# The *Chronicle* of Brother Salimbene: A Polemical Chronicle?

#### Marc Boriosi

"La Cronica de fra Salimbene, une 'Cronique-Polémique'?"

Collectanea Francescana 66 (1996) 127-165 Translated by Edward Hagman, O.F.M. Cap.

The Chronicle of Brother Salimbene' is unquestionably one of the chief works come down to us in the genre of the medieval chronicle. As such it

<sup>2</sup>First edited in 1857 (Chronica fratris Salimbene Ordinis Minorum ex codice Bibliothecae Vaticanae nunc primum edita, in Monumenta Historica ad provinciase Parmensem et Placentium III, Parma 1857), the Chronicle appears in MGH: Cronica fratris Salimbene de Adam Ordinis Minorum, ed. O. Holder-Egger, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica XXXII, Hanover-Leipzig 1905-13. We are using the edition: Salimbene de Adam. Cronica, new

<sup>&#</sup>x27;This article is a summary of the essential points of the themes dev-eloped in my master's thesis, Courants franciscains, mouvements religieux et hérésies dans la "Cronica" de fra Salimbene de Adam, defended November 1994 at the Center for Medieval Studies of the University of Nice, and directed by Professor Monique Zerner. First of all, I wish to express my thanks and gratitude to Michel Lauwers, Assistant Professor of Medieval History at the University of Nice, who began my interest in Salimbene's work and who with great patience guided my research to the writing of this article, which certainly would have never seen the light of day without his help. I also wish to thank Fr. Stanislao da Campagnola, Professor of Church History at the University of Perugia, who very kindly let me take advantage of his flawless knowledge of the Cronica, as well as Fr. Anselmo Mattioli and the personnel of the Oasis Library in Perugia who were so kind in welcoming and assisting me. Finally, thanks to the provincial minister of the Conventuals, Fr. Bernardo Commodi, who made my research in Italy much easier, and to the Capuchins of the Historical Institute in Rome for the warm welcome they gave my study.

has excited the interest of several generations of historians in studies that show a real diversity. Written between 1283 and 1288, most likely in Montefalcone (as indicated by many of the chronicler's allusions'), Salimbene's partially mutilated holograph ended up, after many vicissitudes, in the Latin fund of the Vatican Library, number 7260. In fact, the work of the Franciscan from Parma (which is probably a composite) soon disappeared. No doubt it contained many truths (or falsehoods) that some people did not wish to hear!

### Study Outside the Cloister

If Salimbene's work is special, this is due first of all to the personality of its author. Far from living his vocation in the seclusion of the cloister, Salimbene had a very full life. Its key word was surely mobility. Born into a large family in the city of Parma, a member of

critical edition edited by G. Scalia, Bari 1966 (hereafter *Chronicle*). [Tr. Note: I have used the English translation, *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, trans. Joseph L. Baird, Giuseppe Baglivi, and John Robert Kane (Binghamton, NY: 1986) throughout, with only a few minor changes for the sake of consistency.]

<sup>3</sup>For a general presentation of the subjects treated in the *Chronicle*: Stanislao da Campagnola, "Orientamenti critici interpretativi intorno alla 'cronica' di Salimbene de Adam," in *Laurentianum* 6 (1965) 461-91 and idem, "La 'cronica' di Salimbene de Adam davanti alla critica," in *Archivio Storico delle Provincie Parmensi* 19 (1967) 330-69. We must also mention the work by Nino Scivoletto, *Fra Salimbene da Parma e la storia politica e religiosa del secolo decimoterzo*, Bari 1950, and the proceedings of two symposiums: *Salimbene da Parma*. *Curiosità umana ed esperienza politica in un francescano di sette secoli fa. Studi in occasione delle celebrazione nel VII centenario della morte di Fra Salimbene (1221-1287)*, in *Zenit Quaderni*, supplemento al numero 4 (1987), and *Salimbeniana*, Atti del convegno per il VII centenario di fra Salimbene, Bologna 1991. For a complete bibliography on the subject: Mariano D'Alatri, "Bibliografia Salimbeniana," in idem, *Salimbene da Parma*. *Testimone e cronista* (Bibliotheca seraphico-capuccina, 41), Rome 1992, 245-60.

<sup>†</sup>The *Chronicle* alludes to an act of Nicholas IV, 15 May 1288 (*Chronicle*, 910) and tells of a feat of arms that took place in June 1288 (*Chronicle*, 930).

<sup>5</sup>F. Costa, "In margine alla storia del codice della 'cronica' di Salimbene de Adam," in *MiscFran* 84 (1984) 699-712).

"F. Bernini, "Il parentado e l'ambiente familiare del cronista Frate Salimbene da Parma secondo nuovi documenti," in *AFH* 28 (1935) 345-73, and idem, "Nuovi documenti sulla famiglia del cronista Frate Salimbene," in *AFH* 31 (1938) 198-201.

the fraternity of St. Francis at the age of sixteen,<sup>7</sup> he had to leave his birthplace at once in order to avoid the wrath of his father, a man little inclined to see his son sacrifice his lineage for the love of God and St. Francis.<sup>8</sup> And so Salimbene went into exile on the Adriatic coast (Fano and Jesi) and later in Tuscany, Pisa in particular, where he was first initiated into the teachings of the Joachites.<sup>9</sup>

If his first trips took place in the context of a more or less normal apprenticeship, the reasons for those he took after 1247 are more obscure. At the end of 1247, in order to escape imperial pressure, which was becoming increasingly stronger in his native city, the young Franciscan left for Lyons. On November 1, he arrived in the Rhone capital, where he was received by the Pope, whom he informed about the situation in Italy.<sup>10</sup> It was after this stop in Lyons that our chronicler began his first journey with his companion Giovannino de Ollis, a journey that took them to Paris, which they visited February 2-10, 1248.<sup>11</sup> Then at the conclusion of the Chapter of Sens,<sup>12</sup> in the wake of Louis IX, they made their way to Provence. There they stayed in Hyères, Aix and Arles, where Salimbene perfected his knowledge of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Chronicle I, 136.

<sup>8</sup>Chronicle I, 54-58

<sup>&</sup>quot;Chronicle I, 339: "Nam prius eram edoctus et hanc doctrinam audieram, cum habitarem Pisis.... [For I had heard of this doctrine earlier when I was living in Pisa, where I was taught....]" On the Joachimism of Salimbene, see André Callebaut, "Le joachimiste Benoît, abbé de Camajore et Fra Salimbene," in *AFH* 20 (1927) 219-22, and D.C. West, "The Reformed Church and the Friars Minor. The Moderate Joachite Position of Fra Salimbene," in *AFH* 64 (1971) 273-84.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>Chronicle I, 257: "Eodem anno, cum civitas mea esset obsessa, exivi de Parma et ivi Lugdunum. Et audiens papa statim in festo Omnium Sanctorum misit pro me. Ab illo enim die quo de Parma recesseram et Lugdunum perveneram non habuerat papa nova sive rumores de Parma.... [In that same year, while my city was under siege, I left Parma and went to Lyons. And when the Pope heard of my arrival, he sent for me immediately, on the feast of All Saints, for from the time that I had left Parma to the day I arrived in Lyons, the Pope had received no news or rumor whatsoever from Parma...]"

<sup>11</sup> Chronicle I, 305.

<sup>12</sup> Chronicle I, 316.

Joachite teachings<sup>13</sup> in the circle of Hugh of Digne, maximus joachita. In February 1249, while he was living in the friary in Genoa, Salimbene returned once more to Provence, having been sent there on a mission by his superior. For him this meant the chance for a new journey, which on his return took him across the Alps. 15

Salimbene's numerous trips, over distances that were often quite large, are problematic. If we reject the hypothesis of Jacques Paul, 16 who says that Salimbene returned to France for reasons of studies, we must assume that he was able to enjoy such mobility simply because he was remarkably adept at deceiving his superiors and obtaining "false" obediences legalizing his thirst for discovery. All this is very clear in certain passages of the *Chronicle*, where Salimbene records the reactions of his superior upon learning of his many trips:

You travel around a great deal, boys—now in France, now in Burgundy, now in Provence, now in the convent at Genoa, now in Parma. If I myself could settle down in one place as you can, I wouldn't run around so much.<sup>17</sup>

Nevertheless, our chronicler stopped traveling in 1249, settling down in the city of Ferrara where he stayed for seven years. Later he changed houses within the province several times, but these moves were associated with his preaching activity.

<sup>13</sup> Chronicle I, 323 and 428.

<sup>14</sup>Chronicle I, 466.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup>Chronicle I, 469-71.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup>J. Paul, "Le voyage en France de frère Salimbene (1247-48)," in Voyage, quête, pélerinage dans la littérature et la civilisation médiévale, Aix-en-Provence 1976, 41-59.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup>Chronicle I, 485: "Multum discurritis, pueri, modo in Francia, modo in Burgundia, modo in Provincia, modo in conventu Ianuensi, modo in Parmensi habitare disponitis. Si possem ita quescere sicut vos, non tantum discurrerem."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup>Chronicle I, 446.

