17–41 (pp. 21–2, 25–7).

45 Lefevre, 'Documenti', p. 25, items xv and xvi.

Ethiopians in mind is unknown. Our first notice of Ethiopians' presence in the church dates to 1497, in the pontificate of Alexander VI, when the Chapter of St Peter's, which administered this church, was unable to perform its usual celebration of St Stephen's Day (26 December) at Santo Stefano because the Ethiopians were 'violating' it.[46] No formal concession of the church to the Ethiopians has yet been found in the archives, and probably none was ever issued. But in light of the initial surprise and opposition of the canons of St Peter's, it was very likely the papacy that first proposed the church's use by Ethiopians and then negotiated with the canons about their presence. The papacy certainly remained the community's patron thereafter.

It is worth noting that until the later sixteenth century, Santo Stefano was the only pilgrim hostel in Rome for non-Latin Christians, and the only one created through papal largesse.[47] What is more, in providing the Ethiopians with a church (and not just a residence), the papacy surely meant to offer them a space to conduct their worship. And that worship certainly followed the Ethiopian Orthodox rite: conducted in the Ethiopian liturgical language (Gəʼəz), following the Ethiopian calendar, and using manuscripts brought by the pilgrims to Rome.[48] We are thus presented with the startling image of a community whose technically 'heretical' practice was nurtured, literally in the shadow of St Peter's, by the popes themselves.

What prompted the popes to such an action? Given the freedom of worship the Ethiopians enjoyed, it must be conceded that if the goal were to convert them, it was pursued in the most subtle of ways. Likely the more pressing need was for a steady supply of diplomatic go-betweens. As late as 1497, when we first perceive the Ethiopians at Santo Stefano, no Latin embassy sent by a secular ruler or pope had yet succeeded in reaching Ethiopia and returning to convey the Ethiopian response. Ethiopian pilgrims, by contrast, clearly had fewer difficulties crossing Muslim lands to Europe. Already in 1456, Pope Calixtus III used such pilgrims to carry his letter to Ethiopia. He

46 D. V. Proverbio, 'Santo Stefano degli Abissini: una breve rivisitazione', *Parola del passato* 66 (2011), 50–68 (pp. 55–6); I. Delsere and O. Raineri, *Chiesa di S. Stefano dei Mori: vicende edilizie e personaggi* (Vatican City, 2015), pp. 26–7, 30.

47 The foundation of colleges in Rome for Armenian, Greek Orthodox, and Maronite Christians dates to the pontificate of Gregory XIII (1572–85): R. Lefevre, 'L'Abissinia nella politica orientale di Gregorio XIII: saggio sui rapporti tra Roma e l'Etiopia nel secolo XVI', *Gli annali dell'Africa italiana* 1 (1938), 1171–1209 (p. 1196).

48 Though the Santo Stefano library has not yet been fully reconstructed, Grébaut and Tisserant have identified sixty-six Gəʼəz manuscripts now in the Vatican as having belonged to Santo Stefano before 1628; all are liturgical or devotional in nature and follow the Ethiopian calendar. S. Grébaut and E. Tisserant, *Codices aethiopici vaticani et borgiani*, 2 vols. (Vatican City, 1935–36), II, 19–20. Johannes Potken observed an Ethiopian Orthodox service in 1511 (see below, nn. 54–5), and Paolo Giovio wrote decades later that the Ethiopians 'have their own church … behind Saint Peter's, where they worship according to their custom': P. Giovio, *Historiae sui temporis tomus primus* (Florence, 1550), p. 1077.

described his envoys as 'our beloved sons in Christ, Paul the priest and the deacon Theodore of the Order of St Anthony, Ethiopians'; their description as the pope's own 'sons' suggests they had come to Europe in a private capacity, as pilgrims, and not as envoys of the *nəguś*.[49]

There is some cause to believe that a second reason to establish an Ethiopian Orthodox community in Rome had by now occurred to the popes: not diplomatic, but intellectual. As we have seen, even the earliest Latin commentators on the Ethiopian Orthodox Church knew that it had been founded in antiquity, though they chose to stress its later, post-Chalcedonian descent into error. As the humanist inquiry into antiquity grew in stature and scope over the course of the fifteenth century, some shifted their focus to the value of those ancient origins themselves. Already in the 1440s, Biondo Flavio had noted in his account of the Council of Florence the Ethiopian delegates' claim to possess 'the books of Solomon, of which they said they had more than we. Indeed they said they had all the books written by Solomon'.[50] A decade later, in 1459, the duke of Milan had pressed a visiting Ethiopian to procure these long-lost books of Solomonic wisdom for him.[51] Might the Ethiopians, long 'isolated' (as Latin Christians perceived it) from the West, possess authentic Christian knowledge lost to the Latin tradition, and be worth cultivating for that reason? By the 1480s, such influential scholars as the Jewish convert Guglielmo Moncada and the famed humanist Pico della Mirandola were proposing that even non-Christian traditions of antiquity (Jewish, Egyptian, ancient Chaldean) conformed in their essentials with Christian truth and thus merited study. In that context the Ethiopian tradition, also ancient but at least already Christian, might well have seemed less controversial. It is worth observing that, if the Ethiopians were first installed at Santo Stefano in or shortly before 1497, the pope responsible for their installation would have been Alexander VI (1492–1513), a pontiff famously open even to Pico's radical ideas regarding pagan traditions' essential congruity with Christian truth.[52]

While humanism's role in establishing Santo Stefano remains conjectural, there is no doubt that its Ethiopian denizens promoted such intellectual interests, and in the process nurtured Latin notions of Ethiopian Orthodoxy's proximity to the early Church. Between 1508 and 1511, a group of men in papal service began to assert both that the sacred language of Ethiopia was Chaldean – a very ancient language, believed by some to be the original language of mankind – and that Ethiopian Christianity preserved the customs

49 Raineri, *Lettere,* p. 41.

50 *Scritti inediti*, ed. Nogara, p. 25. On Biondo's view of Ethiopia as preserving ancient traditions see Kelly, 'Biondo Flavio on Ethiopia', pp. 175–7.

51 Ghinzoni, 'Un'ambasciata', p. 149.

52 F. Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (London, 1964), pp. 113–16.

of the earliest, apostolic Church.[53] One of these men was the apostolic scriptor Johannes Potken. In 1511 he attended an Ethiopian liturgical service and, recognizing the names of Mary and other saints despite his ignorance of the language, resolved to study Gəʿəz with the monks. Two years later he and his Ethiopian tutor, Tomas Wälda Samuʿel, published the first printed Gəʿəz text, a psalter. In this work Potken claimed that the Ethiopians 'all use this Chaldean language for their sacred rites, and they have used it since the time of the birth of the Christian faith, as those [Ethiopians] who have come to us on pilgrimage and out of devotion affirm'.[54] Indeed, Potken claimed that the monks of Santo Stefano 'believe … with a constancy from which they could not be shaken by me, that Abraham and Heber and their ancestors as far back as their first parents used this Chaldean language'.[55] A second member of this circle was Johannes's fellow apostolic scriptor Giovanni Battista Brocchi, who had been tasked with accompanying and translating for the 1481 Ethiopian embassy to Rome. Citing his firsthand experience with Ethiopians, a third colleague in papal service, the master of ceremonies Paride de' Grassi, averred not only that the Ethiopians' sacred language was Chaldean, but that their sacred rites were redolent of the early Church. The Ethiopian ruler and his people, he wrote, 'are baptized and also circumcised, for they say that Christ and His apostles were circumcised and baptized in this way'. As for their other practices, 'they perform the rest of their Masses and sacrifices partly following their own rite, that is, one redolent of the early church, partly following one like our own'. De' Grassi thus followed the long philo-Ethiopian tradition of claiming much similarity between the Ethiopian and Latin rites. Where those rites differed, however, he saw in Ethiopian practice not error, but fidelity to apostolic example. He stressed this fidelity again in discussing their celebration of saints' days with fasts and vigils. Though this was presumably not much different from Latin practice, de' Grassi described it as a practice 'which the ancient and primitive church observed'.[56]

Even as such ideas were circulating at the papal court, Latin Christians' long-held desire for military alliance with Ethiopia finally seemed on the cusp of fulfilment. From the later fifteenth century, the Latin rulers who had most persistently pursued this alliance were the Portuguese, who sought to reach the Prester both by the traditional eastern route and via the West African coast. By 1509 several Portuguese envoys had reached the Ethiopian royal court and gained from the queen regent, Ǝleni, exactly the offer that

53 S. Kelly, 'The Curious Case of Ethiopic Chaldean: Fraud, Philology, and Cultural (Mis) Understanding in European Conceptions of Ethiopia', *Renaissance Quarterly* 68 (2015), 1227–64 (pp. 1235–40, 1251–3).

54 *Psalterium aethiopicum*, ed. J. Potken and Tomas Wäldä Samuʿel (Rome, 1513), fol. [1v].

55 Ibid., fol. 101r.

56 P. Stenzig, *Botschafterzeremoniell am Papsthof der Renaissance*: *Der* Tractatus de oratoribus *des Paris de Grassi, Edition und Kommentar*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt, 2013), I, 237, 239.

Latin Christians had hoped for since the early fourteenth century. Observing that 'when we mobilize our army we become powerful, for God helps us to defeat those who oppose our holy religion', she promised that 'we shall send our army to wait for them [the Moors] … so that you may fulfil the wish of your heart, [we] will chase and wipe out these infidel Muslims from the face of the earth (we are ready to cooperate)'.[57] When Ǝleni's chosen envoy reached Portugal in 1514, King Manuel received him with 'great honors and courtesy … thanking God for being blessed … with letters and ambassadors from such a powerful Christian king as the king of the Abyssinians', and made him a knight of the Order of Christ before sending him back to Ethiopia.[58] It seems that Manuel, as a result of this happy embassy, convinced himself that Ethiopian Orthodoxy was in fact essentially congruent with Latin Christianity, with the exception of circumcision, and communicated this view to the pope.[59] In response, Pope Leo X wrote in 1515 to the young *nəguś*, Ləbnä Dəngəl (1508–40), that if he would only abandon circumcision their two Churches could be united, and the Ethiopian army could be joined to that of the Portuguese and other Christian kings to battle the infidel and recover the Holy Land.[60]

If we date the end of the Middle Ages to the posting of Luther's Ninety-Five Theses in 1517, the era's last two decades emerge as an apogee of medieval papal openness toward Ethiopian Orthodoxy and its adherents. Ethiopia's alliance in a joint Christian attack on Muslims, first proposed two centuries earlier and pursued by popes and princes for the previous ninety years, had at last been confirmed by the Ethiopian rulers in their own words. The path to ecumenical union now appeared relatively clear as well, as the papacy convinced itself that Ethiopian Orthodoxy was already in substantial conformity to Latin norms. Men in papal employ were touting the Ethiopian Church as a vestige of that early Christian practice admired by humanists and reformers alike, and that Church's denizens were hosted in the very capital of Latin Christianity, performing their own rites and educating interested Latin scholars in their language and sacred texts.

It is time now, however, to return to the events surrounding the Ethiopian embassy of 1481, and follow the thread of an alternative view that emerged in that context. The Ethiopian envoys, it will be remembered, undertook their traditional pilgrimage to Jerusalem after leaving Cairo. There they fell into conversation with the Franciscan prior of Mount Sion, Giovanni Tomacelli,

57 Sergew Hable Selassie, 'The Letters of Queen Eleni and Libne Dingil to John, King of Portugal', in *IV Congresso internazionale di studi etiopici, 10–15 aprile 1972*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1974), I, 547–66 (citing here from the English translation at p. 557).

58 Salvadore, *The African Prester John*, pp. 113, 115.

59 Leo X specified that his information on this point came from King Manuel: Raineri, *Lettere*, p. 46.

60 Raineri, *Lettere*, pp. 46–7.

and apparently told him (or he understood them to have said) that they were on their way to Greece (presumably to Constantinople) to request a Greek Orthodox delegate to crown their young king. Tomacelli, protesting that the pope was the true universal head of the Christian Church, urged them to betake themselves instead to Rome.[61] Having persuaded them, Tomacelli provided, as a guide, an Italian layman with experience of the papal court who happened then to be in Jerusalem: Giovanni Battista Brocchi. The envoys, when they duly arrived in Rome, spoke no European language. Their message was thus conveyed to the pope by an explanatory letter Tomacelli himself had provided, and by Brocchi, in the role of translator.[62] It is highly unlikely, however, that Brocchi had learned Gəʼəz or any Ethiopian vernacular during his brief acquaintance with this embassy. At best he had picked up some Arabic in the Holy Land, as Ethiopian pilgrims often did too, and they communicated in some fashion through this intermediate language. At worst Brocchi's 'translations' were invented whole cloth. In short, the startling news conveyed by these envoys – of the *nəguś*'s desire to remold his Church in the Latin image, welcome missionaries to convert his people, and be crowned by a papal representative – very likely reflected the ideas and plans for Ethiopia of Tomacelli himself. Indeed we can be sure that Tomacelli's wish was precisely to convert the Ethiopians, for already in 1480, and thus before he met the Ethiopian envoys in Jerusalem, he had dispatched two friars to travel to Ethiopia and work for its conversion.[63]

Tomacelli might be considered simply an outlier in a Latin policy still dominated by the more diplomatic and conciliatory approach pursued by the popes, but he was not alone. His missionary zeal, which he realized in concrete action, was shared by other friars at Mount Sion. The German Franciscan Paul Walther, who was in Jerusalem in 1482–83, heard tell of the embassy to Sixtus IV and, believing that it had effected Ethiopia's return to the Latin fold, celebrated both God's plan to magnify his Church by means of Ethiopia's conversion, and the role of the Franciscans in it.[64] Francesco Suriano, another Franciscan who spent the years 1481–84 at Mount Sion, certainly believed that eastern Christians were heretics who should be brought into the Roman fold, and that the mission of the friars in the Holy

61 So reported the Franciscan Paul Walther, who heard of the events upon his arrival in Jerusalem the following year: *Fratris Pauli Waltheri Guglingensis Itinerarium in Terram Sanctam et ad Sanctam Catharinam*, ed. M. Sollweck (Tübingen, 1892), pp. 39–40. See also Lefevre, 'Riflessi etiopici', pp. 408–9.

62 In his reply Sixtus IV also spoke of a letter the envoys carried from their ruler (Raineri, *Lettere*, p. 43), but no such letter is found in the papal archives, though earlier and later Gəʼəz missives are preserved. If the envoys produced a Gəʼəz letter of some kind, it is doubtful anyone at the papal court could have deciphered it.

63 So reported another Franciscan friar, Francesco Suriano, then in the Holy Land: Suriano, *Trattato di Terra santa e dell'oriente*, ed. G. Golubovich (Milan, 1900), pp. 79–80.

64 *Itinerarium*, ed. Sollweck, pp. 40–2.

Land was precisely to convert them.[65] Thus, although he acknowledged that Ethiopians 'are more fervent in the Christian faith than any other nation', he still portrayed them as 'terrible heretics, adhering to the Jacobites, who follow the heresy of Jacob patriarch of Alexandria … [and who] were reproved and condemned at the Council of Chalcedon'.[66] He also applauded Tomacelli's decision to send missionaries to Ethiopia 'to declare to them their errors, which they retain more out of ignorance than malice, and instruct them in the catholic faith'.[67] For the German Dominican Felix Faber, too, who visited the Holy Land twice in the early 1480s, the Ethiopians lived in great austerity, poverty, and piety, but 'nevertheless they were infected by pernicious errors, and are horrible heretics to the Holy Church'.[68]

To my knowledge, these friars were the first Latin Christians since the early fourteenth century to label Ethiopian Orthodox unequivocally as heretics. Their views may be considered a second expression of the reform movement that gained force in the Latin Church in the later fifteenth century. Where humanist clergy sought to explore the ancient sources illuminating the nature of the primitive Church and to consider the congruities between different Christian (and even non-Christian) religious traditions, others stressed the elimination of corruption and error, prioritizing purgation and the vigilant defense of orthodoxy. The historical significance of Tomacelli and his mendicant colleagues in the Holy Land lies less in their short-term effect on Latin Church policy toward Ethiopia than in signaling a trend that, after Luther, would gain ever more adherents among Catholic clergy and eventually hold sway with the popes themselves.