In fact, even before he was a famous chronicler, as far back as 1247 and throughout his life as a Friar Minor, 19 Salimbene was a popular and dynamic preacher. We need only recall his activity in the region of Arezzo after his return from a pilgrimage to Assisi,20 or his presence in the company of a group of flagellants in 1260.21 The many exempla found in his account reflect this preaching activity. Besides the exempla, his discourse is often moralizing, always ready to dispense lessons to simple layfolk and princes or clerics alike. Exploiting this aspect of the word Salimbeniana, several authors have suggested that the Chronicle was a full-fledged collection of exempla, a sort of preachers manual for the use of his fellow friars.22 But even though he slips in some advice for his preacher friends from time to time,23 Salimbene apparently did not intend to write a work of this kind. Is it not more due to job conditioning than a desire to produce a liber exemplorum ad usum praedicantium that he achieved this result? At any rate, he never presents himself as anything but a historian:

The various digressions that we have indulged in throughout this chronicle may be excused for three reasons. First of all, such things come to mind despite ourselves and at times when, in good conscience, we could not avoid them.... Second, such digressions have enabled us to say many good and useful things which can best be reported in such a history. Third, we always return to the original subject and never leave out any of the facts of the history on account of our digressions.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Chronicle I, 257.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup>Chronicle II, 808.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup>Chronicle II, 675.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup>Especially A. I. Pini, "Bologna e la Romagna nella 'Cronica sive Liber exemplorum ad usum praedicantium' di Salimbene de Adam," in *Salimbeniana*, 174-97, and C. Casagrande and S. Vecchio, "Cronache, morale, predicazione: Salimbene da Parma e Jacopo da Voragine," in *Studi Medievali* (1989) 749-88.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup>Chronicle II, 800, to give just one example.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup>Chronicle I, 267: "Et quia aliquando videmur digressionem facere alicubi a materia inchoata, parcendum est nobis propter tria. Primo, quia preter intentionem nostram talia nobis occurrunt, que quando que convenienter vitare non possumus, conscientia instigante.... Secundo, quia semper dicimus bona et utilia et digna relatu,

Despite its complex and encyclopedic nature, in the end this late-thirteenth-century work by the Franciscan from Parma belongs more to the genre of universal chronicle. Although the part that has come down to us relates only events that occurred after the 1170s, we know from the author himself that the first part of his work was based essentially on the chronicle of Sicardo of Cremona, whose universal character is beyond doubt. In all probability it makes up the main part, if not the entire first two hundred folios that have disappeared today. We can theorize, moreover, that the reason this first part of Salimbene's *Chronicle* was not preserved is because it was not original.

The fact remains that the work contains a good number of peculiarities. Thus it is hard to classify categorically in one literary form or another. Written toward the end of his life, it is by turns autobiographical, historical, religious and moralizing. It is more like an assessment of a life spent in the service of the Church, the faithful, and the Franciscan ideal. And if we try to understand the work's consistency, the connections between the different episodes narrated, we can bring out a new dimension: the work is a great libellus. As such, it offers a rigorous, systematic defense of the current that was pushing for the intellectualization and clericalization of the Order of Friars Minor, and consequently was opposed to the conservative, spiritual party.

Therefore, Salimbene's *Chronicle* appears to us a kind of "polemical chronicle," part of the debate and intrigues experienced by the Order of Friars Minor during the last half of the thirteenth century and the first years of the fourteenth.

et que possunt optime in hystoria computari. Tertio, quia optime redimus postea ad materiam inchoatam et nichil dimittimus propter hoc de veritate narrationis historie primitive."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup>Chronicle I, 40. The chronicle of Sicardo of Cremona was edited by O. Holder-Egger, MGH XXXI, 78-183. Holder-Egger noticed some differences from the text as found in Salimbene's work, which would mean that the latter used a second version made by Sicardo upon his return from the Holy Land.

### A Key to the Chronicle: the Book of the Prelate

Forming a nearly autonomous section within the *Chronicle*, the *Book of the Prelate*<sup>26</sup> is unquestionably the keystone of our Franciscan chronicler's entire structure. A long thirteen-point diatribe against the "bad" minister general, Brother Elias of Cortona, followed by the portrait of an ideal prelate, these pages are an *a posteriori* proof of the plotting and intrigues that brought about the Franciscan leader's fall. With consummate skill, Salimbene turns every action, every decision of Elias into a fault worthy of condemnation. Yet none of his accusations, which are superficial and mostly untrue, can stand up to an examination of the facts.

#### Criticism of Brother Elias27

Salimbene's whole discourse is organized around three basic charges against the man and what he stands for, and his leadership of the fraternity founded by St. Francis. First of all, Salimbene stresses the maxima rusticitas Elias is said to have shown when meeting the podestà of Parma,<sup>28</sup> an attitude that obviously expressed his desire for independence in the case of a great secular lord. Contained in this phrase, no doubt, is all the scorn that our chronicler (who was born into a very rich family<sup>29</sup>) was capable of feeling toward a man of much more modest condition.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup>Chronicle I, 136-239.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup>For this key figure of the first Franciscan century, see E. Lempp, Frère Elie de Cortone, Paris 1901; Giulia Barone, Frate Elia, in Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano 85 (1975) 89-144.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup>Chronicle I, 139-40.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup>Chronicle I, 51-52; 75-80.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup>Chronicle I, 137: "Fuit enim unus parens fratris Helye, scilicet pater, de episcopatu Bononie, de Castro Brittorum, mater vero de Assisio fuit; et vocabatur in seculo Bonusbaro et suebat cultras et docebat puerulos in civitate Assisii psalterium legere.... [For Elias was of humble parentage—his father was from Castel de' Britti in the bishopric of Bologna and his mother from Assisi—and before he entered the Order he used to earn his living by sewing cushions and teaching the children of Assisi to read their psalters. In the secular world he was called Bonusbaro....]"

All this is spelled out in the second and third faults, where Elias is accused of receiving "many useless men" into the Order<sup>31</sup> and raising them to positions of leadership, even though they lacked the necessary qualities.<sup>32</sup> The examples cited leave no doubt that Salimbene deplores the very large number of lay brothers within the movement:

I lived in the convent of Siena for two years, for example, and I saw twenty-five lay brothers there. Then I lived in Pisa for four years, and I saw thirty lay brothers living there.<sup>33</sup>

After this first anti-lay offensive, Salimbene launches a more direct attack against the way in which Brother Elias ran the Order. In fact, his fourth fault was his resistance to change: no new measures saw the light of day under his generalate. The sixth fault is the tremendous pressure, both financial and political, he exerted on all the provincial ministers and guardians. Finally, the eighth fault is a summary that enables us to see clearly Salimbene's ulterior motives:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup>Chronicle I, 141: "Porro secundus defectus fratris Helye fuit quia multos inutiles recepit ad Ordinem. [A second fault of Brother Elias was that he accepted many useless men into the Order.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup>Chronicle I, 144: "Tertius defectus fratris Helye fuit quia homines indignos promovit ad officia Ordinis. Faciebat enim laicos guardianos, custodes et ministros, quod absurdum erat valde, cum in Ordine esset copia bonorum clericorum. [The third fault of Brother Elias was that he promoted unworthy men to offices in the Order. For he placed lay brothers in the positions of guardians, custodians, and ministers, an absurd practice, since there was an abundance of good clerics available in the Order.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup>Chronicle I, 141-42: "Habitavi in conventu Senensi duobus annis, et vidi ibi XXV fratres laycos. Habitavi in Pisano IIII annis, et vidi ibi XXX fratres laycos habitantes."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup>Chronicle I, 145: "Quartus defectus fratris Helye fuit quod, toto tempore quo fuit minister, non fuerunt generales constitutiones in Ordine, ex quibus et regula conservatur, et regitur Ordo, et vivitur uniformiter, et multa bona proveniunt. [The fourth fault of Brother Elias was that during his entire term of office there were no constitutions instituted to govern the Order and thereby to attain the desirable goals of preserving the Rule and regulating the Order and making it uniform.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup>Chronicle I, 148: "Sextus defectus fratris Helye fuit quia ministros provinciales affligebat et vituperabat, nisi redimerent vexationem suam tributa

The eighth fault of Brother Elias was that he attempted to retain rule over the Order by violence. In order to do this, he made use of many political maneuvers. First of all, he changed ministers frequently, so that they could not become firmly enough ensconced to rise up against him. Second, he put only men he considered friends in the post of minister. Third, he held no general chapters....<sup>36</sup>

What our chronicler condemns in this series of accusations is the minister general's unlimited power in managing the affairs of the Order. Yet Elias was no exception in this regard. As Salimbene himself points out, things were the same during the time of St. Francis and his immediate successor, John Parenti. Teven if Elias was very likely authoritarian and headstrong, he was only exercising power with the means granted him by the Later Rule. And Salimbene shows great audacity in trying to pass Brother Elias off as an unworthy friar when, by way of a ninth fault, he accuses him of relying on his circle of friends to keep him in office, even though what he did was authorized by the Rule itself.