The clash between competing visions of Ethiopian Orthodox in the early modern period lies beyond our present scope. Looking back over the late medieval period, we may observe that a dominant and papally approved Latin position, which at first perceived Ethiopians as heretics to be converted, shifted over time to perceive them as Christian brethren to be cultivated. That perception was certainly not the product of a tolerantly multicultural outlook. For Latin Christians, the only true faith remained their own. If popes, princes, and clerical writers chose to view Ethiopian Orthodoxy as relatively proximate to the Latin Church and espoused an accommodating approach to its adherents, they did so in pursuit of their own geopolitical needs and their own intellectual interests. When those needs and interests shifted, approaches to Ethiopian Orthodox shifted accordingly.

65 Suriano, *Trattato*, pp. 71–9 (descriptions of heretical eastern Christian 'nations'), 79 (friars of Mount Sion as the 'shield of faith' established to lead these heretics back to the true faith).

66 Ibid., pp. 76–7.

67 Ibid., p. 80.

68 Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, I, 313.

11

‘By them in reality I meant the Jews’: Medieval Heretics in the Work and Life of Renate Riemeck (1920–2003)

Jörg Feuchter

Medievalists outside of Germany may be forgiven if they have never heard of the historian, publicist, and political activist Renate Riemeck. Only among those interested in the so-called Cryptoflagellants does her name retain some resonance. The Cryptoflagellant movement was a somewhat obscure phenomenon in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Thuringia. Supposed members of this heretical group (if it really was a coherent group) were persecuted by inquisitors for practicing clandestine self-chastisement and adhering to millennial prophecies. Riemeck wrote her 1943 dissertation at the University of Jena about them but never published it.[1] Only half a century later did she publish a journal article presenting the results of that thesis, which has led to some (not notably enthusiastic) reception by scholars.[2] Moreover, the dissertation remained Riemeck’s only rigorous scholarly work, although she did pursue an academic career and become a professor of history at several teachers’ colleges in Germany. Throughout her life Riemeck published articles and books, mostly on the subjects of Church history and dissidence, but these works were more or less popularizing or intended for

1 R. Riemeck, ‘Spätmittelalterliche Ketzerbewegungen in Thüringen’, *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Thüringische Geschichte* 46 (1992), 95–132 (p. 95), notes that she submitted her dissertation on 3 February 1942. However, records from the Jena University Archives [hereafter JUA], M 609, 11, indicate 3 February 1943 as the date of submission, along with the fact that her *Erstgutachter* (main advisor), Erich Maschke, wrote his report (*Gutachten*) on 21 February 1943, and her *Zweitgutachter*, Willy Flach, wrote his on 7 March 1943. I am grateful to Margit Hartleb from JUA for her help with Riemeck’s documents.

2 See F. C. Kneupper, ‘Heretical Rhetoric in the Sermon of the Crypto-flagellant Conrad Schmidt’, in *Rhetorik in Mittelalter und Renaissance. Konzepte – Praxis – Diversität*, ed. G. Strack and J. Knödler (Munich, 2011), pp. 255–65; I. Würth, *Geißler in Thüringen: Die Entstehung einer spätmittelalterlichen Häresie* (Berlin, 2012), p. 20, which qualifies Riemeck’s work as rather ‘superficial’.

teaching use and are now forgotten, although at the time many of them sold extremely well.[3]

Why then write an essay about Renate Riemeck and medieval heretics? There are two parts to the answer. The first is that in the second half of the twentieth century, Riemeck was a well-known public figure in Germany due to her prolific output as a historian, her political activism in the pacifist and neutrality movement in West Germany around 1960, and her role as Ulrike Meinhof's foster-mother. Meinhof (1934–76) remains the nation's most famous terrorist.[4] In 1970, she co-founded the far-left underground organization Rote Armee Fraktion (Red Army Faction), also known as the Baader-Meinhof Gang, which was responsible for several dozen political murders in Germany up until the 1990s. Riemeck had lived with Meinhof's mother Ingeborg from 1941 until the latter's premature death in 1949, and then took over custody of the fourteen-year-old Ulrike. Young Meinhof made her first steps into political journalism and activism at her foster-mother's side, while Riemeck became a figurehead of public opposition to mainstream Cold War politics – that is, against nuclear armament and a strong western alignment – in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) around 1960. It is now mostly due to continued interest in her foster-child that Riemeck remains a person of some renown, even after her own death in 2003. Her role in raising Ulrike Meinhof and in influencing her politically has since come under close scrutiny. Consequently, authors from both left-leaning and conservative viewpoints have taken a very critical view of Riemeck and have unearthed some surprising facts about her.[5]

3 For a list of her monographs see R. Riemeck, *Ich bin ein Mensch für mich. Aus einem unbequemen Leben* (Stuttgart, 1992), p. 222, and N. Hannig, 'Riemeck, Renate', in *Historikerinnen. Eine biobibliographische Spurensuche im deutschen Sprachraum*, ed. H. Kümper, Schriftenreihe des Archivs der deutschen Frauenbewegung 14 (Kassel, 2009), pp. 177–9. There appears to be no exhaustive published bibliography of Riemeck's numerous essays and articles. On the high sales figures for some of Riemeck's books see D. Mellies, *Trojanische Pferde der DDR? Das neutralistisch-pazifistische Netzwerk der frühen Bundesrepublik und die Deutsche Volkszeitung, 1953–1973*, Europäische Hochschulschriften III, 1039 (Frankfurt a. M., 2007), p. 136.

4 See J. Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof. Die Biographie* (Berlin, 2007); K. Wesemann, *Ulrike Meinhof. Kommunistin, Journalistin, Terroristin – eine politische Biographie*, Extremismus und Demokratie 15 (Baden-Baden, 2007); also B. Röhl, *So macht Kommunismus Spaß. Ulrike Meinhof, Klaus Reiner Röhl und die Akte Konkret* (Frankfurt a. M., 2006). On the Red Army Faction as a whole, its other leading members, and especially their fraught and calamitous relationship with their parents' generation implicated in Nazism, see G. Koenen, *Vesper, Ensslin, Baader: Urszenen des deutschen Terrorismus* (Cologne, 2003).

5 Mainly Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, and Wesemann, *Ulrike Meinhof*. I have visited the JUA and Stasi Archives, but I do not claim to have made new discoveries there. I generally follow Ditfurth's and Wesemann's analysis of Riemeck's life, and will not cite every point where I do so, except to emphasize a difference, e.g. regarding the manuscript of Riemeck's dissertation, which both Wesemann and Ditfurth overlooked. Also, Ditfurth and Wesemann did not focus at all on the 'heresy/heretic' narrative in Riemeck's life and work that I develop here.

The second part of the answer is that Riemeck's work on late medieval heretics was an integral part of her life. This goes far beyond the simple fact that she returned to the subject repeatedly in her writings.[6] For Riemeck, pre-modern religious dissidents were not just an object of study but a central fixation, blurring the lines between her historiographical oeuvre, her political activism, and her later autobiographical accounts. She maintained no critical distance whatsoever from her subject of study. On the contrary, she deeply empathized with medieval heretics. She also directly compared the historian's fascination with pre-modern dissident groups to modern political concerns with minorities, and she regarded medieval heresies as prototypes for modern persecuted and opposition groups. In Riemeck's worldview – informed partly by Protestantism, partly by the philosophical and spiritual movement of anthroposophy, and partly by socialism – heretics were also agents of progress. And last but not least, Riemeck often depicted herself as a modern heretic, and an unjustly persecuted one at that.

It is fair to say that the figure of the heretic provided Riemeck with multiple ways to frame and extol her own role as a figure of political opposition and 'outsider' in West Germany. And sadly, it is also fair to say that in her autobiographical self-fashioning and self-adulation, Riemeck did not refrain from mixing truth with omissions, distortions, and plain untruths to present an image of herself as an 'eternal heretic', always standing on the side of history that at first might seem minoritarian, but ultimately would turn out to be righteous. Her case is worth studying because it allows historians of medieval heresy to reflect on how and why they go about their work. It is not a pleasant tale, but we would be well advised to examine it carefully in order to learn from it. This essay will consider how Riemeck's self-presentation as something like a modern heretic intertwined with her claims about wartime support for Jews. Adding to doubts that scholars have already begun to cast on this retrospective self-fashioning, here Riemeck's rediscovered doctoral dissertation will be used to refute her repeated claim that her Nazi-era study of medieval heretics had been intended as coded disapproval of the persecution of Jews.

A Modern Heretic

A startling example of just how much Riemeck connected the issues of medieval heresy, twentieth-century history, and her own autobiographical narrative is a statement she made in a 1989 interview with Alice Schwarzer,

6 E.g. in R. Riemeck, *Jan Hus – Reformation hundert Jahre vor Luther* (Frankfurt a. M., 1965); *Gottfried Arnolds Unpartheiische Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie*, selected and ed. R. Riemeck (Leipzig, 1975); R. Riemeck, *Verstoßen – verfemt – verbrannt: Zwölf Ketzerschicksale aus acht Jahrhunderten* (Stuttgart, 1986).

editor-in-chief of the pioneering German feminist magazine *Emma* and a self-confessed longtime admirer of Riemeck.[7] On that occasion, Riemeck talked about her life, including her youth under National Socialism, and (together with the adulatory Schwarzer) painted a vivid picture of herself at the time as an opponent of the Nazis who was aware of their terrible crimes. As part of that picture, she claimed that she was prompted to write her dissertation on heretics in the early 1940s by her recognition of the horrendous persecution of contemporary Jews in Germany: 'It was not at all by chance that I wrote my Ph.D. thesis on "heretics." By them in reality I meant the Jews.' This statement was so bold that *Emma* printed it at the top of the page, in slightly altered wording: 'I did my Ph.D. about heretics – yet by them I meant the Jews', with the words 'heretics' and 'Jews' literally in boldface.[8] We will analyze below just how brazenly Riemeck was skewing reality with that contention.

Riemeck not only equated modern persecuted minorities with medieval dissidents and maintained that she had done so from the beginning of her professional occupation with history during National Socialism, but, as already mentioned, she also liked to depict herself as a persecuted modern heretic. She did indeed face some degree of 'persecution' at the end of the 1950s, when she had become a figurehead for the movement against nuclear arms, for German neutrality between the Soviet and Western blocs, and for more openness toward the Communist regime in East Germany. West Germany had begun to rearm by establishing its own army and joining NATO in 1955, introducing compulsory military service in 1957, and even considering acquiring nuclear weapons.[9] The pacifist-neutrality movement that emerged in opposition to these developments led to the foundation of a new political party, the German Peace Union (Deutsche Friedensunion, or DFU for short). The DFU ran in the West German elections in 1961, and Riemeck eventually became one of its three leading candidates. As such, she even made the cover of Germany's top political magazine, *Der Spiegel*, in summer 1961.[10]

On one of the DFU's election posters, Riemeck's portrait was arranged against the backdrop of Albert Schweitzer's iconic mustached head, with the captions 'neutral', 'free of atomic weapons', and 'in the spirit of Albert Schweitzer'.[11] Schweitzer, the famous theologian, musician, medic ('jungle

7 A. Schwarzer, 'Wie war das in den 50ern? Ein Interview von Alice Schwarzer', *Emma* (September 1989), pp. 34–7.

8 'Ich habe ja auch nicht zufällig über "Ketzer" promoviert. Damit meinte ich eigentlich die Juden' vs. 'Ich habe über **Ketzer** promoviert – aber damit meinte ich die **Juden**', text and header of Schwarzer, 'Wie war', p. 35.

9 Very instructive on the rearmament debate is the biography of one of the main protagonists of the 'neutralist-pacifist network' (term from Mellies, *Trojanische Pferde*): H. Lindemann, *Gustav Heinemann. Ein Leben für die Demokratie* (Munich, 1986).

10 'Rot und Rosa', *Der Spiegel* (23 August 1961), pp. 20–9.

11 A photograph of the poster is printed in Schwarzer, 'Wie war', p. 34.

doctor' of Lambaréné), and recipient of the 1952 Nobel Peace Prize, supported the DFU, as did many prominent personalities both inside and outside West Germany. The party's political concerns were not illegitimate. However, although many members and supporters were not aware of it, or at least not fully aware, the DFU and the entire pacifist-neutrality movement had been seriously subverted by East German (German Democratic Republic, or GDR) government agencies and their secret agents in the FRG, and also depended heavily on financial support from the East.[12]

Riemeck in particular was considered a valuable asset by GDR agents because of her reputation as the author of many popular books, her official status as a professor, and not least her gender, but most importantly because she did not join in FRG mainstream policies of total rejection of the East German state. Indeed Riemeck did not shy away from traveling to the East and attending official ceremonies there.[13] Thus she was one of the very few alumni of the University of Jena (then in East Germany) who returned from West Germany for the four-hundredth anniversary of her famous alma mater in 1958. She even gave a speech.[14] The following year she also gave a lecture at the theology department of the University of Leipzig.[15] This was at a time when West German authorities denied the very existence of the other German state as a legal entity, and it was official policy that any nation recognizing the GDR would be sanctioned by the severance of diplomatic ties with West Germany. Some have asked whether Riemeck herself secretly collaborated with East German agencies.[16] No proof, however, has ever been found of any intentional collaboration by her with the infamous Department for State Security (Ministerium für Staatssicherheit, or Stasi for short) or other GDR secret agencies.[17]

The pacifist movement and DFU were met with enmity by a large portion of West German society, and Riemeck, like many of its leading figures,

12 Recounted in Mellies, *Trojanische Pferde*, and Röhl, *So macht*.

13 Mellies, *Trojanische Pferde*, pp. 136–9. Riemeck was not, however, wholly uncritical of Communist regimes and also criticized the Soviet Union for its nuclear armament, as both Mellies (ibid.) and Röhl (*So macht*, p. 378) note.

14 Riemeck, *Ich bin*, p. 172, claims that also, during that trip, she went to the GDR's feared secretary of justice, Hilde Benjamin, and personally arranged for the liberation of many Church employees who had been incarcerated on political grounds, among them a member of the Meinhof family. The statement seems highly dubious and would necessitate a critical examination in the archives.

15 Printed as R. Riemeck, 'Der Friede wird nicht geschenkt. Eine historische Betrachtung', *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik* (25 November 1959), pp. 959–67.

16 Röhl, *So macht*, p. 380, writes that Riemeck never answered her questions concerning this point (Röhl is Ulrike Meinhof's daughter and was close to Riemeck), but reports that at least one GDR secret agent told her that the whole DFU party was created by him and his colleagues, with the collaboration of Riemeck and others (p. 82).

17 Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, unearthed no proof. My own archival enquiries have also been negative.

faced political incrimination for 'Communist underground activity' and for 'teaching Marxism'.[18] As a professor, she belonged to a particularly vulnerable group. In Germany, tenured university faculty are usually civil servants, implying an obligation of loyalty to the state and especially a duty to political 'moderation'. The authorities considered Riemeck's activities in East Germany a violation of that obligation, and she soon faced disciplinary consequences. Although prominent international figures such as Schweitzer, Hermann Hesse, and Bertrand Russell interceded for her, she was eventually stripped of her license to administer teacher-certification examinations in 1960. This led to considerable student protests at the teachers' college where she was employed at the time.[19] Shortly thereafter, Riemeck resigned from her professorship.

Because of these events, she has often been considered an early victim of the occupational bans (*Berufsverbote*) for political extremism that were in practice in West Germany.[20] In fact, however, the special legal provision that allowed for someone to be banned from civil service because of political radicalism, known as the *Radikalenerlass* (the 'radicals' decree'), only came into effect much later, in 1972.[21] Despite losing the right to administer examinations, Riemeck was not legally forced to resign her tenure. Rather, her resignation from her professorship was a voluntary move, and questions remain as to why she took this step.[22] In her 1992 autobiography, Riemeck would explain it as stemming from her desire to be free and to avoid possible further disciplinary procedures against her, which would also have damaged the DFU electoral campaign. Yet Riemeck actually only became one of the leading candidates of the party after resigning her tenure. Thus she may

18 Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 153.

19 The Pädagogische Akademie Wuppertal. On the protests and the impression they made on young people at the time, see Schwarzer, 'Wie war', p. 34.

20 Schwarzer, 'Wie war', p. 34 ('erstes Opfer der Berufsverbote'). Similarly R. Böhm, 'Renate Riemeck (1920–2003) – eine Mitteleuropäerin. Zum fünfjährigen Todestag der Historikerin am 12. Mai 2003', *Der Europäer* 12 (September 2008), 13–16 (p. 14) ('im Grunde das erste Berufsverbot'). Röhl, *So macht*, pp. 379–80 also reports how Riemeck was generally seen as a victim of this practice.

21 For a detailed study of the prehistory of the occupational bans, see D. Rigoll, *Staatsschutz in Westdeutschland. Von der Entnazifizierung zur Extremistenabwehr* (Göttingen 2013), treatment of Riemeck's case at pp. 150–8.

22 Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 154, raises the possibility that Riemeck was blackmailed into resigning but does not indicate by whom or for what. Rigoll, *Staatsschutz*, pp. 157–8, suggests that Riemeck might have feared the authorities would reveal her homosexuality or membership in the Nazi Party (see below). Yet lesbianism, although certainly considered disreputable at the time, was not a criminal offence, and Riemeck never hid the fact that she preferred living with women. Also, given the fact that she continued to portray herself as an opponent of the Nazi regime in so many autobiographical reports (see below), it seems clear that she did not suspect the authorities knew about her Nazi Party membership.

simply have wanted to focus all her energy on her political career. Riemeck wrote in her autobiography that the disciplinary procedures against her made her think of inquisitorial procedures against heretics: 'I did not fear the trial, although it reminded me of inquisition trials. The "heretics" mostly were the better Christians, even if they were burned'.[23]

Riemeck's political career failed miserably, however, together with the whole DFU. On 13 August 1961, just a month before the September elections, the GDR government had erected the Berlin Wall, thus making the DFU's position on neutrality very unpopular. The party received less than 2 percent of the vote and so did not qualify for any seats in the West German parliament (only parties with at least 5 percent of the national vote are represented in the Bundestag). After the election, Riemeck quickly withdrew from the political arena. In her autobiography she attributed this withdrawal to severe health problems that befell her in summer 1961.[24] She was thus out of her university job and out of politics, but she continued to make a decent living as an author, editor, and publisher. In these capacities she could rely on a network of friends and supporters.[25] Only once did she make national headlines again, when she launched a public appeal to her foster-daughter-turned-terrorist to lay down arms in 1971.[26]

Despite her somewhat turbulent career, until the end of her life Riemeck remained a respected and well-liked figure among left-wing West German politicians, as well as anthroposophists, professors of pedagogy, ecumenical Church historians, and Christian activists on both sides of the Iron Curtain. She frequently traveled to 'Christian peace conferences' in Prague and other 'Eastern' cities that aimed to promote mutual understanding, and she received an honorary doctorate from a Budapest theological teaching institution. It is hardly necessary to state that her advocacy for pacifism and neutrality was not illegitimate per se. Yet it must also be recognized that Eastern Bloc authorities were very pleased that Riemeck and her colleagues worked to promote neutrality across central Europe without openly criticizing the political oppression in Soviet-dominated countries. Indeed, these meetings and collaborations were financed and staged by these countries'

23 Riemeck, *Ich bin*, p. 191.

24 Schwarzer, 'Wie war', p. 37. Riemeck, *Ich bin*, pp. 196–208, describes symptoms of severe paralysis but never clearly states the nature of her illness.

25 Mellies, *Trojanische Pferde*, p. 137; Röhl, *So macht*, pp. 379–80. At the beginning the 1980s, Riemeck even returned to academic teaching for a time. For three years she lectured at the University of Marburg on the history of pedagogy thanks to a network of friends and supporters at the Faculty of Educational Science. Recently they have edited her lecture manuscripts: R. Riemeck, *Klassiker der Pädagogik von Comenius bis Reichwein. Marburger Sommervorlesungen 1981/1982/1983, mit Quellentexten*, ed. H.-Ch. Berg et al. (Marburg, 2014).

26 Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, pp. 327–8.

regimes to showcase Eastern tolerance and to decry Western armament while diminishing the East's role in the arms race.[27]

Riemeck very much supported the concept of a non-aligned *Mitteleuropa* (central Europe), writing a book of that title in a decisively anti-Western and anti-democratic tone that reflected the influence of Rudolf Steiner, the founder of anthroposophy.[28] Since her youth Riemeck had been very influenced by this esoteric current of philosophical and religious thinking that was (and is) very strong in German-speaking countries. She had come into contact with it as early as the 1930s, when she repeatedly traveled to the anthroposophical center in Dornach (Switzerland), and anthroposophy remained a fixture throughout her life.[29] Significantly, in her accounts of this movement, Riemeck created the impression that anthroposophy was totally contrary to National Socialism and that its adherents were severely persecuted.[30] Yet the relationship between the anthroposophists, who engaged in their share of racist thinking, and the Nazi regime was actually far more complex.[31]

Riemeck's Self-Fashioning

We have seen that Riemeck gave up her professorship of her own volition. Yet this did not prevent her from styling herself as a modern heretic and victim of persecution because of the loss of her tenure. This self-fashioning is most palpable in her 1986 book *Verstoßen – verfemt – verbrannt: Zwölf Ketzerschicksale aus acht Jahrhunderten* (Repudiated – ostracized – burned: The fate of twelve heretics across eight centuries), a collection of portraits of (mostly) medieval religious dissidents. Riemeck began her introduction to the book with a very telling passage:

> Many already have reflected upon the heretics, have presented them in books, written essays and articles about them. To some, the heretics were

27 M. G. Goerner, 'Die Behandlung der Kirchenpolitik im Staatsapparat und in den Massenorganisationen', in *Die Kirchenpolitik von SED und Staatssicherheit. Eine Zwischenbilanz*, ed. C. Vollnhals (Berlin, 1997), pp. 139–58 (pp. 157–8).

28 R. Riemeck, *Mitteleuropa – Bilanz eines Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg, 1965). See the harshly critical review by E. Krippendorff, 'Nebel über Mitteleuropa', *Die Zeit* (25 February 1966). On Riemeck's idea of *Mitteleuropa* see also Böhm, 'Renate Riemeck'.

29 Riemeck, *Ich bin*, pp. 47–8, indicates that she had visited Dornach several times in the second half of the 1930s. These trips are also listed in her 1945 *Fragebogen* (see below).

30 Riemeck, *Ich bin*, pp. 47–8.

31 See H. Zander, 'Anthroposophische Rassentheorie: Der Geist auf dem Weg durch die Rassengeschichte', in *Völkische Religion und Krisen der Moderne. Entwürfe 'arteigener' Glaubenssysteme seit der Jahrhundertwende*, ed. S. Schnurbein and J. H. Ulbricht (Würzburg, 2001), pp. 292–341; idem, *Anthroposophie in Deutschland. Theosophische Weltanschauung und gesellschaftliche Praxis 1884–1945*, 2 vols. (Göttingen, 2007), and U. Werner, *Anthroposophen in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus (1933–1945)* (Munich, 1999).

> and still today are a nuisance. He, however, who is able to empathize and to engage with them has almost always been led to them by his own fate. One feels connected to them, if one has had to experience oneself what it meant to be repudiated and ostracized. Then one becomes attentive to the fate of heretics from the past and feels, through them, strengthened in one's own way of being, and also comforted. That is what happened to Gottfried Arnold.[32]

Although Riemeck continues to focus on Arnold (a seventeenth-century historian to whom we will return in a moment) following this passage, it is obvious that she had herself in mind when writing these words. Already in her preface to this book, she had expanded upon her reasons for choosing the twelve 'heretics' portrayed in the volume by confessing to her 'personal affinity' with them and then posing the question, 'What is it that lets a human being of the twentieth century enter into such a close connection with the heretics of the past?'[33] Riemeck answered this question by quoting approvingly another modern scholar's opinion that most heretics were pioneers of religious progress and were ahead of their time.[34]

Riemeck dedicated *Verstoßen* to Gottfried Arnold (1666–1714), the German pietist, historian of heresy, and himself the final 'heretic' in her collection of portraits. Arnold was a favorite subject of hers. In 1975 she had provided an edition of extracts from his best-known work of historiography, his *Impartial History of the Church and the Heretics*, first published in 1699.[35] Indeed Arnold was an ideal figure for Riemeck to identify with. Not only was he, like her, a historian of medieval heretics,[36] but he was also a theosophist and thus a kind of early anthroposophist.[37] Even more importantly he too had laid down his professorship out of disgust over academic hollowness and vainglory, a fact that Riemeck could not emphasize enough. It seems quite revealing, therefore, that Riemeck dedicated her book portraying heretics to him, but she also added another personal note. She declared that her reason for writing the book 'lay in childhood and youthful experiences, which had been gained in Germany's darkest times, during and before the Second World War. Persecuted Jews, emigrants, detained friends overshadowed one's own existence. That also gave the impulse for a first scholarly work, a dissertation in the field of late medieval heretical movements, and heretics became a

32 Riemeck, *Verstoßen*, p. 11.

33 Ibid., p. 8.

34 Riemeck quotes from W. Nigg, *Das Buch der Ketzer* (Zurich, 1949), without indication of page.

35 Riemeck, ed., *Gottfried Arnolds*.

36 On his position in the historiography of medieval dissidents see A. Borst, *Die Katharer* (1953; reprint Freiburg, 1991), p. 37.

37 Arnold had published a theosophical work entitled *Das Geheimnis der göttlichen Sophia* (Leipzig, 1700).

life-long subject'.[38] Riemeck continued, 'The first historians who concerned themselves with the outsiders of the Christian Church and judged them positively were, like Gottfried Arnold, people whom the Church and the world had disappointed, or even hurt. Being hurt is always a prerequisite for a certain spiritual affection toward heretics from all times'.[39]

In this remarkable passage Riemeck made Arnold her historical alter ego by hinting broadly that she herself had 'been hurt' because of her convictions, and thus that she could, like Arnold, deeply emphasize with pre-modern religious dissidents. She also claimed, as she would again in the 1989 interview quoted above, that her first interest in heretics had been directly spurred by her personal experience as a witness to Nazi persecution, resulting in her choice of dissertation topic. Thus here, in the opening pages of her 1986 book, Riemeck connects the two most critical periods of her life within her 'heretical' autobiographical narrative. Not only did she affiliate herself closely with heresy, but even more remarkably, she entwined her autobiographical heresy narrative with her personal experience of the persecution of 'others' under National Socialism. Sadly, this is also where Riemeck's autobiographical 'heretical' self-fashioning is fraught most heavily with omissions, distortions, and falsehoods.

The 1986 book and the 1989 interview were not the first expressly autobiographical statements entangling Riemeck with the fate of the Jews under National Socialism. Already in 1968, she had published an initial account of how she experienced the persecution of the Jews in a contribution to a volume collecting personal recollections of Christians who had aided Jewish people at the time.[40] The collection was published in the GDR on the thirtieth anniversary of *Kristallnacht* (9 November 1938). The contributors were mostly Protestant theologians or others connected to the Protestant Church in both East and West Germany. The collection also served a presentist purpose: in his introduction, the editor praised the GDR for its strictly antifascist policy while he denounced the FRG as being in the process of becoming fascist ('Faschisierung').[41]

In her contribution, Riemeck recounted several stories about her solidarity with Jewish friends and acquaintances. Particularly remarkable among these is what she wrote about a visit made to Jena by Ulrike Meinhof's godmother, Grete Ulrich, who was of Jewish descent. Riemeck writes that she went to the train station to meet Ulrich and walked side by side with her through Jena. According to Riemeck, this was an act of public solidarity and defiance, because Ulrich had to wear a 'Star of David' badge, making it obvious that

38 Riemeck, *Verstoßen*, p. 11.

39 Ibid, p. 12.

40 R. Riemeck, 'Als die Stunde schlug', in *Stärker als die Angst. Den 6 Millionen, die keinen Retter fanden. Mit einem Geleitwort von Emil Fuchs*, ed. H. Fink (Berlin, 1968), pp. 71–5.

41 H. Fink, 'Vorwort', in *Stärker als die Angst*, pp. 11–16 (p. 15).

Riemeck was accompanying a Jew. Riemeck even recounts how she was approached the next day by fellow students who had seen her with Ulrich and who complimented her on her bravery. As others have already noted, however, Grete Ulrich did not have to display the yellow star mandated by a 1941 Nazi ordinance, for she was still legally married to a non-Jewish German, although separated from him at the time,[42] and those living in (what the Nazis called) 'mixed marriages' (*Mischehen*) were exempt from the obligation to wear the yellow star. Riemeck's account of her public bravery thus does not seem very convincing, casting initial doubt on the reliability of her stories.

Riemeck ended her short contribution to the 1968 volume with an appeal to prosecute the perpetrators of National Socialist crimes and with a denouncement of the 'little' as well as the 'big' Nazis: 'Without the many "little" Nazis, the "big ones" would not have been able to carry out their criminal policies'.[43] She did not mention heresy in that text, but twenty years later, in 1988, she published another recollection of her youth under National Socialism and this time included the heretical narrative that we have already encountered in her 1986 book and her 1989 interview. As in 1968, this account was again a contribution to a volume collecting personal experiences under National Socialism, although this time the contributors were educators. The title of Riemeck's contribution was 'Unscathed through the Third Reich'. [44] In it, she not only repeated the story about accompanying a woman wearing the yellow star on her coat through Jena,[45] but also explicitly explained her choice of 'heresy' as a subject of study: 'From the beginnings of my studies at university, I was interested above all in medieval history and heretical movements; for I had come to know people persecuted by the Nazi regime and had encountered Jews. Were not the politically persecuted treated just like "heretics"?'[46] That parallel was the reason why she chose the topic of the Cryptoflagellants for her dissertation – a study that she wanted to finish as quickly as possible, she tells us, because she was already convinced that Germany would not win the war. In fact, she very much hoped for defeat, fearing what a victorious Nazi regime might do. She claimed that from the outset of the German attack on the Soviet Union, in June 1941, she had found solace in the thought of Napoleon's defeat by the Russians. Consequently the best moment of the war, she recalled in her contribution, was when it was all over, which for her was when American troops entered Jena in April 1945.[47]

42 Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 38.

43 Riemeck, 'Als die Stunde schlug', p. 75.

44 R. Riemeck, 'Unversehrt durchs Dritte Reich', in *Verführung – Distanzierung – Ernüchterung. Kindheit und Jugend im Nationalsozialismus. Autobiographisches aus erziehungswissenschaftlicher Sicht*, ed. W. Klafki (Weinheim, 1988), pp. 45–55.

45 Riemeck, 'Unversehrt', p. 54. In this account, however, Riemeck does not name Grete Ulrich or explain the nature of their acquaintance.