Finally, Salimbene accuses Elias of refusing to convoke general chapters. At first glance, this does not look like an argument in favor of the ex-minister general.<sup>39</sup> But given the Order's amazing growth during

solvendo et sibi munera dando.... [The sixth fault of Brother Elias was that he treated the provincial ministers harshly and abusively unless they paid him off with money and gifts....]."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup>Chronicle I, 232: "Octavus defectus fratris Helye fuit quia violenter voluit tenere dominium Ordinis; quod ut melius tenere posset, plures sagacitates habebat: primam, quia frequenter mutabat ministros, ne nimis radicati fortius insurgerent contra ipsum; secundam, quod illos fratres faciebat ministros, quos reputabat amicos; tertiam, quia non faciebat capitula generalia...."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup>Chronicle I, 145.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup>In chapter VIII of the Later Rule we read: "Let all the brothers be found to have always one of the brothers of this Order as minister general and servant of the whole fraternity and let them be strictly bound to obey him." Likewise, Admonition III says: "Should a subject see that some things might be better and more useful for his soul than what a prelate commands, let him willingly offer such things to God as a sacrifice; and, instead, let him earnestly strive to fulfill the wishes of the prelate."

<sup>39</sup>Be that as it may, the Later Rule says nothing about the frequency of

its first decades of existence, it was becoming increasingly difficult for every provincial minister to gather annually in Assisi for a plenary meeting, often of indeterminate length. The fifteenth fault, says Salimbene, is that Elias never visited the Order, 40 forgetting that it was on the occasion of the latter's passage through Parma that our chronicler was received into the Franciscan fraternity. 41 Moreover. systematic visits to all the provinces of the Order was not yet standard practice in the 1230s. Salimbene himself mentions that the first one to carry out such a physical feat was John of Parma between 1247 and 1257.42 The ex-general's lifestyle is also ridiculed; this is his seventh fault. Once we dismiss the argument about the minister general's place of residence as being without any real foundation," the book leaves us with a body of facts that enable us to follow the author's analysis. Indeed, even though Salimbene admits that Elias was often compelled by poor health to travel on horseback, 45 the fact remains that, seduced by the Benedictine ideal, 46 he liked to live rather comfortably. But the

general chapters, mentioning only that they must be held at Pentecost.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup>Chronicle I, 147: "Quintus defectus fratris Helye fuit quia nunquam personaliter volebat Ordinem visitare.... [The fifth fault of Brother Elias was that he would never personally visit the districts of the Order....]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup>Chronicle I, 136.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup>Chronicle I, 434: "Hic fuit primus generalis qui cepit Ordinem circuire et provincias Ordinis visitare, quod consuetum prius non erat.... [He was the first minister general to make trips in order to visit all the various provinces of the Order, a fact which...was never the custom before.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup>Chronicle I, 231: "Porro septimus defectus fratris Helye fuit quia nimis volebat splendide et delitiose et pompatice vivere. [The seventh fault of Brother Elias was that he wanted to live too luxuriously amid pomp and splendor.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup>Despite what Salimbene may say (*Chronicle* I, 231), the architecture of the friary in Cortona differs only slightly from that of other Franciscan buildings dating from the same period.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup>Chronicle I, 231: "...et semper ibat eques, etiam si transibat ab una ecclesia ad aliam per dimidium miliare.... [...and he always rode wherever he went, even if he were travelling just half a mile from one church to another.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup>Gratien de Paris, *Histoire de la fondation et de l'évolution de l'Ordre des Frères Mineurs au XIII*<sup>rme</sup> siècle, Paris 1913 (revised and enlarged edition, Rome 1982), 143.

importance of this fact is scarcely equal to Salimbene's fulsome description of it.

What is more, this desire to do harm often leads our chronicler to certain contradictions. Thus when in the eighth fault he speaks of Brother Elias's personal "dictatorship" and accuses him of changing ministers frequently, he forgets that a few pages earlier he was using these words to comment on the general's deposition: "It should be borne in mind that the preservation of a religious order requires a frequent change of leaders...."

Beginning with the tenth fault, Salimbene criticizes Elias's behavior following his deposition. First of all, there was his support for the party of the emperor, Frederick II—a logical position for a man who had evidently just lost the trust and protection of the Pope. 48 Often a mediator between the two parties, 40 the deposed minister had no trouble inserting himself, forgetting that by so doing he was placing himself in a most awkward situation. In fact, the axe fell almost immediately: Elias was excommunicated. 50

Once tensions relaxed, there was a real attempt at reconciliation, but it failed. Salimbene denounces this rupture as the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup>Chronicle I, 159: "Notandum quod conservatio religionum est frequens mutatio prelatorum...."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup>Chronicle I, 234: "Decimus defectus fratris Helye fuit quia, postquam fuit absolutus a generali officio, nec humiliter nec patienter se habuit, sed imperatori Friderico a Gregorio papa iam excommunicato totaliter adhesit, equitando cum ipso et cum eo morando in habitu Ordinis cum quibusdam fratribus qui erant de familia sua; quod redundabat in scandalum pape, in scandalum Ecclesie et in scandalum Ordinis sui, presertim quia imperator excommunicatus iam erat.... [The tenth fault of Brother Elias was that after his deposition, he did not conduct himself with humility but rather attached himself wholly to the Emperor Frederick, who had been excommunicated by Pope Gregory IX. And while living at the imperial court, Brother Elias accompanied the emperor on horseback, although he continued to wear the robes of the Order (as did all the other members of his retinue), an act which scandalized the Pope, the Church, and his own Order. And all this in spite of the fact that the emperor was excommunicate.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup>Chronicle I, 136.

<sup>50</sup> Chronicle I, 235.

twelfth fault: Elias is accused of wanting to hold the friars responsible for his deposition and refusing to accept any blame whatsoever in the affair.<sup>51</sup>

To dirty the picture, Salimbene presents this rupture as definitive in the thirteenth point. He fails to mention that at the end of his life, Elias of Cortona felt the need to be reunited with his brothers and return to the Church by confessing his faults in order to receive pardon. Salimbene also leaves hanging the question about the state of Elias's soul at the time of his death—as if he wanted us to remember that Elias left "this shipwrecked world" as an excommunicate. But three days after his death, April 25, 1253, legal proceedings were begun. Testifying were those who had witnessed his death along with the clerics who had been present during his last moments and declared him rehabilitated. His absolution was recognized by the papacy, as Salimbene surely knew.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup>Chronicle I, 235: "Duodecimus defectus fratris Helye fuit quia, postquam erat depositus et ibat cum imperatore vagabundus, quadam die venit ad quemdam locum fratrum Minorum et congregatis fratribus in capitulo cepit velle ostendere innocentiam suam quomodo fratres deposuerant eum. [The twelfth fault of Brother Elias was that, even after his deposition and his sojourn with the Emperor, he sought to establish his innocence and to prove the injustice of the Order in deposing him. For once he arrived at a convent of the Friars Minor just as the brothers had gathered together for a chapter meeting....]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup>Chronicle I, 237: "Tertius decimus defectus fratris Helye fuit quia nunquam voluit Ordini suo reconciliari, sed semper usque ad ultimum diem vite sue permansit in pertinatia sua. [The thirteenth fault of Brother Elias was that he never sought to be reconciled to his Order, but persisted in his obstinacy until the day he died..]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</sup>L. Mirri, Frate Elia da Cortona. Profilo storico, Assisi 1932, 18-19.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup>Chronicle I, 238: "Igitur processu temporis mortuus est frater Helyas. Excommunicatus erat prius a papa Gregorio nono. Si fuit absolutus et si bene ordinavit de anima sua, modo cognoscit. [Finally, Brother Elias died. Earlier, he had been excommunicated by Pope Gregory IX, and whether or not he was ever reconciled to the Church and had put his soul in order, he now knows.]"

<sup>55</sup> The proceedings are published by E. Lempp, Frère Elie de Cortone, 179-87.

Having come to the end of this list, we really must ask what lay behind this wave of accusations against the man who had received the young Ognibene<sup>56</sup> into the Order in 1238. His concept of the Order shows through in his criticism of the ex-minister general. It is a concept that favors the intellectualization and clericalization of the Order of Friars Minor. In the Book of the Prelate—and more generally in the Chronicle—Salimbene adopts a very clear position vis-à-vis the changes taking place in the Order during the thirteenth century.

#### Salimbene and the Evolution of the Order

At the beginning, the fraternity was nothing more a handful of laymen from the region of Assisi who followed Francis. But with subsequent papal approval, it experienced a considerable growth in numbers and extent, bringing in clerics as well as laity. As early as 1220, Jacques de Vitry was stressing the dangers of such living together:

But, to our way of thinking, this Order constitutes a danger because it sends out not only formed religious, two by two, throughout the world, but also imperfectly formed young men who should rather be tried and subjected to strict conventual discipline for a period of time.<sup>57</sup>

At first, Francis remained inflexible with regard to his ideals. Chapter X of the Later Rule states that "those who are illiterate should not be anxious to learn." But gradually he was obliged to accept certain changes in his fraternity's manner of operation. Thus things were already quite stormy by the time Elias arrived on center stage. The first great innovation in the Order was the introduction of studies, and as Salimbene mentions, this was Elias's own personal doing. It is the only good quality our chronicler acknowledges in him. 
<sup>59</sup> And so it is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup>This was Salimbene's baptismal name (Chronicle I, 53).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup>Gratien de Paris, Histoire de la fondation, 64.

<sup>58</sup> Oeuvres de saint François, 90.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup>Chronicle I, 147: "Nam hoc solum habuit bonum frater Helyas, quia Ordinem fratrum Minorum ad studium theologie promovit. [For Brother Elias did have this single good quality: he promoted the study of theology in the Order.]"

clear that, far from embodying a conservative policy, Elias of Cortona was a true reformer. What is more, it was with great difficulty that he attained the highest position of responsibility in the Order.

At Francis's death, it seemed from everything that he would become the legitimate successor. But his violent opposition to the first companions, who rejected his plans for a great basilica, led to the election during the general chapter in Assisi of John Parenti, who became the first minister general of the Franciscan Order. At the next chapter, held on the occasion of the transfer of Francis's body, Brother Elias, supported by his allies, seemed once again to be in the best position. But his plans were thwarted by accusations that he was responsible for the too-hasty transfer of the Saint. Once again this was a maneuver aimed at removing Elias from power, since Salimbene, totally opposed to him though he was, mentions nothing unusual about the ceremony:

In the year of the Lord 1230 a general chapter of the Friars Minor was held at Assisi, at which time the translation of the remains of St. Francis took place, on May 25.... And on that same day God did many other miracles through his servant and friend Francis, which are certainly worthy of recording, but for which I refer you to the life and legend of St. Francis. <sup>61</sup>

At that point our chronicler did not consider the minister general deserving of any condemnation at all.<sup>62</sup> Thus we must ask ourselves what it was that drove Salimbene into the camp of Elias's enemies. Here the *Book of the Prelate* is of vital importance. Based on

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup>It was Brother Elias whose encyclical letter announced to all the provincial ministers the death of Francis of Assisi, thus claiming to be his legitimate successor.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup>Chronicle I, 96: "Anno Dominice incarnationis MCCXXX generale capitulum fratrum Minorum Assisii est celebratum. In quo corporis beati Francisci, VIII kal. Iunii, translatio facta fuit.... Multa etiam alia miracula fecit eadem die Deus per servum et amicum suum Franciscum digna relatu, pro quibus ad legendam suam poteris habere recursum."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup>At first Salimbene was among the supporters of Elias. It was not until he realized that Elias was initiating only limited changes that our chronicler joined the camp of Elias's enemies.

the criticisms directed against Brother Elias, it seems clear that even though the minister general supported certain adaptations of the Rule, he did not want to commit himself to a path that would lead to total clericalization of the fraternity. Since his views set him at odds with the clerical fringe (and by extension, with the plans of the papacy), he was deposed so that the process begun might be properly concluded. In fact, Brother Elias had reached the point that he was supported by no one. Already prey to the opposition of the friars called "zealots," he was abandoned by most of those who had pushed for his election.

As presented in the *Chronicle*, the revolt that brought about his fall started with his reinstatement of the decree concerning visitors. It escalated quickly in the foreign provinces of the Order thanks to the joint activity of Haymo of Faversham (d. 1244), Alexander of Hales (d. 1245), and John of La Rochelle (d. 1245), and it was passed along to Rome by Brother Arnulf, who was penitentiary in the curia. Despite Elias's resistance, the plot was a complete success, guided as it was by a master's hand, and Blessed Giles could only exclaim: Paris! Paris! Why are you destroying the Order of St. Francis!

The logic of Elias's eviction should inevitably have propelled one of the noted rebel leaders to the top of the Franciscan hierarchy. In fact, it did nothing of the sort, since the choice fell on an old man, Brother Albert of Pisa (d. 1240). Although a cleric and a man of letters, he was far from being the one needed to continue the program of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>63</sup>This office was officially established by John Parenti. These friars, who legally represented the authority of the minister general, had been sent to each province of the Order to watch over the administration of each provincial minister and to settle potential conflicts between the friars and their superiors (*Chronicle* I, 151-52).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup>Chronicle I, 232: "Ad hoc autem, ut ista congregatio in generali capitulo fieret omnium ministrorum ad deponendum Helyas, multum laboravit frater Arnulfus Anglicus ex Ordine Minorum, homo sanctus et litteratus et zelator Ordinis et promotor; erat enim tunc temporis penitentiarus in curia domini Gregorii pape noni. [It was Brother Arnulf the Englishman who labored most strenuously to bring this general chapter of all the ministers together for the deposition of Brother Elias. Now, Brother Arnulf was a holy and learned man, an enthusiastic promoter of the Order; and he was at that time penitentiary in the court of Pope Gregory IX.]"

<sup>65</sup> Analecta Franciscana III, 86.

reform. Salimbene was under no illusions in this regard, for he quickly passes over this minister general and his immediate successors as well. And he spends only a little time on the decision by Crescentius of Jesi (d. 1246) to charge Thomas of Celano (d. 1260) with the writing of a new life of St. Francis to mark the split that had just occurred in the Order.

The fact is that, besides Elias, only one other minister general appears throughout in the *Chronicle*: John of Parma (d. 1289). A true admirer, Salimbene does not hesitate to present him as the ideal minister general. The least that can be said is that John's generalate represented a definite break in the process begun with the deposition of Brother Elias. Consequently, Salimbene's unlimited support of this distinguished figure who preached absolute respect for the main elements of primitive Franciscanism, may throw us off somewhat. But in the *Chronicle* very few questions remain unanswered!

First of all, they share a common place of origin, a fact not to be overlooked, given our knowledge of Salimbene's very strong feelings for his city. Equally important is the Joachimism of both men. But above all, there is the fact that our chronicler sees the person of John of Parma as the necessary complement to the negative figure of Brother Elias. Whereas Elias was fond of luxury, Brother John becomes a follower of the most pure Franciscan poverty; Hereas Elias fights to preserve his position, Brother John agrees to relinquish his. Salimbene interprets the facts as needed, disguising the minister general's deposition in 1257 as a voluntary departure. By proposing John of

<sup>66</sup> Chronicle I, 241.

<sup>67</sup> Chronicle I, 433-34.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup>L. Gatto, "Il sentimento cittadino nella 'Cronica' di Salimbene," in *La coscienza cittadina nei comuni italiani nel duecento*. Atti del XI convegno del Centro di Studi sulla Spiritualità Medioevale (11-14/10/1970), Todi 1972, 365-94.

<sup>69</sup> Chronicle I, 431.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup>Chronicle I, 450-51: "Ultimum generale capitulum quod sub eo celebratum fuit acceleravit, quia penitus nolebat esse minister; et factum est Rome, in festo Purificationis, anno Domini MCCLVII. Et steterunt per unum diem ministri et custodes et discreti, quod in negotiis capituli processum non est, quia penitus nolebant ipsum absolvere. Tunc ingressus locum capituli protulit verba sua

Parma as a model whose charisma he recognized, Salimbene added to the weight of his arguments in the service of the clerical cause.

Still, we must remember that the only link between Salimbene and John of Parma appears to be their Joachite beliefs. For the rest, we must cite their basic differences, especially on the question of the Spirituals and the Testament of Francis. Both are admittedly hard to situate within the two great opposing forces; in reality, their position seems to be in the middle. The question arises, then, of how to classify the currents or tendencies within the Order of Friars Minor.

## Classification of Franciscan Currents in the Thirteenth Century

Years ago, in an article devoted to the Provençal Franciscan, Hugh of Digne (d. 1255), Jacques Paul pointed out this middle current between the spiritual position and the extremism of the clericals.<sup>71</sup>

secundum quod scivit et voluit dicere. Tunc hic quibus electio incumbebat, videntes angustiam anime eius, quamvis male libenter, dixerunt ei: 'Pater, vos, qui visitastis Ordinem et cognoscitis mores et conditiones fratrum, assignetis nobis unum ydoneum fratrem, quem constituamus super hoc opus, et vobis succedat.' Et statim assignavit fratrem Bonaventuram de Bagnoreto et dixit quod in Ordine meliorem eo non cognoscebat [He hastened the end of the last general chapter that he presided over, because he no longer wished, by any means, to remain minister general. This chapter was held in Rome, during the feast of the Purification in the year of the Lord 1257. And the business of this chapter was completely stalled for one whole day because the ministers, the custodians, and the delegates did not want to allow him to step down from his office. Finally, Brother John went into the chapter meeting and made known his full desire according to his understanding of the situation. Then, seeing the anguish of his spirit, those whose duty it was to see to elections, said to him, though against their will, 'Father, you have traveled throughout the Order and you know the ways of all the brothers very well indeed; therefore, you select a suitable brother to succeed you.' And immediately he selected Brother Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, saying that he knew not a better man in the entire Order.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup>J. Paul, "Hugues de Digne," in Franciscains d'Oc. Les Spirituels ca. 1280-1324 (Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 10), Toulouse 1975, 32-45. On the Franciscan from Hyères, we may also cite Ubald d'Alençon, "Hyères Franciscains," in Études Franciscaines 34 (1922) 239-46, and Alessandra Sisto, Figure del primo francescanesimo in Provenza. Ugo e Douceline di Digne (Bibliotheca della rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa, 111), Florence 1971.

Basing himself on the accounts of Joinville, the statements of Salimbene, and precious information found in the autobiographical works of Brother Hugh, he gave an interesting interpretation of the theories defended by Hugh. These were based essentially on a strong conventual ideal and deep Joachite beliefs, and on a respect for the precepts of St. Francis, especially in the area of poverty.