46 Ibid, p. 53.

47 Ibid., p. 54.

Riemeck's heretical self-fashioning culminated in her autobiography published in 1992, at the age of seventy-two. The title, *Ich bin ein Mensch für mich. Aus einem unbequemen Leben* ('I am a person of my own. From an inconvenient life'), plays on the dual connotations of the German word *unbequem*, meaning both 'uncomfortable' and 'inconvenient'. By using it, Riemeck was claiming both that her life was not easy for her, and also that she made life inconvenient for the authorities. Indeed the text emphatically conveys Riemeck's lifelong self-fashioning as a misfit and dissenter, that is, as a heretic. She elaborated on many of the narratives she had presented already in 1968, 1986, 1988, and 1989. Yet here she went even further. In this book, she not only distanced herself more intensely from National Socialism, but also strengthened her connection to Jewish people. She cited a story that, as an infant, she had been fed the breastmilk of a Jewish woman, the wife of a lawyer, and wondered whether her own life-long 'pro-Semitic basic attitude' ('prosemitische Grundhaltung') had been determined by this fact. She then went on to muse about the fate of this woman's child, a boy with whom she used to play, and about the fate of a Jewish pediatrician who once saved her life: 'Could they escape the Nazi terror? Were they gassed? I don't know.' Then she added, 'But perhaps they would be content with me if I could have told them that at the high point of the persecutions of the Jews in Hitler's Reich I befriended people who had to wear the "Star of David", and that I never disavowed them.'[48]

We can easily recognize in this passage the dubious story of Grete Ulrich's visit to Jena. That story is, in fact, related in more detail later in the book.[49] Yet we can also clearly see that this passage is all about Riemeck herself, not about the victims. This becomes even more evident in the following: 'In wonderful ways I was preserved from having fallen prey to the lure of National Socialism. Thanks be given to the Jewish lawyer's wife.'[50] What Riemeck seems to claim here is no less than some kind of inoculation against Nazi ideology by virtue of having ingested Jewish milk as a newborn, and of having been preordained to be a philo-Semite by this as well. Riemeck seems almost pathologically obsessed with creating a closeness to Jewish victims and distancing herself from the Nazis. Later in the book, she expressly states that she had not been a member of the National Socialist Students' Association and 'erst recht nicht' (a fortiori) of the party (we will come back to this below).[51] Again, all of this culminated in her assertion that she had written her heresy dissertation 'in reality' about the Jews. Yet as much as Riemeck was trying to put herself on the 'right side' of history, with the victims rather than the perpetrators, these accounts are deeply flawed.

48 Riemeck, *Ich bin*, p. 24.
49 Ibid., pp. 83–4.
50 Ibid., p. 25.
51 Ibid., p. 80.

A Crumbling Façade

In 2007, two biographies of Ulrike Meinhof were published.[52] The books were written from very different political perspectives and with very different attitudes toward their subject. One is sometimes condoning toward Meinhof (Ditfurth), while the other is sharply and unreservedly condemning (Wesemann). But they converge in providing very unflattering accounts of Riemeck's role in her life. Riemeck indeed exerted a huge personal and political influence on Ulrike Meinhof. From 1941 on, Riemeck had lived with Ulrike's mother, Ingeborg, then a recent widow, along with Ulrike and her sister Wienke. At the time, both Riemeck and Ingeborg Meinhof were students at the University of Jena. They spent a semester together in Munich and continued to cohabit in Bavaria after the war. Whether they were just friends or a couple is not known, although the latter seems more likely.[53] After Ingeborg's premature death in 1949, Riemeck gained custody of Ulrike, the younger of the two girls.

Ulrike Meinhof lived with Riemeck until the mid-1950s, and continued to assist her closely in her political activism against rearmament even after that. Although she soon became more radical than her foster-mother, it was only in the 1960s that she began to become estranged from Riemeck. After Meinhof joined the so called 'armed resistance' in 1970 by participating in or even masterminding a violent plot to free Andreas Baader, who had already been convicted of terrorism, the two women fell out completely. Thereafter, Meinhof repeatedly expressed her deep disdain for Riemeck, whom she considered to be only a lukewarm opponent of the state and a deeply egocentric character with a tendency toward pretense.[54] This culminated in her response to Riemeck's public appeal for her to lay down arms, in which she accused Riemeck of being a 'slave mother' who wished for her

52 Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*; Wesemann, *Ulrike Meinhof*. The previous year, 2006, had marked the thirtieth anniversary of Meinhof's suicide in prison. Another important biographical book had appeared then: Röhl, *So macht*. Röhl writes mainly about her mother and father, Ulrike Meinhof and Klaus Rainer Röhl, and the direct GDR influence on their far-left magazine, *konkret*. She was not aware of Riemeck's Nazi Party membership while writing her book, but nonetheless expressed many doubts about Riemeck's autobiographical accounts, including the story about Grete Ulrich; see esp. pp. 145–50, 379–80.

53 Riemeck never married and lived with another woman from 1955 until the end of her life. However, as far as I can see, she never publicly associated herself with homosexuality or openly identified as a lesbian; nor did Ingeborg Meinhof. Riemeck, *Ich bin*, p. 78, states that she was never really interested in men. Röhl, *So macht*, p. 146, notes that Riemeck avoided talking about her own sexuality (among other subjects).

54 Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, pp. 327–31, 358–9; Röhl, *So macht*, pp. 177–80. Röhl prints a letter to a relative in which Meinhof accuses Riemeck of many fabrications, among them depicting herself as having engaged in antifascist resistance ('antifaschistischer Widerstand').

child (Ulrike herself) to continue living in slavery.[55] Meinhof also called out Riemeck's claim of having engaged in antifascist resistance, although without giving any details as to why she felt this claim to be hollow.[56]

On this point, both biographers agreed with Ulrike Meinhof's judgment, since they had visited the archives and unearthed new information about Riemeck's life from 1940 to 1945 that directly contradicted her self-projected image. The most stunning revelation was that Riemeck, the self-proclaimed opponent of the Nazis and friend of their victims, had been a member of the Nazi Party (Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei, or NSDAP) from 1941 to 1943.[57] In light of her contention that she had eagerly anticipated a German defeat at least from the moment that the German army attacked the Soviet Union, the timing of her application for NSDAP membership seems particularly interesting. Riemeck had applied for a party card in July 1941 – two weeks after the German army launched 'Operation Barbarossa' against the Soviets, when it still appeared to be a huge success. She was accepted into the party in October 1941. We have no information on Riemeck's personal motives, but statistics show that her age (twenty years) was exactly the median for women entering the party in that year. She was also typical in that she had previously been very active as a leader in the female party youth organization Bund Deutscher Mädel. Indeed, she had been a member of that organization since 1932, even before Hitler came to power (Riemeck had never hidden this, and membership in the BDM was, in fact, almost universal among girls at this time). Riemeck was also not untypical in being a female member of the NSDAP, for it is well established that there were many women in the party. The leadership encouraged them to join, especially after 1937, and their percentage increased throughout the war years. Among the half-million Germans who joined the party in 1941, about 100,000 were women, and this reflects the general ratio of women among the party membership overall. [58]

Yet Riemeck did not remain in the NSDAP. On her membership card there is a handwritten notice that she left the party in June 1943.[59] We have no reason to assume that this was a later manipulation.[60] Again, Riemeck was

55 Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, pp. 329–30.

56 Röhl, *So macht*, p. 178.

57 Wesemann, *Ulrike Meinhof*, pp. 54–6; Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 37.

58 A. Schley, 'Frauen in der NSDAP. Eine empirische Analyse der weiblichen Neumitglieder', in *Junge Kämpfer, alte Opportunisten. Die Mitglieder der NSDAP 1919–1945*, ed. J. W. Falter (Frankfurt a. M., 2016), pp. 299–317 (pp. 306, 311).

59 Wesemann, *Ulrike Meinhof*, pp. 55–6. Ditfurth does not note this fact. Yet it is clearly marked on Riemeck's membership card kept in the Federal Archives (Bundesarchiv) in Berlin-Lichterfelde (a second copy in the files of her federal district is lost). The membership number is 8915151. I have used a copy sent to me by the Federal Archives.

60 Wesemann, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 56 n. 222, raises some doubt, but on the (clearly false) assumption that leaving the NSDAP was not allowed. A handwritten notice of discharge

not alone in this choice; throughout the years of the Nazi regime, a considerable number of people left the party. Although that number was at its all-time low in 1943, it is still reckoned at more than 3,000.[61]

As with her motives for entering the party, we can also only attempt to fathom Riemeck's reasons for leaving. Was she a convinced National Socialist for a time, who then underwent an interior conversion? A fellow student of hers remembered her as a very engaged National Socialist, who was even decorated with the Golden Party Badge (a decoration for special commitment).[62] As that interview was conducted fifty years after the fact, however, it is possible that this recollection was not accurate. Also, the witness did not mention Riemeck leaving the party. It is also quite possible that Riemeck, although raised through her teenage years in the Nazi regime and active in its youth organizations, acted out of opportunism, like so many Germans. This could apply to both her entry to and exit from the party. For when she applied, in July 1941, the Nazi regime was at the zenith of its success. It seemed that nothing inside or outside Germany could stop it. National support was overwhelming, it appeared that the Soviets would soon collapse as all other enemies had before, and the US had not yet entered the war.

When Riemeck left the party in June 1943, however, the situation was very different. In winter 1942/43, Germany had been defeated at the battle of Stalingrad, with terrible losses. In May 1943, the Axis troops in North Africa had capitulated and the Allied invasion of Italy was only a matter of time (it would begin in July). A clear-minded observer might well have concluded that this was not just a string of temporary setbacks, but rather that the Germans were now losing the war. Indeed, by leaving the encircled German Sixth Army to die on the Volga at Stalingrad, instead of allowing it to surrender, Hitler had made apparent that he would not act like a rational leader and seek to negotiate with the Allies. In June 1943, it was thus entirely possible that a sensible person analyzing the situation would conclude that the Third Reich would collapse in the not-too-distant future. In this situation, leaving the party could seem like the right choice.[63]

on the membership card was the usual procedure for doing so, and the membership files were secured by the Allies soon after the war and kept in the Berlin Document Center and then in the Federal Archives.

61 J. W. Falter and K. Khachatryan, 'Wie viele NSDAP-Mitglieder gab es überhaupt und wie viele davon waren überzeugte Nationalsozialisten?', in *Junge Kämpfer*, pp. 177–95 (p. 187). On the people leaving the NSDAP in general, see J. Meßner, 'Austritte aus der NSDAP 1925 bis 1945', in *Junge Kämpfer*, pp. 271–96.

62 Wesemann, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 54. This might be a confusion with Riemeck's Hitler Youth golden membership badge, mentioned in 'Rot und Rosa', p. 22.

63 Addressing this period, Riemeck, *Ich bin*, pp. 80–1, reads like a coded description of her losing faith in the Nazis (or perhaps just in the possibility of their success). She may, however, have tried to hedge her bets. Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 40, indicates that

Certainly this move did not harm her, for just a few months later she made an important first step in her professional career. Having already received her Ph.D. and qualified as a secondary school teacher, in October 1943 she obtained the post of *Assistent* in the Historical Institute at the University of Jena.[64] She kept this job until the very end of the war and even beyond.

Riemeck made no secret of her position at the Historical Institute, but she never mentioned the name of the institute's director and thus the person she worked for as an *Assistent*.[65] He was Johann von Leers, not only the author of a biography of Adolf Hitler that the Nazis themselves considered authoritative,[66] but one of the most high-profile *Rasseforscher* (race researchers) of the Third Reich, and a publisher of furiously anti-Semitic works.[67] In 1933, for example, he had published a 'classic' of Nazi anti-Semitism, *Jews are Looking at You*,[68] and in 1944, that is, when Riemeck was his *Assistent* in Jena, he wrote a book about *The Criminal Nature of the Jews*.[69] The University of Jena in general was a leading center of Nazi 'race research', in disciplines like biology and anthropology, but also in history.[70] Of course we

Riemeck joined the National Socialists' Female Students Association (Arbeitsgemeinschaft Nationalsozialistischer Studentinnen) in 'about' June 1943. Unfortunately Ditfurth does not mention where she found this date. In her *Fragebogen* from 1945 (see below) Riemeck noted that she had been a member of this organization for one year, but without indicating which. A few years later she omitted this membership (Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 58), and she expressly denied it in her autobiography (Riemeck, *Ich bin*, p. 80).Yet if the date given by Ditfurth is correct, Riemeck left one major Nazi organization for another, less compromising one (possibly to raise less suspicion of being politically 'unreliable'?).

64 It is clear from documents preserved in JUA, C 865 that Riemeck had undermined her predecessor in order to better install herself as the new *Assistent* (noted in Wesemann, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 55).

65 She was likewise silent about her dissertation advisor, Erich Maschke, who was also a Nazi Party member and in his academic work justified Nazi Germany's territorial claims in Eastern Europe. On Maschke, see H. Gottwald, 'Die Jenaer Geschichtswissenschaft', in *'Kämpferische Wissenschaft'. Studien zur Universität Jena im Nationalsozialismus*, ed. U. Hoßfeld et al. (Cologne, 2003), pp. 913–42 (pp. 917–20).

66 J. von Leers, *Reichskanzler Adolf Hitler* (Leipzig, 1933).

67 On von Leers, see M. Sennholz, *Johann von Leers. Ein Propagandist des Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin, 2013); G. P. Wegner, '"A Propagandist of Extermination": Johann von Leers and the Anti-Semitic Formation of Children in Nazi Germany', *Paedagogica Historica* 43 (2007), 299–325; M. Finkenberger, '"Während meines ganzen Lebens habe ich die Juden erforscht, wie ein Bakteriologe einen gefährlichen Bazillus studiert" – Johann von Leers (1902–1965) als antisemitischer Propagandaexperte bis 1945', *Bulletin des Deutschen Historischen Instituts Moskau* 2 (2008), 88–99; idem, 'Johann von Leers und die "faschistische Internationale" der fünfziger und sechziger Jahre in Argentinien und Ägypten', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 59 (2011), 522–43.

68 J. von Leers, *Juden sehen dich an* (Berlin, 1933).

69 Idem, *Die Verbrechernatur der Juden* (Berlin, 1944).

70 See *'Kämpferische Wissenschaft'*, ed. Hoßfeld et al., esp. Gottwald, 'Die Jenaer Geschichtswissenschaft' on the Historical Institute (pp. 924–5 on von Leers).

cannot blame Riemeck for what von Leers wrote, but considering the almost heroic 'heretical' self-fashioning in her later autobiographical accounts, not mentioning her close collaboration with this man amounts to a very awkward omission. Her paper trail in the Jena University Archive, mostly dating from 1943 to 1945, does not reveal a particular commitment to Nazi ideology, beyond occasionally signing letters with 'Heil Hitler'. That greeting was not obligatory, but Riemeck was hardly the only one to use it. The records of the written exams she passed do not reveal any overly ideological zeal. But one document shows something of Riemeck's attitudes at the time. It is a 1943 Christmas newsletter to the (male) alumni of the Historical Institute now serving as soldiers. Signed by both Riemeck and von Leers, the peer-to-peer-style and content clearly point to Riemeck's authorship. Setting aside some typical formulae used at the time, it does not testify to fanaticism. Although not ideologically revealing, it is nevertheless appalling in its serene display of the banal normality of academic business as usual, in the middle of a war and with the horrendous systematic genocide against European Jews and other minorities running at full throttle. For example, Riemeck informed the alumni in detail about the grades obtained by the different Ph.D. candidates at the institute, including Riemeck herself.[71] One wonders if soldiers actively fighting on the war's many fronts really cared about such news from home.

Another question one might ponder is why Riemeck did not simply admit that she had been a member of the NSDAP but left it in 1943. After all, this would have made for an even better 'heretic' story. For in order to become a heretic, one first has to be a member of the Church. Also, members of the party younger than twenty-seven (Riemeck was only twenty-five in 1945) were officially exempted from any retributions by the Allied powers after the war. Perhaps the stain of Nazi Party membership, albeit temporary, was too much for a personality always intent on displaying herself as an outsider and a dissident on the right side of history?

The Cover-up and the Dissertation Rediscovered

What is certain is that Riemeck began to lie in the immediate aftermath of the war. Like every German adult, she had to fill out a *Fragebogen*, the questionnaire issued by the Allied authorities about involvement in National Socialism, which included many questions about membership in party organizations. Riemeck signed her *Fragebogen* on 9 June 1945, just one month after the war officially ended. In it, she admitted to having been a member of the National Socialist female students' organization for one year,

[71] JUA, C 865 preserves this newsletter as well as many other records of Riemeck's activity as *Assistent*. Documents about her Ph.D. graduation are in M 609, 11.

but did not tick the box for membership in the party itself, or indeed any other box.[72]

By that time, Riemeck had already been entrusted with 'cleansing' the Jena Historical Institute – at least that is what she indicated in her autobiography.[73] That she was credited as a person with a 'clean slate' by the new authorities (both Allied and German) is also evidenced by the fact that she soon got a similar assignment in another part of Germany. By pre-existing agreement, the Americans were to hand Jena over to the Soviet allies on 1 July along with the whole of Thuringia, and the Soviet troops were much feared by the German population. Therefore Reimeck, together with Ingeborg Meinhof and her two girls, fled to neighboring, US-occupied, Bavaria. There both she and Ingeborg worked as school teachers in the small town of Berneck, and Riemeck was entrusted with restructuring the school system for the entire district. Thus for the second time she was deemed morally fit and professionally competent to reform institutions tainted by Nazism. How she managed to convince the authorities of her integrity we do not know, but it is clear that she did. Together with her frenetic publication of works in history and other fields of the humanities beginning in the immediate post-war period, the confidence that the new powers showed in her became the basis for her rapid rise in teachers' education in the following decade.