Salimbene's autobiographical accounts of his formation enable us to suggest that Hugh of Digne was his intellectual guide. But we cannot say that the two men were exactly in the same camp. Like John of Parma, Hugh of Digne definitely represented the moderate camp regarding the different questions being discussed at the time. Salimbene seems more radical, especially when he defends with conviction the privileges granted by Martin IV<sup>72</sup> in the bulls Ad fructus uberes and Exultantes in Domino. Within the Order of Friars Minor, there were not just two or three opposing factions but a great variety of currents. Can we classify them in outline form?<sup>73</sup>

On the extreme conservative side, we have of course the fringe consisting of the Spirituals from the Marches of Ancona and, more generally, central Italy. Direct descendants of the first generation of Francis's companions, convinced Joachites, led by Liberato of Macerata (d. 1307) and Angelo Clareno (d. 1337), they advocated a blanket return to primitive Franciscanism. They unanimously rejected all privileges granted to the Order since the death of Francis, and the only legal structure they would accept was the *Rule of 1223* and the Seraphic Father's *Testament*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>72</sup>Chronicle I, 595-96: "...recte fecit papa Martinus quartus, qui dedit Ordini fratrum Minorum privilegium optimum per quod possunt libere predicare et confessiones audire, non obstante quod in eorum regula dicebatur, scilicet quod «fratres non predicent in episcopatu alicuius episcopi cum ab eo illis fuerit contradictio». [...Pope Martin IV acted rightly in granting the privilege of preaching and hearing confessions to the Order of Friars Minor, despite the fact that the Franciscan Rule states, 'Let the Brothers not preach in any bishopric against the will of the bishop.']"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</sup>Here we are dealing with what is no more than a working hypothesis, based entirely on analysis of the *Chronicle*. The analysis needs to be extended to the all the early Franciscan sources.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</sup>René de Nantes, Histoire des Spirituels dans l'Ordre franciscain, Paris 1909.

More moderate in their position, the Spirituals of Provence, grouped around Peter John Olivi (d. 1298), must be distinguished a bit from their trans-Alpine counterparts. Borrowing a great deal from Hugh of Digne, they stood out especially in the area of poverty, of which Olivi, together with Ubertino of Casale (+1328), was a staunch defender. The differences between these two branches of the Spirituals are easily measured by the treatment they reserved for their two leaders. Summoned several times to explain and defend himself, Peter John Olivi was in the end very little harassed and was allowed to end his life as a lector in the friary in Montpellier. Angelo Clareno, on the other hand, was declared a heretic. Excommunicated and hounded, he had to flee from monastery to monastery until the end of his life.

Next, we have a group that, numerically speaking, was certainly the most important throughout the thirteenth century: the non-involved. These were the friars in the community whose sole choice was to obey the minister general and the provincial ministers. On the side of the reformers, the most moderate were undoubtedly the followers of John of Parma and Hugh of Digne. Attached to the Testament and avoiding a complete break with the spiritual movement, they remained defenders of gradual adaptation on the part of the Order to the new realities of the age.

Firmer in dealing with the conservative threat, St. Bonaventure (d. 1274) embodies the other wing of the moderate party, seeing that he was always anxious to maintain ties with the spirit of St. Francis. Besides, there was nothing really innovative about his actions, for, as Salimbene very rightly emphasizes, he only brought order to the laws already in existence. In fact, the constitutions of 1260, often remembered as the product of Bonaventure's thought, are nothing but a restatement of those enacted during the protest chapter of 1239 that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>75</sup>Franciscains d'Oc. Les Spirituels ca. 1280-1324 (Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 10), Toulouse 1975.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup>Chronicle I, 233: "Et in illo capitulo facta est maxima multitudo constitutionum generalium, sed non erant ordinate, quas processu temporis ordinavit frater Bonaventura generalis minister, et parum addidit de suo.... [Also at that chapter a large number of constitutions were written, although they were not organized until later under the minister generalate of Brother Bonaventure, at which time they were codified by Bonaventure, although he added very few of his own....]"

led to the deposition of Brother Elias." The ex-general could represent another reforming current: although he wished to promote studies in the Order, Elias did not intend to transform it into an entirely clerical institute.

Finally, on the far extreme, we have the university doctors, eager for privileges, and in their train, all those friars whose only hope was that the Order would replace the secular clergy in the pastoral care of the laity. This led to many crises, and in 1274 the mendicant orders were almost suppressed.<sup>78</sup>

Salimbene, as seen through his work, seems hard to place within this hodgepodge. On the one hand, his affection and admiration for John of Parma and Hugh of Digne classify him among the moderates; on the other hand, his arrogance and some of his positions mentioned earlier push him toward the camp of the most bitter extremists. Nevertheless, looking at his statements as a whole, a rough classification begins to take shape. An ardent foe of the conservative Spirituals who were so opposed to the *curialiatas* he loves to praise, Salimbene, as a convinced supporter of clericalization, uses every means at his disposal to support the cause so dear to his heart, which happened to be threatened at the end of the thirteenth century. Therein lies the whole meaning of the Book of the Prelate and the entire Chronicle—a true polemic and the testament of a friar come to the end of a life devoted to the defense of his convictions.

## Secular Clergy and Lay Religious as Seen through Salimbene's "Filter" 81

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>77</sup>H. Roggen, "Saint Bonaventure second fondateur de l'Ordre des Frères Mineurs?" in *Etudes Franciscaines* 17 (1967) 67-79.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>78</sup>1274 année charnière. Mutations et continuités. Actes du colloque international du CNRS 518, Paris 1977.

<sup>79</sup>See above.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>80</sup>C. Violante, "Motivi e caratteri della 'cronica' di Salimbene," in *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 22 (1953) 110-14; C. Casagrande and S. Veccho, *Cronache, morale, predicazione*, 754-55; S. Vecchio, "Valori laici e valori francescani nella 'Cronica' di Salimbene da Parma," in *Salimbeniana*, 260-62.

<sup>81</sup> This concept of a Franciscan filter through which Salimbene views the

The Book of the Prelate is not only directed toward criticism of Brother Elias; in it Salimbene also takes up the subject of the secular clergy. But our chronicler does not launch headlong into a bitter critique of the secular clergy modeled on that of the ex-minister general. First, he draws a portrait of the ideal priest that will serve his point of view as Friar Minor. Thus he lays down three qualities necessary for the exercise of the priesthood and three faults incompatible with the exercise of ecclesiastical responsibility. But a service of ecclesiastical responsibility.

## Salimbene Face to Face with the Secular Clergy: Defense of a Position

True to his rhetorical method, he draws up a veritable catalogue of scriptural quotations and patristic references to back up each point of his argument, one at a time. For Salimbene, the first quality is wisdom, 44 which can be likened to intelligence, culture and a quick mind. This desire to intellectualize church ministry from the outset fits in perfectly with the ideal he means to defend in his work. Salimbene outdoes himself in stressing that everyone remains master of his own choice and must know how to refuse an office for which he is unfit. 45 Even if the primary aim of these words is to make unworthy

events of the thirteenth century was developed by M. P. Alberzoni, "Un mendicante di fronte alla vita della Chiesa nella seconda metà del Duecento. Motivi religiosi nella Cronica di Salimbene," in *Salimbeniana*, 7-34.

<sup>82</sup> Chronicle I, 239: "Explicit liber de prelatis in quo multa utilia continentur tam de bonis quam de malis prelatis. [Explicit the Book of the Prelate which contains many useful things about good and evil prelates.]"

<sup>83</sup> Chronicle I, 173.

<sup>84</sup>Chronicle I, 173: "Dico quod prelatus, primo, debet habere sapientiam, ut sapienter regat subditos sibi commissos. [I say that a prelate ought, first of all, to have wisdom, so that he may rule the subordinates submitted to his care wisely.]"

studuit nec didicit, dum potuit, Dominus dicit, Osee IV: Quia tu scientiam repulisti, repellam et ego te, ne sacerdocio fungaris michi. Cum autem aliquis cognoscit insuffitientiam suam quantum ad scientiam Scripturarum et videt quo eligitur in prelatum, debet resistere quantum potest et contradicere et facere, ne penitus eligatur.... [Thus the Lord speaks to the illiterate prelate who...although he has not properly studied nor learned while he could, still wishes to be a prelate, Hosea 4:

clerics responsible, in no way do they exonerate the higher religious authorities who appoint men to these positions. <sup>86</sup> Although this is no more than a simple warning on Salimbene's part, we can already see the beginnings of his offensive against the episcopal hierarchy.