Thus the reason for Riemeck never disclosing her party membership may simply have been that, having started her post-war career with a serious lie to the Allied authorities, she felt she could not afford to soil her 'clean slate' with them. Then, with every passing year, the price of admitting to her past grew steadily higher. Yet in hindsight it seems bitterly ironic that in the letter announcing her departure for the Bayreuth region of Bavaria to her superiors in Thuringia, Riemeck wrote that she expected her task to be particularly burdensome, as the teachers of Bayreuth were so infested with Nazi ideology.[74]

Unless new documents are unearthed, we will probably never know exactly what young Renate Riemeck did and thought from 1941 to 1945. What we can establish, however, is that her later assertions of having always been in opposition to the regime, of having wished for a German defeat as early as 1941, and of never having been a member of the Nazi Party were simply false. In light of that fact, her self-ascribed acts of compassion or public bravery toward Jewish Germans – none of which, as one of the Meinhof biographers remarks, can be proven to have occurred – must also appear highly dubious.[75]

72 JUA, D 2387.

73 Riemeck, *Ich bin*, pp. 89–90. I have found no proof for this assertion in JUA files except for the fact that she did remain in her position of *Assistent* after the war ended, in May and June 1945.

74 Letter from 29 June 1945, JUA, D 2387.

75 Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 58. For example, Riemeck, *Ich bin*, p. 56, and eadem, 'Als die

Beyond data already brought to light by Meinhof's biographers, we can now further establish the contrast between Riemeck's autobiographical self-fashioning and reality, thanks to the discovery of her original doctoral dissertation. This study on the heretical Cryptoflagellants, which she allegedly wrote with Nazi persecution of the Jews firmly in mind, has never been analyzed before.[76] Neither of the two Meinhof biographies, otherwise so revealing concerning Riemeck, made use of it, because it was thought lost. As mentioned at the beginning of this essay, Riemeck never published it, contrary to the universal obligation to publish that exists (to this day) in the German university system. In 1943, due to the war, she was exempted from that obligation at her own request – signed with 'Heil Hitler' – on the condition that she would publish the book no later than eighteen months after the war ended.[77]

Riemeck never fulfilled that promise. Rather she created the impression that the manuscript had been lost. When finally in 1992 she published an article presenting her findings, the first footnote misleadingly stated that this was the text of a journal article the author had prepared back in 1943, on the basis of her dissertation. The footnote states (correctly) that Riemeck had been freed from the obligation to publish the dissertation itself, but it ends with a lie: 'The dissertation manuscript is missing' ('Die Dissertation ist verschollen'). In fact, the manuscript was never actually lost. Not only is a copy of the original typescript preserved in the library of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica (MGH) in Munich,[78] but it appears to have been presented to this famous institution by Riemeck herself. For another copy made from the one at the MGH for the library of the Freie Universität Berlin carries a typewritten note on its cover page: 'When quoting from this work please indicate: "Quoted from the manuscript of the dissertation that has been made available to the MGH by courtesy of Frau Prof. Riemeck".'[79]

Stunde schlug', p. 74, claimed to have hidden a Jewish woman with friends. Röhl, *So macht*, p. 149, mentions this episode too, but cites no proof, and is probably just relying on Riemeck's autobiography, so doubts remain. Evidence is also very thin that Riemeck was in close contact with members of the resistance in Jena toward the end of the war. Riemeck, *Ich bin*, p. 81, claimed that in 1944 she befriended industrial workers who were in a Communist group actively fighting the Nazis. Ditfurth, *Ulrike Meinhof*, p. 45, provides more details and shows that this acquaintance was relatively inconsequential. Indeed Riemeck herself never claimed that she actively joined the resistance, but she never failed to mention (e.g. *Ich bin*, p. 81) that she had lent her bed linen to the Jena workers she had befriended, so that they could hoist it as a capitulation flag when US troops entered the city.

76 Though Würth, *Geißler*, p. 20, seems to have had access to it.

77 JUA, M 609, 11, Nr. 143 (letter from 14 April 1943).

78 Shelfmark By 64420: Riemeck, 'Die spätmittelalterlichen Flagellanten Thüringens und die deutschen Geisslerbewegungen: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Ketzertums' (Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Jena, 1943) [hereafter Dissertation].

79 'Bei Zitaten dieser Arbeit bitte vermerken: "Zitiert nach dem MS der von Frau Prof.

The copy was registered in the MGH library in 1972 – or at least that year is marked on the front page. If that really is the date of accession,[80] again one wonders why Riemeck, while publicly creating the impression that her dissertation was missing, would present a copy to a (more or less) public institution. The reason for her duplicity lies in the manuscript itself. There are very few differences between the original dissertation and the 1992 article. The latter omits the appendices to the former, but otherwise it is a nearly verbatim rendering. Thus it is striking that three passages present in the dissertation but cut from the 1992 article all concern medieval Jews. These omissions offer abundant proof that Riemeck did not have persecuted Jews in mind when she wrote her dissertation about late medieval heretics. And they also prove that Riemeck was well aware of this fact in 1992, the very same year in which she published her autobiography lauding herself for her closeness to Jewish people, her philo-Semitism, and her acts of solidarity, while also asserting that she had always opposed the Nazis and had never been a member of the Party or even its students' organization.

Jews were not a main topic of Riemeck's dissertation. She only touched upon them in relation to the pogroms of 1349, the year that also saw the first great activity of flagellants in Germany. Yet this fact makes these 1943 passages carefully omitted from the 1992 article all the more telling. In the first, Riemeck wrote about medieval Germans' hatred for the Jews in 1349 as 'rassebedingte(r) Abneigung', that is, as 'racially caused aversion'.[81] In the second, she indicated that the 'form of economy' of the medieval Jews was despised because it was *artfremd* for the Germans, that is, 'alien to the species' (the terms *Art* [species] and *Rasse* [race] were used interchangeably in the Nazi jargon of social Darwinism).[82] In the third, she asserted that medieval

Riemeck den MGH freundlicherweise zur Verfügung gestellten Dissertation".' The Berlin copy is located in the branch library at the university's History Institute (Friedrich Meinecke Institut), shelfmark 57 Hy 1. The note is in a more modern typewriter script-type than the dissertation itself. One word ('freundlicherweise') is added in handwriting. The note must have been added when the MGH library allowed the Freie Universtiät library to make the copy, in order to give Riemeck due credit.

80 The circumstances of the acquisition are not recorded, but the director of the library, Arno Mentzel-Reuters (email from 1 February 2018) thinks that it is more likely that Riemeck gave a copy to the MGH in 1943 which was then re-copied in 1972, due to the rapid decay of paper produced in wartime Germany, and that the accession date is just the date of the new copy (while the old copy was discarded). Given the current state of research, however, we cannot establish exactly what happened. A third copy is known to exist at the University of Regensburg library, shelfmark 00/NV 5800 R556.

81 'Die elsässische Judenverfolgung von 1336 unter "König Armleder", von der Johann von Winterthur berichtet, zeigt, wie viele andere solcher Unternehmungen auch, die enge Verknüpfung von religiöser Wut auf die "Feinde Christi" und rassebedingter Abneigung mit einem erbitterten sozialen Haß': Dissertation, p. 8, completely omitted in Riemeck, 'Spätmittelalterliche Ketzerbewegungen', p. 98.

82 'Allein Vorwand oder Tarnung ist das religiöse Motiv oder die Vorstellung der

Germans, in persecuting Jews, were just trying to remedy social grievances ('sozialen Mißständen … abzuhelfen').[83] Indeed, the idea that the persecution in 1349 was some kind of justified protest against 'Jewish capitalism' is the main argument of the dissertation insofar as it touches on the Jews. Riemeck expressed this in very clear terms just after the first passage that she deleted, when she wrote, 'The persecution of the Jews in 1349 is likewise nothing but a kind of revolution of ordinary Joes against Jewish proto-capitalism and Jewish privilege'.[84] Shockingly, this sentence was retained in the article printed in 1992.[85] Obviously, neither Riemeck nor the journal editors at that time found the concept of 'Jewish capitalism' problematic.

To sum up: when Riemeck wrote about Jews in her dissertation, she reiterated to all intents the mainstream anti-Semitic views of Nazi ideology. She condoned the medieval persecution of Jews as caused by justified social grievances. Her post-war claim that she had the fate of the contemporary Jews in mind when writing her dissertation about medieval heretics must be called out as specious – indeed laughable, were it not so tragic in the light of the genocide of European Jews by National Socialist Germany. Moreover, it is now clear that Riemeck's misleading claims cannot be attributed to faulty memory, since she deliberately edited out the most scandalously anti-Semitic passages from her dissertation in 1992. And yet the idea of a righteous and understandable hatred for 'Jewish capitalism' is still there in that 1992 version of the supposedly lost dissertation. One cannot help but wonder why Riemeck published that text at all. One also wonders why she did not fear that the copy of her original dissertation, which she had given to the MGH, would surface and be compared to the 1992 article. The same goes for her explicit claims of non-membership in the NSDAP made in her autobiography from the same year: was she not aware that the files were available in the Berlin Document Center?[86]

Brunnenvergiftung dabei nicht gewesen. Es verbinden sich solche Beweggründe vielmehr mit einem aus sozialen Wurzeln stammenden Haß gegen die artfremde Wirtschaftsform': Dissertation, p. 9, completely omitted in Riemeck, 'Spätmittelalterliche Ketzerbewegungen', p. 99.

83 'Sie gehörten also den Ständen an, die an der Not der Zeit besonders hart zu leiden hatten, und die ihren sozialen Mißständen durch die Judenverfolgung von 1349, die gerade in Thüringen besonders scharf ausgetragen wurde, abzuhelfen versuchten': Dissertation, p. 50, underlined section left out in Riemeck, 'Spätmittelalterliche Ketzerbewegungen', p. 121.

84 'Die Judenverfolgung des Jahres 1349 ist nichts anders als gleichfalls eine Art Revolution der kleinen Leute gegen den jüdischen Frühkapitalismus und die jüdischen Privilegien': Dissertation, pp. 8–9 (immediately following the first omitted passage).

85 Riemeck, 'Spätmittelalterliche Ketzerverfolgungen', p. 98.

86 After 1994 the files were transferred to the Federal Archives. The Nazis made some attempts to destroy the membership files toward the end of the war, but less than a quarter were actually lost. On the state of research about the preservation of the membership registers, see K. Khachatryan and J. Meßner, 'Die Stichprobenziehung aus

Yet Riemeck actually 'won' the bet she had made. She lived until old age without being confronted with any of her false statements. When she died in 2003 at the age of eighty-two, many fond obituaries highlighted her activism for peace, understanding between East and West, and the anthroposophical cause, and praised her as a pioneer of the women's movement.[87] As late as 2014, in spite of having learned about her Nazi past from the two 2007 Meinhof biographies, Riemeck's friends and supporters in the pedagogy department of the University of Marburg published a lecture series she had given there in the 1980s and heralded her as one of the great figures promoting a democratic and progressive spirit in Germany after the war.[88]

Conclusion

It has become evident that Renate Riemeck's autobiographical self-fashioning, centered around the figure of the heretic – the medieval religious one and the modern political one – was a mixture of facts, half-truths, and falsities, concocted to redound to her own credit. Not only had she lied to the Allied authorities about her Nazi Party membership, but from the 1960s on, she claimed that she had despised the Nazis during the Third Reich and had wished for their defeat, that she had felt empathy toward Jewish Germans at the time, and that she had actively supported them. None of these purported acts of solidarity can be proven to have occurred; the other contentions, meanwhile, can be demonstrated as false. The same goes for Riemeck's assertion that her 1943 dissertation was a coded expression of her feeling for persecuted Jews. Taken together with her lifelong fascination by the figure of the heretic, one might well wonder if, by writing about heretics and styling herself as one, she was laboring under a compulsion to deceive even herself.

Riemeck's importance as a historian does not compare to that of Ernst Kantorowicz, the object of Robert E. Lerner's recent biographical masterpiece.[89] As German intellectuals, however, both Riemeck and Kantorowicz had to grapple with the biographical challenges posed by National Socialism and the subsequent Cold War. Both historians moved from the right to the left of the political spectrum. Yet while 'EKa' demonstrated an impressively

der NSDAPZentralkartei: Stichprobenverfahren und Stichprobenäquivalenz', in *Junge Kämpfer*, pp. 121–76 (pp. 124–7).

87 E.g. B. Mansel, 'Ihre politische Karriere war eher kurz', *Der Freitag* (23 May 2003); I. Nödinger, 'Auch ich habe viele Leben gelebt', *Wir Frauen*, issue 3 (2003), p. 25; R. von dem Borne 'Aus einem unbequemen Leben. Zum Tod von Renate Riemeck', in *Die Drei. Zeitschrift für Anthroposophie in Wissenschaft, Kunst und sozialem Leben*, issue 7 (2003), pp. 78–81; see also Böhm, 'Renate Riemeck' (written on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of Riemeck's death).

88 Riemeck, *Klassiker der Pädagogik*, pp. xiii–xiv.

89 R. E. Lerner, *Ernst Kantorowicz: A Life* (Princeton, 2017).

forthright attitude in doing so, in his stance both with regard to the Nazis and then against McCarthyism, Riemeck for whatever reason chose consciously to obscure the truth about herself. In its own more equivocal fashion, her story, with its convoluted autobiographical self-fashioning interwoven with the subject of medieval heretics, reveals as much about twentieth-century German medievalists as does Kantorowicz's.

Afterword

Who or What Was a Heretic in the Late Middle Ages?

Barbara Newman

Historians of heresy, as of anti-Semitism, can become inured to the brutality of their subject. So let me begin by recalling a brute fact that we know too well to repeat too often. The prosecution of late medieval heresy culminated in a uniquely barbaric act: the consignment of living men and women to the flames, in the name of God, to punish thought-crimes and purify the Church. To work in this field, therefore, is to study people who courageously risked or haplessly endured that fate, as well as those who were all too willing to inflict it. In this volume honoring Robert E. Lerner, let it be remembered that his lifelong research on medieval heresy has accompanied a passionate commitment to peace and justice, to forging a world in which such atrocities and their latter-day equivalents become less and less thinkable.

As the richly diverse essays in this volume remind us, the term 'heretic' could be applied to three very different types of people. First (and of greatest interest to intellectual historians) are the individual thinkers whose positions fell afoul of what others defined as orthodoxy. Some were learned theologians who might have intended to be provocative, but seldom heretical – men such as Peter John Olivi, Meister Eckhart, John Wyclif, and perhaps Barthélemy Sicard. But others spoke from more marginal locations, like the monk and ritual magician John of Morigny, the beguine mystic Marguerite Porete, the alchemist Limoux Negre, and the anticlerical prophets Livin and Janko Wirsberger. A few more such figures lurk in the footnotes, including Na Prous Boneta, Olivi's *soror mystica* and loyal martyr, and Maifreda da Pirovano, the *papessa* of the Guglielmites.

Very different are the secular rulers prosecuted as heretics for their political opposition to the papacy, otherwise known as the 'heresy of disobedience'. A few of them figure prominently in these pages: Louis of Bavaria, Matteo and Galeazzo Visconti, and Louis of Durazzo. Finally, there are whole populations, religious orders, or communities hereticated by churchmen or even (in one case) temporal rulers. Such are the Knights Templar, the beguines of northern Europe, Spiritual Franciscans, magicians and alchemists, the

alleged conspiracy of satanic witches, Eastern Orthodox Christians, *conversos* (Spanish Jews who, after being forcibly converted to Catholicism, continued to practice Judaism in secret), and 'Free Spirit' mystics (who, being free spirits, would have done virtually anything sooner than create an organized movement). In this closing essay I will reflect on each category, drawing together some of the insights scattered throughout the volume and adding parallels from other spheres.

Michael Bailey's essay offers a useful starting point, for he notes some surprising affinities between two contemporary but otherwise quite dissimilar writers – John of Morigny and Marguerite Porete. 'What unites them,' Bailey writes, 'is their steadfast commitment to their personal religious visions, through whatever tribulations arose.' Each wrote a highly controversial book and witnessed its condemnation, yet 'persevered, continuing to write when others might have retreated into more comfortable orthodoxies'. Those 'personal visions' had little in common. The monk wanted to conjure visions of the Virgin Mary through a complex system of prayers, meditations, and magical figures, in order to attain from her complete knowledge of all arts and sciences. The beguine wanted (with apologies for that verb) to become a 'free soul' by attaining total annihilation of her knowledge and will, disappearing without remainder into God. Marguerite would doubtless have spurned John's project, seeing him as hopelessly mired in self-will and a quest for personal gain. John, for his part, would have been just as scandalized by Marguerite's rejection of virtues, prayers, Masses, and sermons as were the theologians at the University of Paris. In fact, these two figures seem to embody the classic opposition between mysticism and magic – one practice aiming at self-surrender to the Divine, the other at manipulating the Divine for one's personal ends.

Nevertheless, both John and Marguerite (so far as we can tell) thought of themselves as devout Christians. Neither set out to be heretical. When their books were attacked, both revised them to clarify their intentions, in part by adding new autobiographical material. John simplified his figures to distance himself further from the *ars notoria*, a form of condemned magic, while Marguerite added more scriptural exegesis and a ladder of divine ascent, adopting a familiar topos of other mystical writings. She also sought – and received – endorsements from a few authoritative theologians, despite her disdain for 'Holy Church the Little'. But her ultimate authority was none other than *Amour*, divine Love, while John's was the Virgin Mary herself. Despite these good-faith efforts at revision, both books were once again condemned and burned. Marguerite died with and for her *Mirror*, as she had the terrible luck to fall into the hands of Philip IV's personal confessor, the inquisitor William of Paris. We do not know what happened to John of Morigny. Perhaps he was forced to recant and live out his life in monastic penance, or perhaps his abbot managed somehow to protect him. At any rate, he seems not to have been tried for heresy. Both their names

then disappeared from history for centuries until the modern rediscovery of their books.

Two North American scholars, Claire Fanger and Nicholas Watson, have now done for John of Morigny what Romana Guarnieri did for Marguerite Porete in 1946.[1] Remarkably, their twenty-first-century recovery of *The Flowers of Heavenly Teaching* led to the rapid discovery of an astonishing number of manuscripts. Therein lies yet more evidence that, as Justine Trombley writes, a 'condemned' text does not necessarily stay condemned. 'Rather, the heresy or orthodoxy of a text could be assigned and re-assigned at each moment of reception, within individual contexts that often differed from place to place, person to person'. What Robert Lerner has said of *The Mirror of Simple Souls* can just as well be said of *The Flowers of Heavenly Teaching*: 'it appears as if dozens of copies … were bobbing up continually in the seas of late-medieval western Europe like unsinkable corks'.[2]

Trombley herself has been a pioneer in the study of Porete's reception. She points out that we now have nine witnesses to the Latin recension of the *Mirror*, including both complete and partial copies and lengthy citations by its opponents. (As I have argued elsewhere, Marguerite herself may have commissioned the Latin translation from one of her clerical friends in order to assure the survival of her book.[3]) Both of Trombley's newly discovered manuscripts have Bohemian connections: one was written in Bohemia and circulated in Germany (the first known witness to Marguerite's reception in those lands), while the other belonged to the well-known figure John-Jerome of Prague, who lived as a Camaldolese monk in Tuscany. As Trombley astutely notes, the *Mirror*'s critique of the institutional Church might have appealed to a reform-minded monk like John-Jerome just as much as it did to antinomian mystics. The meaning of a text varies widely with its reception, and there is no better proof of this than the conflicting verdicts passed on the *Mirror* from Marguerite's own day until the present.

Sylvain Piron takes on another text whose survival defies the odds. During the harsh repression of the Spiritual Franciscans and Beguins in Languedoc, inquisitors went to great lengths to destroy the sect's treasured manuscripts of Peter John Olivi, which they in turn risked their lives to preserve. But somehow Barthélemy Sicard's *Postilla super Danielem* flew beneath the radar, surviving (despite its considerable length) in six manuscripts identified

1 John of Morigny, *Liber florum celestis doctrine / The Flowers of Heavenly Teaching*, ed. C. Fanger and N. Watson (Toronto, 2015); C. Fanger, *Rewriting Magic: An Exegesis of the Visionary Autobiography of a Fourteenth-Century French Monk* (University Park PA, 2015). As of 2015, the team had located twenty-three manuscripts in sites ranging from Austria to Spain and Italy to England.

2 R. E. Lerner, 'New Light on *The Mirror of Simple Souls*', *Speculum* 85 (2010), 91–116 (p. 116).

3 B. Newman, 'Annihilation and Authorship: Three Women Mystics of the 1290s', *Speculum* 91 (2016), 591–630 (p. 618).

to date. Sicard was a companion and loyal follower of Olivi. His personal fate remains mysterious; while he was never charged with heresy, he may have been 'disappeared' by enemies of the movement. As Piron shows, his commentary on Daniel follows a clear Olivian framework while prudently avoiding any direct reference to Olivi or Joachim of Fiore. More than any other text in the Old Testament, the book of Daniel openly invites speculation on future ages and rulers, making it an excellent choice for Joachite exegesis. Written perhaps in Montpellier, Sicard's *Postilla* not only circulated in Italy, where Bernardino of Siena owned a copy, but also reached as far as Moravia. Like the Bohemian manuscript of Marguerite's *Mirror*, the Moravian *Postilla* provides evidence of the Czech lands' full participation in the culture of Latin Christendom. Another owner of interest, the humanist friar Tedaldo della Casa, was an expert scribe and bibliophile who engaged freely with condemned and dangerous texts. As Kathryn Kerby-Fulton has demonstrated for late medieval England, prestigious monastic and conventual libraries could at times provide safe havens for otherwise endangered books.[4]

Louisa Burnham's fascinating subject, Limoux Negre, was no writer, belonged to no movement, and never converted anyone to his strange beliefs – yet he was prepared to die for them. One has to wonder why such a man, apparently harmless, was hauled before his bishop, then before the inquisitor of Carcassonne. Did he have personal enemies? Was he regarded as the village crank? Or could some other suspect individual have tried to curry favor with the authorities by informing on a 'real' heretic? We may never know. But, as we learn from Burnham's ingenious research, there is more to Limoux than meets the eye. What looks at first like a mix of fantastical delusions – speculation about the sun and moon urinating, or the Virgin Mary conceiving by artificial insemination – goes to show that Limoux was not only sane but, by his own lights, a rationalist. Burnham persuasively argues that he was an alchemist, perhaps a laboratory assistant to the author of the pseudo-Llullian *Testamentum*, produced in Montpellier in his lifetime. Alchemists understood their laboratory processes as analogous to the stages of creation, and when we realize that 'sun and moon' stand for gold and silver, urine was employed as an organic solvent, and so forth, Limoux's cosmology makes a kind of sense.

All the same, his attitude toward Christianity is peculiar and not entirely consistent. Unwilling to reject the faith altogether, he preserved beliefs that he considered essential, such as the resurrection of Jesus, yet did not hesitate to call the Scriptures 'false' when it suited him and to prune away their miracles like some eighteenth-century Deist. Thus Limoux's heresy makes an important addition to the history of medieval skepticism, which remains a growth field. It is worth noting that, as early as 1200, the Augustinian canon

4 K. Kerby-Fulton, *Books under Suspicion: Censorship and Tolerance of Revelatory Writing in Late Medieval England* (Notre Dame IN, 2006).

Peter of Cornwall justified his huge collection of vision-texts by claiming that the world was full of atheists and materialists: 'there are some who think there is no God: they believe the world has always been as it is now, ruled by chance rather than the providence of God. And many, considering only what they see, do not believe that good or bad angels exist, that the human soul lives on after the body's death, or that there are other spiritual and invisible realities'.[5]

Anticlericalism – hardly rare even among the orthodox – was almost *de rigueur* for a heretic. It is one of the few things that Limoux Negre had in common with Marguerite Porete, and they both shared it with Livin and Janko Wirsberger, two fifteenth-century brothers from the region of Eger (Cheb) in Bohemia. These rabble-rousers, members of the lower nobility, used eschatological prophecies to annoy the local clergy and inspire their own 'conventicle of heretics'. Frances Kneupper examines a quodlibet delivered in 1466 by the theologian Johannes Bauer of Dorsten, apparently aimed at the Wirsberger brothers and seeking to refute their alleged belief that the Joachite Third Status would arrive in 1471. The question is vexed because, on the one hand, Dorsten's *questio* never actually names his opponents, and on the other, the only surviving texts by the Wirsbergers fail to mention Joachim or his scheme of salvation history at all. The brothers did qualify as 'roosters' in Richard Landes's typology – urgent apocalyptic witnesses who took the staid, rational 'owls' to task for spurning their message of tribulation to come.[6] But Kneupper concludes 'that Dorsten either imagined or invented the connection between Joachim of Fiore and the Wirsberger brothers', perhaps to tar them with the same brush as a known heretic. If the Wirsbergers were indeed Dorsten's targets, is it possible that they had pursued Joachite ideas at some other point in their letter-writing campaign? As Kneupper observes, 'almost all of their writings have been destroyed'. But if Dorsten completely misread the heretics he strove to discredit, his *questio* would be ironic indeed, for he built his case on a denunciation of their own poor scholarship and misinterpretation of texts.

At this point I suspect Robert Lerner will sympathize, as I do, with the learned theologian. Both of us, after all, have devoted not a little time to chastising poor Latin, faulty translations, and bad readings of authoritative texts. It is nonetheless interesting that Dorsten based so much of his rebuttal on those grounds. For him, correct predictions about the End Times had to rest on a correct understanding of Scripture, which in turn required the use of

5 Peter of Cornwall, *Liber reuelationum*, prologue, in R. Easting and R. Sharpe, *Peter of Cornwall's Book of Revelations* (Toronto, 2013), p. 74.

6 R. Landes, 'On Owls, Roosters, and Apocalyptic Time: A Historical Method for Reading a Refractory Documentation', *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 49 (1996), 165–85; idem, 'Roosters and Owls: On the Dynamics of the Apocalyptic Curve', in his *Heaven on Earth: The Varieties of the Millennial Experience* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 37–61.

correct scholarly tools. The Wirsbergers' vernacular ravings did not qualify. Yet, despite their belief in direct divine inspiration, they too 'had sought the approval of educated authorities', just as Marguerite Porete had done – and they may also have had their own clerical ally. It was a rare vernacular theologian who could afford to dispense altogether with the clergy.

Aside from the immediate question of prophecy, Dorsten's opposition to the Wirsbergers can be seen as part of a larger, pan-European struggle over the right to translate and interpret Scripture in the vernacular. Was there something *intrinsically* heretical about the use of vernacular Bibles? Guibert of Tournai thought so; he had famously denounced the beguines in 1274 for veering into heretical novelties through their study of a French Bible. His solution to that problem was simple: 'let the copies be destroyed, the translators locked up, the texts that have been found to be false burnt, lest the divine Word be cheapened by vernacular speech, … lest what is holy be given to the dogs, and the most precious pearls set before swine'.[7] In Oxford in 1401, a recently completed vernacular Bible likewise became the object of heated debate, with some theologians supporting the translation and others opposing it. The status of that Bible is still contested. A majority opinion among scholars has long held it to be a banned book, commonly known as the 'Lollard' or 'Wycliffite' Bible. But Henry Ansgar Kelly has recently argued that what he now calls the 'Middle English Bible' was wholly orthodox in conception and allowed to circulate freely.[8] In some eyes, vernacular Bible reading was a sure path to heresy, while in others, it was the best way for laypeople to avoid it.

Very different issues are involved in the contributions of Georg Modestin and Elizabeth Casteen. Modestin investigates Pope John XXII's prosecution and condemnation of the German king Louis of Bavaria, while Casteen studies the troubles of Louis of Durazzo, an Angevin prince. After rebelling against his cousins, Queen Johanna of Naples and her husband Louis of Taranto, Louis of Durazzo became the object of heresy proceedings, initiated by the archbishop of Naples, in 1362. I will not attempt to wade into these murky political waters except to make a few broad points. Both Louis of Bavaria and Louis of Durazzo were charged with favoring the Spiritual Franciscans (*fraticelli*), the objects of relentless papal hostility since 1318, and Casteen and Modestin both conclude that there was some substance to those charges. But in spite of their support for apostolic poverty as a Franciscan ideal, neither Louis had any intention of personally adopting it. Rather, it stands to reason that political enemies of the papacy should have made common cause with its ideological foes. Needless to say, the frequent ecclesiastical use of heresy charges, excommunication, interdict, and even calls for

7 Guibert of Tournai, *Collectio de scandalis ecclesiae*, ed. A. Stroick, *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 24 (1931), 33–62 (pp. 61–2).

8 H. A. Kelly, *The Middle English Bible: A Reassessment* (Philadelphia, 2016).

intra-European 'crusades' as weapons of power politics could only contribute to the rising tide of anticlericalism.[9]

Modestin also addresses John XXII's vendetta against Matteo Visconti, the lord of Milan, and his son Galeazzo. In that case we see political enmity tightly bound up with concerns about magic and heresy. In 1317 John had issued the decretal *De crimine falsi*, forbidding the practice of alchemy, and his 1326 bull *Super illius specula* condemned demonic magic and declared witchcraft to be a form of heresy.[10] The latter decree fell midway between the burning of John of Morigny's book in 1323 and the execution of Limoux Negre in 1329. The Visconti trial, which came to a head in 1321–22, included spectacular charges of sorcery. Matteo, it was alleged, had personally tried to kill the pope by fumigating a statue inscribed with the name of a demon, while Galeazzo had boiled the host in a frying pan so that the devil would keep him in power. Those charges, more sensational than plausible, were eventually dropped. But the Visconti undoubtedly did impede the Milanese inquisition and commit many of the other anticlerical acts imputed to them. The most interesting of these charges was that of interfering with the heresy trial of the Guglielmites, or 'Children of the Holy Spirit', in 1300. Matteo was first cousin to Sister Maifreda da Pirovano, the *papessa* or earthly vicar of St Guglielma, whom her devotees believed to be the incarnation of the Holy Spirit. There is credible evidence that the lord of Milan managed to delay her inevitable burning for as long as he could. Many of his closest friends and allies belonged to the movement, and Galeazzo himself had been a member in his youth. As a purely local sect, the Guglielmites were connected with Cistercian and Humiliati houses in Milan and its suburbs; they had no evident ties to the Spiritual Franciscans. Nevertheless, their theology was strongly influenced by Joachim of Fiore – another instance of Joachite ideas buttressing resistance to a much-hated papacy.

As we have seen, inquisitorial fires did a better job of eliminating people than books. Despite the inquisitors' best efforts, the works of Peter John Olivi, Barthélemy Sicard, Marguerite Porete, and John of Morigny continued to circulate, and even two letters of the Wirsberger brothers managed to survive. Unfortunately, the numerous and no doubt fascinating gospels, hymns, litanies, and prophetic books produced by the Guglielmites all perished in the flames. As I have argued elsewhere, even the record of their trial – or half of it – survived the destruction of the Milanese inquisitorial archives in 1788 only because Matteo Visconti had long since confiscated it, probably when he

9 A. Patschovsky, 'Heresy and Society: On the Political Function of Heresy in the Medieval World', in *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy*, ed. C. Bruschi and P. Biller (York, 2003), pp. 23–41.