The second quality of the ideal prelate is relatively undeveloped. Salimbene simply calls for priests to live a holy life, which is naturally associated with wisdom. The third point, directly linked to the preceding, emphasizes the need for good morals. This means not only irreproachable chastity, but also conduct and behavior that will distinguish a cleric socially from a simple layman. Salimbene deplores the fact that in some situations a religious can be mistaken for a layman. Moreover, in his battle against the large number of laybrothers in the Minorite movement, he pursues the same goal. To conclude his remarks, Salimbene, relying on the model provided by some of the great figures of Christianity, attempts to show that it is not good to seek election to episcopal office. He cites the example of two bishops whose elections stirred up trouble in Reggio and Modena. He

<sup>&#</sup>x27;Because you have rejected knowledge, I will reject you, that you shall not do the office of priesthood to me.' When, therefore, someone knows his own incompetence with regard to his knowledge of the Scriptures and yet finds himself chosen as a prelate, he ought to resist the choice as far as he is able, and work and speak against the choice so that he might not be elected....]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>86</sup>Chronicle I, 176: "Item gravissime peccant illi qui prelatum insufficientem servis Dei preficiunt. [And so those men sin gravely who place an incompetent prelate over the servants of God.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>87</sup>Chronicle I, 177: "Secundo, prelatus debet habere sanctam vitam, sine qua non valebit unam festucam, quantumcumque aliter sit litteratus et sapiens. [Second, a prelate ought to have a holy life, without which he is not worth a straw, however learned and wise he may be.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>88</sup>Chronicle I, 180: "Tertio, prelatus debet habere bonos mores. [Third, a prelate ought to have good morals....]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>89</sup>Chronicle I, 181: "Alium enim habitum habent layci seculares, alium hystriones, et alium sacerdotes et religiosi habere tenentur. [For laymen, minstrels, priests, and men in religious orders are required to wear distinctive clothing.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>90</sup>Chronicle I, 204-05.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>91</sup>Chronicle I, 204.

even goes so far as to provide an argument that would allow virtuous religious to defer their appointment. With regard to the faults of anger, avarice and pride, Salimbene is more articulate and less original. His treatment simply follows the line of the biblical commandments.

The argument presented in the *Book of the Prelate* introduces Salimbene's first criticism of the secular clergy, whom he blames again and again for their tyranny and the increasing pressure they put on the lay masses. Here our chronicler shows great skill in his handling of Scripture, transforming what are in fact isolated examples into a general description of the situation. One after the other, he condemns the usual pomp of high church officials, the family networks linking the major Italian podestàs to the bishops, the family networks linking the lack of respect for the law of chastity.

<sup>92</sup> Chronicle I, 207-08.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>93</sup>Chronicle I, 220: "Privative ad hoc, ut prelatus sit ydoneus et sufficiens, debet carere tribus, scilicet iracundia, avaritia et superbia. [A suitable and competent prelate must, on the other hand, lack three qualities: anger, avarice, and pride.]"

<sup>94</sup>Chronicle I, 171, 185-86.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>95</sup>Chronicle I, 597: "Aliud studium clericorum et sacerdotum secularium est quia student ut laute et splendide comedant.... Quia igitur sacerdotes et clerici seculares ad hoc student, ut bene comedant et bene bibant.... [Moreover, such clerics and secular priests study only how to eat magnificently and splendidly.... It is precisely because the secular priests and clerics study these things, that is, how to eat and drink well....]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>96</sup>To give one example, *Chronicle* II, 741: "Sed et potestas Laudensium in illo prelio mortuus fuit, scilicet dominus Scultapellicia de Porta, qui erat civis Parmensis et consanguineus domini Opiçonis Parmensis episcopi. [Also killed in that battle was Lord Scurtapelliccia de Porta, the podestà of Lodi. He was a citizen of Parma and a cousin to Lord Obizzo, bishop of Parma.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>97</sup>Chronicle I, 245.

<sup>&</sup>quot;SChronicle I, 566: "Verumtamen de domino Gregorio de Monte Longo sciendum est quod podagricus fuit et non bene castus. Alicuius enim sue amasie noticiam habui. Sed multi clerici seculares, qui in dominio et in prelationibus sunt et in delitiis vivunt, parum de castitate curare videntur, et imponunt Apostolo quod dixerit: "Et si non caste, tamen caute." [Furthermore, it is worth knowing that

Although Salimbene allows himself to criticize the secular clergy, most of his grievances are placed on the lips of Hugh of Digne, in an address the latter supposedly delivered during a consistory. Even if we can accept the historical reality of that assembly, which took place in Lyons, we still have a passage that has been extensively reworked by our chronicler, seeing that it contains Salimbene's characteristic style. The vehemence of the remarks probably led Salimbene to distance himself vis-à-vis what he wrote. In fact, after this pseudo-intervention he tries to present an array of defenses, using the device of questions, one more ingenuous than the other.

Here we have another example of the great care used by our chronicler in composing his *Chronicle*. The hypothesis that this work is a polemical chronicle, intended to serve the interests of one group, finds support here. Salimbene could not risk seeing his efforts come to naught through a condemnation of this or that allegation of his by Pope or university. Thus he takes greater precautions<sup>102</sup> and focuses his criticism on the central points of the clergy's concerns (especially

Gregory of Monte Longo had the gout, and, moreover, was not a chaste man. I myself know about one of his affairs. But many secular clerics, who hold high church offices and live in luxury, appear to care little about chastity. And they say that the Apostle said, 'If you can't be chaste, be careful.']"

<sup>99</sup> Chronicle I, 324-32.

Oswald Holder-Egger, *Chronica*, 485. Furthermore, Jacques Paul pointed out that the ideas expressed in this address are identical to those found in other sermons. As for its bold language, we find the same thing in the sermon to Louis IX related by Joinville (J. Paul, *Hugues de Digne*, 69-91).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>101</sup>As Holder-Egger notes: "The entire long rebuke with which Hugh of Digne addresses the cardinals is certainly more the work of Salimbene than of Hugh. Salimbene, we may presume, amplified in his own fashion the core of the narrative he remembered as being given by Hugh of Digne. In fact, we find all of Salimbene in these pages: his feeling, his literary style, his habit of over-seasoning his account with scriptural citations" (Salimbene de Adam da Parma, *Cronaca*, tr. B. Rossi, Bologna 1987, 321).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>102</sup>Giving voice to possible criticisms, Salimbene warns Hugh of Digne about the danger of such talk. In his responses, the latter exhibits all the strength of his position and shows how much he could count on papal support.

during the councils of 1215, 1245 and 1274<sup>103</sup>). He concludes by saying that he sees no need to criticize the secular clergy!<sup>104</sup>

Nevertheless, Salimbene's words are explicit enough to challenge the role of the secular clergy in the care of souls, for it is really on this level that his argument must be seen. His desire to replace the secular clergy with the Franciscans is apparent in the words he places on the lips of a bishop addressing his subordinates:

You stupid fools, to whom shall I give the task of confessing the seculars, if not to the Friars Minor and the Preachers? I cannot give it to you with a clear conscience, for when the seculars come to you for confession seeking medicine for their souls, you give them poison instead. For you take the women behind the altar on the pretext of confessing them, and there you know them carnally: which is an evil to speak of and worse to do. 105

But it is useless to criticize the adversary while lacking the legal means to take his place. Consequently, in all his disagreements with the secular clergy, Salimbene relies on the various papal decisions that would allow the Franciscans to represent a real alternative to the secular clergy, whose shortcomings were well-known. The stakes were no less than the two most important aspects of the clergy-laity relationship: preaching and confessions. With regard to preaching, it was only a simple question of competition and exclusive rights. 106

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>103</sup>Hefélé-Leclerc, *Histoire des conciles*, V/2, 1316-98, 1633-79, VI/1, 181-209.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>104</sup>Chronicle I, 619: "Longum esset, si vellem narrare lascivias et miserias et turpitudines clericorum. Quod necesse non video.... [It would take far too long to recount all the lascivious and shameful deeds of the clerics. But it is not necessary....]"

personarum, si fratres Minores et Predicatores non audiunt eas? Vobis secura conscientia eas committere non possum, quia, si veniunt ad vos et petunt tiriacam volentes confiteri, venenum eis datis. Ducitis enim mulieres post altare causa confidenti et ibi eas cognoscitis: quod nefas est dicere et peius operari."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>106</sup>Soon after they appeared on the scene, the Friars Minor had as their mission preaching, but this was only for those friars who had successfully passed the examination before the minister general. In 1240, the role of examiner was extended

Confessions, however, were a trickier problem. <sup>107</sup> The first privilege in this area dates from the bull *Quoniam abundavit iniquitas*, <sup>108</sup> promulgated by Gregory IX on April 30, 1237. This provision was constantly renewed, especially by the bull *Virtute conspicuos*, <sup>109</sup> August 2, 1258. There is no question, then, that throughout the thirteenth century the Franciscans benefited from the good will of most of the sovereign pontiffs. What is more, the most important popes of the time had held the office of cardinal protector of the Order of Friars Minor before their accession. <sup>110</sup> Gradually, we find more and more lay people desiring to go to the Franciscans for confession. <sup>111</sup> This inevitably caused tensions between the friars and the secular clergy.

The greatest threats to the Franciscans came from the University of Paris where William of St. Amour was teaching. Things came to a head November 21, 1254, with Innocent IV's proclamation of the bull *Etsi animarum*. The Pope objected to certain intrigues on

to the provincial ministers; then in 1245 the examination was abolished completely. With Martin IV, the friars even obtained the right to preach without having to answer in any way to the bishops. Increasingly numerous and evolving in total freedom, the Franciscan preachers posed more problems to the secular clergy, who saw their churches deserted in favor of those of the Friars Minor (R. Manselli, "I vescovi, gli ordini religiosi e i movimenti popolari religiosi nel secolo XIII," in *Italia Sacra* 5 [1964] 328; Mariano D'Alatri, "La predicazione francescana nel Due e Trecento," in *Picenum Seraphicum* 10 [1973] 10-11).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>107</sup>R. Rusconi, "I francescani e la confessione nel secolo XIII," in *Francescanesimo e vita religiosa dei laici nel '200*. Atti dell'VIII convegno internazionale di studi francescani, Assisi 1981, 251-309.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>108</sup>Bullarium franciscanum I, 214-15.