10 R. Kieckhefer, 'Witchcraft, Necromancy and Sorcery as Heresy', in *Chasses aux sorcières et démonologie: entre discours et pratiques (XIV^{e}–XVII^{e} siècles)*, ed. M. Ostorero, G. Modestin, and K. Utz Tremp (Florence, 2010), pp. 133–53.

evicted the Dominican tribunal from the city in 1317.[11] But this sect, though small and short-lived, enjoys a unique distinction in that, alone among medieval heresies, the Guglielmites had both the desire and the wherewithal (under Visconti patronage) to commission ecclesiastical art. During their brief lifespan between *c*. 1282 and 1300, at least six Milanese churches were adorned with the sectarians' paintings. Of course these were all destroyed or white-washed, but I have identified one votive image of St Guglielma from *c*. 1450 that seems to have been copied from an old devotional painting in private hands. Nancy Caciola has more recently discovered a *sinopia*, or preparatory drawing, for a Guglielmite Trinity fresco in the abbey of Viboldone – probably sketched shortly before the trial and, for obvious reasons, left unfinished.[12]

In a provocative 2013 essay on 'Empathy for the Oppressor', Richard Kieckhefer has explored the historiography of inquisition. Empathy for persecutors does not come easily to us; it is hard to advocate tolerance for those who seem completely devoid of it. Yet a few historians have tried, pointing out that 'inquisitors may have done nasty things, but they often had sterling personalities. They did their work out of a sense of responsibility grounded in principle. … And a few of them, at least, struck contemporaries as saintly individuals'.[13] Peter Martyr of Verona, assassinated in 1252 in the line of duty, was canonized less than a year later – faster than even St Francis. And Bernard Gui was said by his intimates to be 'a man of contemplative soul and lively conversation', an avid bibliophile, and even a miracle worker. After his death in 1331, he appeared to a prior in a luminous vision. In his case, too, there was talk of canonization, though it was not to be.[14]

Sean Field hardly makes a case for Gui's sanctity, but he does present some unexpected evidence for his integrity. On Field's showing, what Philip IV hoped to achieve with his heretication of the Templars in 1307 was something like a national French Inquisition, anticipating the notorious Spanish one by almost two centuries. The king entrusted the machinery of interrogation (frequently under torture) and eliciting and recording confessions to the Dominicans. Philip had already appointed William of Paris, the leading inquisitor of heretical depravity for the realm of France, as his personal confessor – a truly alarming conflict of interest. Under William's immediate jurisdiction in Paris, 138 Templars reliably confessed to an array of preposterous charges. But the kingdom of France had only two other Dominicans

11 B. Newman, 'The Heretic Saint: Guglielma of Bohemia, Milan, and Brunate', *Church History* 74 (2005), 1–38 (pp. 21–3).

12 Newman, 'Heretic Saint'; N. M. Caciola, 'A Guglielmite Trinity', *California Italian Studies* 6 (2016), 1–20.

13 R. Kieckhefer, 'Empathy for the Oppressor', in *Studies on Medieval Empathies*, ed. K. F. Morrison and R. M. Bell (Turnhout, 2013), pp. 317–36 (p. 321).

14 Kieckhefer, 'Empathy for the Oppressor', pp. 323, 329–30; B. Guenée, *Between Church and State: The Lives of Four French Prelates in the Late Middle Ages*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago, 1991), pp. 69–70.

appointed as papal inquisitors at this time: Bernard Gui in Toulouse and his counterpart, Geoffrey of Ablis, in Carcassonne. Field's research indicates that both kept their distance from the Templar process, cooperating as little as possible, while a third inquisitor in Lorraine (outside the royal domain) explicitly refused to employ torture and thus obtained no confessions. Of course the Dominicans must have been aware that Pope Clement V not only disapproved of Philip's proceedings but had recently suspended the French inquisitors' authority to interrogate Templars. Even so, one can hope that their implicit disobedience to Philip's orders stemmed not only from loyalty to pope over king, but also from reluctance to dirty their hands in an obvious travesty of justice.

It would be hard to muster much empathy for the avarice of Philip IV or the paranoia of John XXII. But the two remaining essays in this volume explore cases of tolerance rather than persecution. Deeana Copeland Klepper looks at the *Speculum clericorum* (1369) of Albert of Diessen, a manual for parish priests in Bavaria. Albert, an Augustinian canon, broke with a long-standing legal tradition of lumping Jews, Muslims, and heretics together as *infideles* – outsiders to Christian society and enemies of God. He did so chiefly because his purpose was to tell diocesan priests what they needed to know, and that included how to maintain equitable (if distant) relations with Jews. But, since there were no Muslims or heretics in his region, he left them out, except for some brief allusions to heresy as a historical category. It is notable, too, that in a revision of 1373, Albert strengthened his emphasis on peaceful coexistence, perhaps because a recent outbreak of plague had intensified the danger of anti-Jewish violence. Klepper's essay, like Field's, is a useful reminder that tolerance and intolerance often depended on local conditions and individual choices. Miri Rubin has shown, for example, that while charges of host desecration commonly led to pogroms, resistance or skepticism on the part of local authorities could keep violence at bay.[15] By the same token, 'heretical depravity' in a region might be prosecuted avidly, sporadically, or not at all, depending on each inquisitor's personal zeal.[16]

Finally, Samantha Kelly's essay takes us to Ethiopia, a realm seldom visited in books on medieval heresy. Orthodox Christians in general could be branded as either heretics or schismatics. But the Ethiopians, as a non-Chalcedonian ('miaphysite') Church, were liable to further censure for what Jacques of Vitry called their 'damned and most terrible heresy' – teaching that Christ had one nature instead of two. Although they were periodically targeted for conversion, missionizing plans failed in large part because of geographical ignorance. Most Europeans had only the foggiest notion of where Ethiopia was, since the catch-all term 'India' could be used to cover both South Asia

15 M. Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven CT, 1999).

16 R. Kieckhefer, 'The Office of Inquisition and Medieval Heresy: The Transition from Personal to Institutional Jurisdiction', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1995), 36–61.

and East Africa. The realm of the legendary priest-king Prester John – a fabulously rich, devout, and heroic ruler – was variously located in India, Central Asia, or Ethiopia. As Kelly shows, however, late medieval Europe's need for an effective military alliance against the Turks encouraged more realistic efforts to reach and establish diplomatic relations with the Ethiopian Orthodox. The urgency of these efforts led to a religious about-face, as Ethiopians went from being heretics to valued brethren and potential allies, even if the desired alliance never quite materialized.

Kelly's research also sheds light on an interesting problem in art history. Otto of Freising's chronicle asserts that the lineage of Prester John goes back to the Magi, while John of Hildesheim's mid-fourteenth-century *Book of the Three Kings* identifies the youngest of the three Magi as a black Ethiopian. In fourteenth-century art we occasionally find black attendants in the retinue of the Magi. But the first important representation of a black Magus, royally robed and crowned, appears to be an *Adoration of the Magi* painted by Hans Multscher as part of the Wurzach Altarpiece, dated 1437.[17] This iconography spread first within the Empire, where depictions of the Magi were especially popular because of the cult centered around their relics in Cologne. After 1460 the black Magus began to appear in Italy, Iberia, and elsewhere in northern Europe, and by 1520 the figure had become standard.[18] Superb examples of the *Adoration* with a black king include works by Hugo van der Goes (*c*. 1470–75), Martin Schongauer (*c*. 1475), Hans Memling (1479), Hieronymus Bosch (*c*. 1494), and Albrecht Dürer (1504–05). After this period we even find earlier representations altered to make one of the Three Kings black, in accord with the new iconographic norm.

African embassies had been steadily arriving in Europe since 1402.[19] The black Magus, who usually has African features as well as dark skin, emerged at this time not simply because of a new interest in universality or the spread of an old literary motif. Rather, as Kelly notes, it was in 1437 that Eugenius IV convened the Council of Ferrara-Florence, and in 1439 he sent envoys to Jerusalem to meet the invited Ethiopian delegates and escort them to Italy. Those delegates arrived in 1441, and the pope deemed their visit so significant that he commissioned new bronze doors for St Peter's to commemorate it. In 1481 more Ethiopian envoys visited Pope Sixtus IV, who received them royally, and by 1497 we find Ethiopians with a permanent residence and chapel, Santo

17 This Magus is dark-skinned but, unlike later representations, does not have a noticeably African face.

18 P. H. D. Kaplan, 'Introduction to the New Edition', in *The Image of the Black in Western Art*, ed. D. Bindman and H. L. Gates, 5 vols. (Cambridge MA, 2010), I.1, 1–30 (pp. 21–5). See also J. Devisse, 'The Black and His Color: From Symbols to Realities', *Image of the Black*, I.1, 121–8.

19 R. C. Trexler, *The Journey of the Magi: Meanings in History of a Christian Story* (Princeton, 1997), pp. 126–8.

Stefano degli Abissini, behind the apse of St Peter's. Kelly points out that the Africans were allowed to celebrate in their own liturgical language, following the Ethiopian Orthodox rite. Before long a few humanists in Rome even set out to learn their sacred 'Chaldean' language. So the black king's growing popularity in the fifteenth century is not just a homage to Prester John, but one spurred by the increasingly visible presence of Ethiopians in Europe.

As for the Council of Florence, it hammered out a fragile formula of union between the Eastern and Western Churches in 1439. That agreement was triumphantly signed by all the attending bishops except one – Mark of Ephesus, who would be canonized by the Orthodox Church for his resistance to Latin heresy. On their return to Constantinople, the Eastern delegates found that neither the monks nor the populace would accept any union with Rome. So the two Churches returned to their mutual recriminations and the proposed military alliance fell through, arguably hastening the fall of Byzantium to the Turks.

After this rambling journey through so many heretical realms, what can we say a 'heretic' was? If this volume has a single dominant theme, it may be the staggering variety of things a person could believe or do to earn that title. A heretic could be someone who attempted the magical assassination of a pope, or conjured dreams of the Virgin Mary through carefully designed meditations. He might claim that priests had invented miracles to mystify the works of nature and deceive the faithful, or she might worship the local saint as a female embodiment of the Holy Spirit. A heretic could rise above humdrum piety through the absolute surrender of her will to Love, or he could make unauthorized predictions about the End Times. Heretics could use leavened bread in the Eucharist, or reject that sacrament entirely. They could maintain subtly variant views about the nature of Christ or intra-Trinitarian relations. They could insist on the absolute poverty of Christ and his apostles, or deny the doctrine of Purgatory. They could be midwives, herbalists, or cunning men whose enemies used the machinery of inquisition to satisfy personal grudges.

Heretics could be idealists. Multitudes were inspired by Joachim of Fiore's vision of a utopian future and Francis of Assisi's joyful renunciation of wealth. Both Carthusians in England and Camaldolese monks in Tuscany found the sublime in Marguerite Porete's sacralized version of *fine amour* (though always *caute legendum*). Dozens of other monks (presumably not the same ones) were eager to deepen their intimacy with the Virgin by operating with John of Morigny's Book of Figures. Conversely, heretics could be cynics. Anticlericalism – the disgruntled awareness of priestly greed, oppression, entitlement, and abuse of power – could provoke either open revolt or tacit non-compliance. Skeptics and materialists, most of whom probably never came to the notice of authorities, simply clung to the evidence of their senses and refused to believe the whole system of revealed doctrine, even if they

went through the motions. Secular rulers whose self-interest clashed with the Church's temporal power might do just as they pleased, incurring the heresy of disobedience by appointing antipopes when it suited them, forming alliances against the papacy, and settling the issue by force of arms.

Heretics could be loners – quirky freethinkers like Limoux Negre or the miller Menocchio. More often, though, they were fiercely loyal to their friends and fellow partisans. When put to the final test, some went to their deaths heroically, like Jacques de Molay and Joan of Arc, inspiring deathless legends. Some recanted and eked out the rest of their miserable days in prison. Pressed under torture to name others who had attended the witches' sabbath or kissed Satan's posterior, many stammered out names and so widened the net of persecution. Above all, heretics were people who defied the Church's authority. They preached without license, copied and circulated forbidden books, interpreted the Bible in their own language without benefit of clergy, resisted interdicts, or reclaimed the beliefs they had been compelled to renounce under torture. Perhaps the easiest way to become a heretic, and one of the most common, was guilt by association, for to defend or assist other heretics could itself be heresy.

Taken together, these essays challenge us once again to ask what it meant to inhabit a 'persecuting society',[20] whether in the centers of power or on its geographical, sociological, or ideological margins, whether as enforcers or dissidents – or simply as people who, through no fault of their own, found themselves in the wrong place at the wrong time, and so had their lives upended.

[20] R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 2007).

Robert E. Lerner: A Chronological Bibliography

1963 'Turner and the Revolt Against E. A. Freeman', *Arizona and the West* 5, 101–8.

1965 'The Uses of Heterodoxy: The French Monarchy and Unbelief in the Thirteenth Century', *French Historical Studies* 4, 189–202.

1968 *The Age of Adversity: The Fourteenth Century* (Ithaca NY).

'Vagabonds and Little Women: The Medieval Netherlandish Dramatic Fragment *De Truwanten*', *Modern Philology* 65, 301–6.

1969 'Weltklerus und religiöse Bewegung im 13. Jahrhundert. Das Beispiel Philipps des Kanzlers', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 51, 94–108.

1971 'The Image of Mixed Liquids in Late Medieval Mystical Thought', *Church History* 40, 397–411.

1972 *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (Berkeley).

1974 'Literacy and Learning', in *One Thousand Years: Western Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard L. DeMolen (Boston), pp. 165–233.

'A Collection of Sermons Given in Paris *c*. 1267, Including a New Text by Saint Bonaventura on the Life of Saint Francis', *Speculum* 49, 466–98.

'A Note on the University Career of Jacques Fournier, O. Cist., later Pope Benedict XII', *Analecta Cisterciensia* 30, 66–9.

1976 'Medieval Prophecy and Religious Dissent', *Past & Present* 72, 3–24.

'Refreshment of the Saints: The Time after Antichrist as a Station for Earthly Progress in Medieval Thought', *Traditio* 32, 97–144.

'An "Angel of Philadelphia" in the Reign of Philip the Fair: The Case of Guiard of Cressonessart', in *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of Joseph R. Strayer*, ed. William Chester Jordan et al. (Princeton), pp. 343–64, 529–40.

1980 *Western Civilizations* (with Standish Meacham and Edward McNall Burns), 2 vols., 9th edn (New York). (Editions of text have been translated into Chinese, Korean, Spanish, and Portuguese.)

'Joachim of Fiore as a Link between Saint Bernard and Innocent III on the Figural Significance of Melchisedech', *Mediaeval Studies* 42, 471–6.

1981 'The Black Death and Western European Eschatological Mentalities', *American Historical Review* 86, 533–52.

1982 *World Civilizations: Their History and Their Culture*, 6th edn (with Philip Lee Ralph, Standish Meacham, and Edward McNall Burns) (New York).

'The Black Death and Western European Eschatological Mentalities' (revised), in *The Black Death: The Impact of the Fourteenth-Century Plague*, ed. Daniel Williman (Binghamton NY), pp. 77–105.

1983 *The Powers of Prophecy: The Cedar of Lebanon Vision from the Mongol Onslaught to the Dawn of the Enlightenment* (Berkeley).

1984 *Western Civilizations* (with Standish Meacham and Edward McNall Burns), 2 vols., 10th edn (New York).

'Les communautés hérétiques (1150–1500)', in *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, ed. Pierre Riché and Guy Lobrichon (Paris), pp. 597–614.

'The "Rich Complexity" of the Late-Medieval Church', *Medievalia et Humanistica* 12, 225–34.

1985 *Weissagungen über die Päpste: Vat. Ross. 374, Entstanden um 1500* (with Robert Moynihan), 2 vols. (Stuttgart).