<sup>109</sup> Bullarium franciscanum I, 218.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>110</sup>Chronicle II, 727-28: "Et nota quod omnes cardinales qui fuerunt Ordinis fratrum Minorum gubernatores, protectores et correctores, postmodum facti sunt summi pontifices.... [And take note that all the cardinals who were governors, protectors, and correctors of the Order, afterward became popes....]"

<sup>111</sup> Chronicle I, 594-95.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>112</sup>On this question, see M.M. Dufeil, Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne 1250-1259, Paris 1972.

<sup>113</sup> Bullarium franciscanum I, 219.

the part of the mendicant orders against the church; moreover, he accused them of usurping some of the seculars' rights. Salimbene does not explicitly mention the conflict, but he is rather harsh in his condemnation of Innocent IV's about-face, 114 explaining that the Pope, by his attitude, had incurred the divine wrath. In fact, he died soon after. 115

Things calmed down with the accession of Alexander IV. William of St. Amour tried, nevertheless, to restart the quarrel by launching a new wave of attacks against a Joachite libellus published secretly by the Franciscan, Gerard of Borgo San Donnino (d. 1276). Salimbene responded by showing that in no way could the Franciscan community be condemned because of an unfortunate act by one of its members, whom his peers rightly disavowed for having violated the Rule. On October 23, 1255, by the bull *Libellum quemdam*, Alexander IV condemned the work and its author. Although Salimbene repeats this condemnation, he immediately links it to the one issued against *De periculis*. The latter work, by William of St. Amour, represented a pause in his crusade against the Franciscans. But this condemnation came several months later, October 5, 1256, with the bull *Romanus Pontifex*.

his policy, probably under the influence of William of St. Amour, who was in Rome at the end of that year, 1254: L. Pisanu, *Innocenzo IV e i francescani [1243-1254]* (Studi e testi francescani, 41), Rome 1968.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>115</sup>Chronicle I, 608: "Et statim percussit eum Deus, et subito infirmari cepit infirmitate de qua mortuus est. [And immediately he was stricken by God, and suddenly he began to grow sick of the illness whereof he died.]"

<sup>116</sup>Chronicle I, 341-42.

reprobavit; quorum unus dicebat quod omnes religiosi et verbum Dei predicantes de helemosinis vivendo salvari non possent. Hunc libellum fecit magister Guilielmus de Sancto Amore et Parisius publicavit.... Alter vero libellus continebat multas falsitates contra doctrinam abbatis Ioachym, quas abbas non scripserat.... [This pope also condemned two harmful books. One of these maintained that all members of religious orders who preach the Word of God while living wholly on alms could not be saved. William of St. Amour wrote this book and published it at Paris.... The second book contained many lies against the teaching of the Abbot Joachim, which the Abbot had never written.]"

The fall of the Paris master (who was prohibited from staying in that city<sup>118</sup>) brought a brief respite to the Friars Minor, who wanted nothing more than to live in peace with the secular clergy. We see this from the encyclical letter sent by Bonaventure in the spring of 1257 to all the friars, asking them to hold to a moderate course. <sup>119</sup> However, in 1261, on the occasion of a synod held in Ravenna to deal with the question of the Tartars, a barrage of attacks came from the secular clergy, who were obviously not resigned to sharing their privileges. <sup>120</sup>

These new accusations explain those pages where Salimbene with as much venom as possible—adopts a position of full intervention on the part of the mendicants in the care of souls. He recalls in particular an imaginary meeting of his friends with three prelates who had come directly from the synod. 121 In this discussion, arranged exactly like a debate, Salimbene (as is his custom) refutes in minute detail each of the accusations leveled by the clergy gathered in Ravenna. Although his words add nothing new from the viewpoint of the arguments, they do allow us to see how burning the question still was at the time the Chronicle was being written. Indeed, passions were rekindled following the bull Ad fructus uberes, December 13, 1281—a personal initiative by Pope Martin IV which brought the exemptions of the Friars Minor to new heights. The Paris masters, even though they had learned a lesson from their past defeats, refused to take any important action.<sup>122</sup> In the end, the friars made the wise choice, opting for a limited use of the privileges granted by Martin IV. Despite everything, Salimbene is unwavering in his support of this pontiff. 123 He ignores the chapter

Alexandro quarto quam a rege Francie sancto Lodovyco de Parisius fuit expulsus, sine spe revertendi illuc usque in eternum et ultra. [But he himself did not remain unpunished, for he was expelled from the University of Paris by both the king of France, St. Louis, and by Pope Alexander IV, without any hope of ever returning there for ever and ever.]"

<sup>119</sup> M. M. Dufeil, Guillaume de Saint-Amour, 299.

<sup>120</sup> Chronicle I, 580-81.

<sup>121</sup> Chronicle I, 583-93.

<sup>122</sup> Gratien de Paris, Histoire de la fondation, 333.

<sup>123</sup> See above.

decisions of 1282 purely and simply (which ordered the friars to follow the earlier privileges<sup>124</sup>), seeing that he makes only a vague reference to this general chapter. <sup>125</sup> Salimbene's position vis-à-vis the secular clergy illustrates once again the partisan dimension of the *Chronicle*, a work in which he tirelessly defends a clerical concept of the Franciscan ideal. But such a concept inevitably involved massive participation by the Friars Minor in the care of souls. <sup>126</sup>

## On the Margins of the Evolution: the Para-Franciscan Movement

Born from a layman's desire to open up a new way to religious perfection, the Franciscan Order, spurred on by certain friars, experienced an evolution that gave it a clerical aspect. Before long, many lay candidates came up against the new criteria for admission and were unable enter the Order. Among these "rejects" there were determined men who wished to pursue their vocation. They established religious congregations in Italy and Provence, adopting the ideals of early Franciscanism: voluntary poverty and assistance to those most in need.

In his *Chronicle*, Salimbene vigorously opposes these movements as real competitors of the Franciscans in the race for offerings and gifts. His remarks as a whole rest on a legal arsenal that will serve his convictions, namely, the decisions made at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215<sup>127</sup> and the Second Council of Lyons in 1274. Salimbene refers only briefly to the canon of Innocent III prohibiting all new religious orders. He stresses above all that it was not strictly

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>124</sup>G. Fusenegger, "Definitiones Capituli generalis Argentinae celebrati anno 1282," in *AFH* 26 (1933) 135).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>125</sup>Chronicle II, 748.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>126</sup>A proper balance between the mendicant orders and the secular clergy would be achieved at the beginning of the fourteenth century with the bull *Super cathedram (Bullarium franciscanum V*, 498-500) by Boniface VIII.

<sup>127</sup> Héfélé-Leclerc, Histoire des conciles V/2, 1316-98.

<sup>128</sup> Héfélé-Leclerc, Histoire des conciles VI/1, 151-218.

applied.<sup>129</sup> Again and again he goes back to canon 23 (*Religionum diversitatem*),<sup>130</sup> adopted during the sixth session of the Council of Lyons, July 17, 1274, which decided to suppress (without mentioning them by name) two religious congregations: the Brothers of the Sack (Order of the Penitence of Jesus Christ)<sup>131</sup> and the Brothers of the Apostles.<sup>132</sup>

Given the importance of the passages Salimbene devotes to the movement founded by Gerard Segarello, he obviously saw it as a real threat to the Franciscans. Using a twelve-point argument akin to that in the Book of the Prelate, our chronicler lists the main criticisms that could be leveled against this group and its leader. First of all, he criticizes the fact that they were of no use in the care of souls, 133 thus confirming the hypothesis that this was a movement made up of men (and women) left on the fringes by the Franciscans. What is more, Salimbene states clearly that Gerard was turned down by the friars because he lacked the new profile resulting from the Order's clerical evolution. 134 As for his first disciple, he found him in the person of a young layman from Parma—a servant of the Friars Minor! 135

<sup>129</sup> Chronicle II, 713.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>130</sup>M. De Fontette, "Religionum diversitatem et la suppression des ordres mendiants," in 1274 année charnière, 223-29.

<sup>131</sup> G. M. Giacomozzi, L'Ordine della penitenza di Gesù Cristo, Rome 1962.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>132</sup>G.G. Merlo, "Controllo ed emarginazione della dissidenza religiosa," in Francescanesimo e vita religiosa, 365-88; idem, "Salimbene e gli Apostoli," in Salimbeniana, 144-47; R. Orioli, Venit Perfidus Heresiarcha: il movimento apostolico-dolciniano dal 1260-1307, Rome 1988.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup>Chronicle I, 369: "Quia nec utiles sunt ad predicandum nec ad ecclesiasticum officium decantandum nec ad missas celebrandas nec ad confessiones audiendas nec ad legendum in scolis nec ad consilia danda nec etiam pro benefactoribus exorandum.... [They were useless for preaching or singing the church offices; they could not celebrate Mass, nor hear confessions, nor teach in the schools, nor give counsel, nor even seek out benefactors.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>134</sup>Chronicle I, 369: "...venit quidam iuvenis natione Parmensis, de vili progenie ortus, illetteratus et laycus, ydiota et stultus, cui nomen Gerardinus Segalellus, et petiit ut a fratribus Minoribus reciperetur in Ordine. Qui cum non exaudiretur ab eis, tota die quando poterat, morabatur in ecclesia fratrum et

After this biased presentation of the man, our chronicler offers us a sample of Gerard's first intrigues. These he uses to deliver a series of criticisms. In particular, Salimbene recalls the dangers inherent in a faulty interpretation of Scripture by laymen who are devoid of knowledge. But in spite of all this, he does not go so far as to demonize Segarello's movement, since he is embarrassed by its similarity to the Franciscan Order and the quasi-official nature of its spread. No matter how much our chronicler multiplies his accusations, he fails to convince us completely. In fact, right from its beginning, this congregation (much to Salimbene's displeasure) could count on the active support of the citizens of Parma<sup>137</sup> as well as the bishop of that city. The citizens of Parma<sup>138</sup> as well as the bishop of that city.