'Joachim of Fiore's Breakthrough to Chiliasm', *Cristianesimo nella storia* 6, 489–512.

'Antichrists and Antichrist in Joachim of Fiore', *Speculum* 60, 553–70.

'Poverty, Preaching, and Eschatology in the Revelation Commentaries of "Hugh of St. Cher"', in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood (Oxford), pp. 157–89.

'Recent Work on German Speaking Waldenses', in *Rapports: XVI^e Congres International des Sciences Historiques*, ed. August Nitschke (Stuttgart), pp. 360–2.

1986 *World Civilizations: Their History and Their Culture*, 7th edn (with Philip Lee Ralph, Standish Meacham, and Edward McNall Burns) (New York).

'A Case of Religious Counter-Culture: The German Waldensians', *The American Scholar* 55, 234–47.

'Petrarch's Coolness toward Dante: A Conflict of "Humanisms"', in *Intellectuals and Writers in Fourteenth-Century Europe: The J. A. W. Bennett Memorial Lectures, Perugia, 1984*, ed. Pietro Boitani and Anna Torti (Tübingen), pp. 204–25.

1988 *Western Civilizations* (with Standish Meacham and Edward McNall Burns), 2 vols., 11th edn (New York).

'On the Origins of the Earliest Latin Pope Prophecies: A Reconsideration', *Fälschungen im Mittelalter: Internationaler Kongress der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, München, 16.–19. September 1986*, 6 vols. (Hanover), V, 611–35.

'Waldenser, Lollarden und Taboriten. Zum Sektenbegriff bei Weber und Troeltsch', in *Max Webers Sicht des okzidentalen Christentums: Interpretation und Kritik*, ed. Wolfgang Schluchter (Frankfurt), pp. 326–54.

'Frederick II, Alive, Aloft, and Allayed in Franciscan-Joachite Eschatology', in *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, ed. Werner Verbeke et al. (Leuven), pp. 359–84.

1989 'The Pope and the Doctor', *The Yale Review* 78, 62–79.

1990 'On the Origins and the Import of the Columbinus Prophecy' (with Elizabeth A. R. Brown), *Traditio* 45, 219–56.

'Millénarisme littérale et vocation des Juifs chez Jean de Roquetaillade ou la rencontre de l'imaginaire', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome: Moyen Âge* 102, 311–15.

1991 *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages*, rev. edn (Notre Dame IN).

World Civilizations: Their History and Their Culture, 8th edn (with Philip Lee Ralph, Standish Meacham, and Edward McNall Burns) (New York).

'Ernst Kantorowicz and Theodor E. Mommsen', in *An Interrupted Past: German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States*, ed. Hartmut Lehmann and James J. Sheehan (Cambridge), pp. 188–205.

'The Prophetic Manuscripts of the "Renaissance Magus" Pierleone of Spoleto', in *Il profetismo gioachimita tra Quattrocento e Cinquecento*, ed. Gian Luca Potestà (Genoa), pp. 97–116.

'Werner di Friedberg intrappolato dalla legge', in *La parola all'accusato*, ed. Jean-Claude Maire Vigueur and Agostino Paravicini Bagliani (Palermo), pp. 258–71.

1992 'Ecstatic Dissent', *Speculum* 67, 33–57.

'The Medieval Return to the Thousand-Year Sabbath', in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard Emmerson and Bernard McGinn (Ithaca NY), pp. 51–71.

'I "Prelati" dell' "ecclesia spiritualis"', in *Poteri carismatici e informali. Chiesa e società medioevali*, ed. Jole Agrimi et al. (Palermo), pp. 137–52.

1993 *Western Civilizations* (with Standish Meacham and Edward McNall Burns), 2 vols., 12th edn (New York).

'Recent Work on the Origins of the "Genus nequam" Prophecies', *Florensia* 7, 141–57.

'Preface' to *Marguerite Porete: The Mirror of Simple Souls*, trans. Ellen L. Babinsky (New York), pp. 1–3.

1994 *Johannes de Rupescissa,* Liber secretorum eventuum*: Édition critique, traduction et introduction historique* (with Christine Morerod-Fattebert) (Fribourg).

Propaganda miniata: le origini delle profezie papali Ascende calve (with Orit Schwartz), trans. Luca Diego Fiocchi (Milan).

'Illuminated Propaganda: The Origins of the *Ascende calve* Pope Prophecies' (with Orit Schwartz), *Journal of Medieval History* 20, 157–91.

'Writing and Resistance among Beguins of Languedoc and Catalonia', in *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530*, ed. Peter Biller and Anne Hudson (Cambridge), pp. 186–204.

'Himmelsvision oder Sinnendelirium? Franziskaner und Professoren als Traumdeuter im Paris des 13. Jahrhunderts', *Historische Zeitschrift* 259, 337–67.

1995 *Refrigerio dei santi: Gioacchino da Fiore e l'escatologia medievale* (Rome).

Himmelsvision oder Sinnendelirium? Franziskaner und Professoren als Traumdeuter im Paris des 13. Jahrhunderts (stand-alone reprint) (Munich).

'Ernst H. Kantorowicz (1895–1963)', in *Medieval Scholarship: Biographical Studies on the Formation of a Discipline, Volume 1: History*, ed. Helen Damico and Joseph B. Zavadil (New York), pp. 263–76.

'Introduction' to Herbert Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages: The Historical Links Between Heresy, the Mendicant Orders, and the Women's Religious Movement in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Century, with the Historical Foundations of German Mysticism*, trans. Steven Rowan (Notre Dame IN), pp. ix–xxv.

1996 *Neue Richtungen in der hoch– und spätmittelalterlichen Bibelexegese* (editor) (Munich).

'Zur Einführung', in *Neue Richtungen in der hoch- und spätmittelalterlichen Bibelexegese* (Munich), pp. ix–x.

'Afterword', in *Neue Richtungen in der hoch- und spätmittelalterlichen Bibelexegese* (Munich), pp. 181–8.

'"Popular Justice": Rupescissa in Hussite Bohemia', in *Eschatologie und Hussitismus: Internationales Kolloquium, Prag 1.–4. September 1993*, ed. Alexander Patschovsky et al. (Prague), pp. 39–52.

1997 *World Civilizations: Their History and Their Culture*, 9th edn (with Philip Lee Ralph, Standish Meacham, and Edward McNall Burns) (New York).

'New Evidence for the Condemnation of Meister Eckhart', *Speculum* 72, 347–66.

'"Meritorious Academic Service": Kantorowicz and Frankfurt', in *Ernst Kantorowicz: Erträge der Doppeltagung Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Johannes Fried (Stuttgart), pp. 14–32.

'Kantorowicz and Continuity', in *Ernst Kantorowicz: Erträge der Doppeltagung Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Johannes Fried (Stuttgart), pp. 104–23.

1998 *Western Civilizations* (with Standish Meacham and Edward McNall Burns), 2 vols., 13th edn (New York).

'Millennialism', in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Volume 2: Apocalypticism in Western History and Culture*, ed. Bernard McGinn (New York), pp. 326–60.

1999 'Peter Olivi on the Conversion of the Jews', in *Pierre de Jean Olivi (1248–1298): Pensée scolastique, dissidence spirituelle et société*, ed. Alain Boureau and Sylvain Piron (Paris), pp. 207–16.

'Medieval Prophecy and Politics', *Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento* 25, 417–32.

2000 'Preaching in Paris in the Thirteenth Century', *Franciscana* 2, 185–200.

2001 *The Feast of Saint Abraham: Medieval Millenarians and the Jews* (Philadelphia).

'Joachim and the Scholastics', in *Gioacchino da Fiore tra Bernardo di Clairvaux e Innocenzo III*, ed. Roberto Rusconi (Rome), pp. 251–64.

'Gentile of Foligno Interprets the Prophecy "Woe to the World", with an Edition and English Translation' (with Matthias Kaup), *Traditio* 56, 149–211.

2002 *La festa di sant'Abramo: millenarismo gioachimita ed ebrei nel medioevo*, trans. Cristina Colotto (Rome).

2003 'A Newly Discovered Letter by Georg Simmel of May 1918', *Simmel Studies* 13, 425–38.

'Notes bibliographiques' (with Sylvain Piron and Gian Luca Potestà), *Oliviana* 1 (online journal).

2004 'Ornithological Propaganda: The Fourteenth-Century Denigration of Dominicans', in *Politische Reflexion in der Welt des späten Mittelalters / Political Thought in the Age of Scholasticism: Essays in Honour of Jürgen Miethke*, ed. Martin Kaufhold (Leiden), pp. 171–91.

'Medieval Millenarianism and Violence', in *Pace e guerra nel basso medioevo. Atti del XL Convegno storico internazionale, Todi, 12–14 ottobre 2003* (Spoleto), pp. 37–52.

'The Vocation of the Friars Preacher: Hugh of St Cher between Peter the Chanter and Albert the Great', in *Hugues de Saint-Cher (†1263): bibliste et théologien*, ed. Louis-Jacques Bataillon et al. (Turnhout), pp. 215–31.

2005 'Poetry of Gertrud Kantorowicz: Between "Die Blätter für die Kunst" und Theresienstadt', *George-Jahrbuch* 5, 98–109.

'The Jerusalem Rumors: The Earliest Stage of the "Master of Rhodes" Letter on the Birth of Antichrist' (with Jessica Roussanov), *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 2, 157–72.

'Conversations with George Kennan', *Historically Speaking* 6.6, 11–13.

2006 'The Jerusalem Rumors: An Addendum', *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 3, 541–3.

'The Vision of "John, Hermit of the Asturias": Lucas of Tuy, Apostolic Religion, and Eschatological Expectation' (with Christine Morerod), *Traditio* 61, 195–225.

'Eiximenis i la tradició profètica', trans. Eva Izquierdo, *Llengua i literatura* 17, 7–28.

2007 'Reception of Prophecy in Bologna: The *Visio fratris Johannis* in a Hearing of 1299', *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* 61, 67–74.

'Philip the Chancellor Greets the Early Dominicans in Paris', *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 77, 5–17.

'Analecta Rupescissiana', *Franciscana* 9, 1–11.

2008 *Scrutare il futuro: l'eredità di Gioacchino da Fiore alla fine del medioevo* (Rome).

'Fleas: Some Scratchy Issues Concerning the Black Death', *Journal of the Historical Society* 8, 205–28.

'Meister Eckhart's Specter: Fourteenth-Century Uses of the Bull *In agro dominico*, Including a Newly Discovered Inquisitorial Text of 1337', *Mediaeval Studies* 70, 115–34.

2009 *The Powers of Prophecy: The Cedar of Lebanon Vision from the Mongol Onslaught to the Dawn of the Enlightenment*, reprint edn (Ithaca NY).

'John the Astonishing', *Oliviana* 3 (online journal).

'Selective Bibliography of Studies and Editions of High and Late Medieval Latin Eschatological Prophecies, Excluding Works by Joachim of Fiore: 1990–2008' (with Katelyn Mesler), *Oliviana* 3 (online journal).

'Prophetic Utopias: Olivi, Rupescissa and Eiximenis', in *Utopies i alternatives de vida a l'Edat Mitjana*, ed. Flocel Sabaté (Lleida), pp. 69–81.

'Eschatological Prophecy: "Woe to the World in One Hundred Years"', in *Medieval Christianity in Practice*, ed. Miri Rubin (Princeton), pp. 285–9.

2010 'New Light on *The Mirror of Simple Souls*', *Speculum* 85, 91–116.

'Origine, contenuto e fortuna della *Summula pseudogioachimita*', in *Profezie illustrate gioachimite alla corte degli Estensi*, ed. Gian Luca Potestà (Modena), pp. 13–34.

2011 'Letters by Ernst Kantorowicz concerning Woldemar Uxkull and Stefan George', *George-Jahrbuch* 8, 157–74.

'Antichrist Goes to the University: The *De victoria Christi contra Antichristum* of Hugo de Novocastro, OFM (1315/1319)', in *Crossing Boundaries at Medieval Universities*, ed. Spencer Young (Leiden), pp. 277–313.

'*Pertransibunt plurimi*: Reading Daniel to Transgress Authority', in *Knowledge, Discipline and Power in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of David Luscombe*, ed. Joseph Canning et al. (Leiden), pp. 7–28.

'The Secret Germany of Gertrud Kantorowicz', in *A Poet's Reich: Politics and Culture in the George Circle*, ed. Melissa S. Lane and Martin A. Ruehl (Rochester NY), pp. 56–77.

2012 'Alfonso Pecha on Discriminating Truth about the Great Schism', in *Autorität und Wahrheit: Kirchliche Vorstellungen, Normen und Verfahren (13.–15. Jahrhundert)*, ed. Gian Luca Potestà (Munich), pp. 127–46.

'Gertrud Kantorowicz', in *Stefan George und sein Kreis: Ein Handbuch*, 3 vols., ed. Achim Aurnhammer et al. (Berlin), III, 1478–80.

2013 *Marguerite Porete et le* Miroir des simples âmes*: perspectives historiques, philosophiques et littéraires* (editor, with Sean L. Field and Sylvain Piron) (Paris).

'Marguerite Porete et son *Miroir*: perspectives historiques' (with Sean L. Field and Sylvain Piron), in *Marguerite Porete et le* Miroir des simples âmes*: perspectives historiques, philosophiques et littéraires*, ed. Sean L. Field, Robert E. Lerner, and Sylvain Piron (Paris), pp. 9–23.

'Addenda on an Angel', in *Marguerite Porete et le* Miroir des simples âmes*: perspectives historiques, philosophiques et littéraires*, ed. Sean L. Field, Robert E. Lerner, and Sylvain Piron (Paris), pp. 197–213.

2015 'Ernst Kantorowicz's "Methods" Course at Berkeley, 1948–1950', in *Mythen, Körper, Bilder: Ernst Kantorowicz zwischen Historismus, Emigration und Geisteswissenschaften*, ed. Lucas Burkart et al. (Göttingen), pp. 311–28.

'Life, Works, and Fortune of the Prophet Immured', in *Giovanni di Rupescissa,* Vade mecum in tribulatione, ed. Elena Tealdi (Milan), pp. 25–39.

'John Baldwin' (with Gabrielle Spiegel and Jacques Toubert), *Speculum* 90, 889–91.

'Howard Kaminsky' (with Elizabeth A. R. Brown and Felice Lifshitz), *Speculum* 90, 898–901.

2016 'Joachim haud posuit verba ista', in *'Ioachim posuit verba ista': Gli pseudoepigrafi di Gioacchino da Fiore dei secoli XIII e XIV*, ed. Gian Luca Potestà and Marco Rainini (Rome), pp. 171–82.

'Ernst Kantorowicz's Decision', in *'Politisierung der Wissenschaft': Jüdische Wissenschaftler und ihre Gegner an der Universität Frankfurt am Main vor und nach 1933*, ed. Moritz Eppler et al. (Göttingen), pp. 173–91.

'Yet Another Work by John of Rupescissa', *Oliviana* 5 (on–line journal).

2017 *Ernst Kantorowicz: A Life* (Princeton) (French and German translations are forthcoming).

'Briefe von Ernst Kantorowicz und Woldemar von Uxkull-Gyllenband an Josef Liegle' (with Katharina Roettig), *George-Jahrbuch* 11, 323–55.

'A Return to the Evidence for Marguerite Porete's Authorship of the *Mirror of Simple Souls*' (with Sean L. Field and Sylvain Piron), *Journal of Medieval History* 43, 153–73.

'Alfonso Pecha's Treatise on the Origins of the Great Schism: What an Insider "Saw and Heard"', *Traditio* 72, 411–51.

Index

YORK MEDIEVAL PRESS: PUBLICATIONS

Heresy and Inquisition in the Middle Ages

1 *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century: The Textual Representations*, L. J. Sackville (2011)

2 *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Medieval Quercy*, Claire Taylor (2011)

3 *Heresy, Inquisition and Life Cycle in Medieval Languedoc*, Chris Sparks (2014)

4 *Cathars in Question*, ed. Antonio Sennis (2016)

Details of other York Medieval Press volumes are available from Boydell & Brewer Ltd.