What is more, before acquiring a rule of life, they went to Albert of Parma, a notary at the curia, who sent them to the Cistercian abbot in the city. The latter advised them to travel through the world with beard and long hair. 139 Salimbene holds all this against them!

cogitabat quod postea stultizando implevit. ["...there came a young citizen of Parma to the convent beseeching the Friars Minor to receive him into the Order. And he was a man of base family, an illiterate layman, ignorant and foolish, by the name of Gerard Segarello. But because they would not accept him, he used to spend the whole day in the church of the brothers, where he thought out what he later performed in his foolish way."]

<sup>135</sup> Chronicle I, 372-73.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>136</sup>There is the episode of the vineyard (*Chronicle* I, 371) or again the famous "Penitenziagite" (*Chronicle* I, 372).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>137</sup>Chronicle I, 373: "Et plus et libentius dabant eis Parmenses, concives mei, viri et mulieres, quam fratribus Minoribus et Predicatoribus darent. [And the Parmese, my own fellow citizens, men and women, gave more, more liberally, to these men than they did to the Minorites and the Preachers.]"

Sancto Vitale Parmensis episcopus, qui diu foverat eos occasione fratris Ghirardini Segalelli.... [Therefore, when Lord Obizzo of San Vitale, bishop of Parma, heard of these things, he expelled them from Parma and his entire bishopric, although, previously, he had favored them for the sake of Brother Gerard Segarello, their founder.]"

<sup>139</sup> Chronicle I, 376-77.

Strengthened by the protection it enjoyed, the movement experienced a rapid growth, which Salimbene bitterly notes. 140

The arguments aimed at showing that the followers of this movement were beyond salvation<sup>141</sup> came up against a reality, namely, the facts which our chronicler refused to accept. He condemns, for example, the presence of a branch for women,<sup>142</sup> failing to mention that it was personally approved by the bishop of Parma, Obizzo of San Vitale (d. 1295), in 1269.<sup>143</sup> For the twelve criticisms listed in his work, he draws from certain contemporary tracts opposed to this movement, marshaling a series of arguments really very much like the anti-peasant literature of the time.<sup>144</sup> Indeed, far from marginalizing the group, these criticisms reveal the similarities between the ideals defended by Gerard and the ideals which, in their time, had caused Francis of Assisi's fraternity to succeed.

For instance, Salimbene deplores the fact that movement is without a head. 145 Perhaps Gerard shared the same concern for equality among the members of the fraternity as did St. Francis. 146 In the same way, Salimbene condemns those brothers who wander about alone, 147 who have no fixed residence, 148 and who receive no instruction. 149 But is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>140</sup>Chronicle I, 383.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>141</sup>Chronicle I, 387.

<sup>142</sup> Chronicle I, 391.

<sup>143</sup> G.G. Merlo, Eretici e eresie medievali, Bologna 1992, 99.

<sup>144</sup>N. Scivoletto, Fra Salimbene da Parma, 150.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>145</sup>Chronicle I, 393: "Et prima, quia acephali sunt, id est sine capite; que est stultitia magna.... [First of all, because they are acephalous, that is, headless, which is a great foolishness....]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>146</sup>In chapter V of the Rule of 1221, we read: "Likewise, let all the brothers not have power or control in this instance, especially among themselves" (*Oeuvres de saint François*, 58).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>147</sup>Chronicle I, 393: "Secunda istorum stultitia est quia vadunt soli aliqui eorum. [Their second foolish act is that they travel alone....]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>148</sup>Chronicle I, 393: "Tertia istorum stultitia est quia tota die sunt vagabundi et ociosi et discurrentes per mundum sine utilitate. [Their third foolish act is that

this not a description of the early days of the Order?<sup>150</sup> In reality, the Brothers of the Apostles exemplify everything Salimbene and the supporters of clericalization had wanted to eliminate in the Franciscan Order during the first half of the thirteenth century. Since their social origin renders them incompetent as far as the care of souls is concerned, our chronicler accuses them of usurping the office of preaching<sup>151</sup> and unjustly accepting offerings.<sup>152</sup> He even condemns their manner of begging from house to house,<sup>153</sup> even though this was not so very different from the practice of the early Franciscans.<sup>154</sup>

In the end, the only admissible criticism in Salimbene's list concerns their failure to obey the conciliar decrees of 1274. Despite the terms of the canon *Religiosum diversitatem*, for many years the congregation of Gerard Segarello was strong enough to threaten the Franciscans' monopoly in pastoral care of the laity. However, Salimbene remains very cautious in this area; for example, he does not

every day they are at leisure, like vagabonds, running through the world without usefulness.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>149</sup>Chronicle I, 394: "Quinta istorum stulticia est quia...isti nullum instructorem habent.... [Their fifth foolishness is that...they have no instructors.]"

<sup>150</sup> See above.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>151</sup>Chronicle I, 406-07: "Nona istorum stultitia est quia volunt predicare nec habent pradicationis offitium sibi commissum ab eo qui dare potest et debet, sed summunt illud a semet ipsis.... [Their ninth foolishness is that they wish to preach without having the office of preaching conferred on them by anyone in authority, and so they take it upon themselves.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>152</sup>Chronicle I, 414: "Undecima istorum Apostolorum stultitia est quia volunt de helemosinis vivere nec habent quid rependant his qui helemosinas sibi faciunt. [The eleventh foolishness of these Apostles is that they wish to live by alms and give nothing in return for them.]"

in domum, que est vita nequam, sicut Ecclesiasticus docet, XXIX. Dominus etiam dixit, Luc. X: Nolite transire de domo in domum. [Their sixth foolishness is that they go as a guest from house to house, which is a miserable life, as Ecclesiasticus 29 teaches. The Lord also said, Luke 10: Do not go from house to house.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>154</sup>In one passage of the *Chronicle*, Salimbene explains how, when he was living in Pisa, he would go into the city with his companion (*Chronicle* I, 62).

go so far as to call the followers of the movement heretics. But although in 1284 (the date when Salimbene wrote his notes on the Brothers of the Apostles) Segarello's movement still enjoyed unusual support, after 1286 and the bull *Olim felicis recordationis* of Honorius IV, the congregation fell into dissent.

Why did Salimbene fail to mention this condemnation, which was obviously worth more than any words of his?<sup>155</sup> Perhaps we must see this as an expression of the chronicler's embarrassment at a movement that embodied—before it was completely eradicated by papal authority in the early fourteenth century<sup>156</sup>—the only real alternative to the Franciscan Order. For the latter, in its evolution, had come to deny certain precepts which St. Francis had tried to defend throughout his whole life.

The space occupied by the Brothers of the Sack in the *Chronicle* is marginal compared to that devoted to the Brothers of the Apostles, seeing that it is limited to a few short notes. In this account, which is more historical than polemical, Hugh of Digne's fundamental role in the birth of the movement is stated explicitly. As with the Brothers of the Apostles, we have two founders whom Hugh refused to accept into the Franciscan fraternity, advising them instead to go to the woods and learn to eat roots, since tribulations were at hand.<sup>157</sup>

Taking the ex-minister provincial's statement literally, the two laymen set out for Mount Fenouillet, where they founded the Order of Penitence of Jesus Christ.<sup>158</sup> Their life, similar to that of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>155</sup>For the year 1286, Salimbene tells only of their expulsion from the city of Parma by the bishop who had always supported them (*Chronicle* II, 903). This was one of the consequences of their condemnation that our chronicler passes over in silence.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>156</sup>After Gerard Segarello's death at the stake, direction of the movement was taken over by Fra Dolcino, who from his stronghold at Lake Garde prolonged the sufferings of the Church for a while, before being executed at Vercueil in 1307, the date that marks the real end of the movement of the Brothers of the Apostles (R. Orioli, *Venit Perfidus Heresiarcha*, 200-10).

<sup>157</sup> Chronicle I, 366.

 $<sup>\,^{158}\</sup>text{Also}$  called the Sacchetti or Brothers of the Sack because of their clothing (Chronicle I, 367).

Franciscans, included preaching, voluntary poverty and service to the sick. At first Salimbene repeats the criticisms against Brother Hugh, whom he accuses of being the real founder of the new institute, but later he resolutely dismisses these accusations. The Brothers of the Sack soon acquired a legal structure, thanks in particular to a series of interventions by Alexander IV. In 1274, on the eve of the Council of Lyons, the Order had seventy-six institutions in all parts of the West.

But even though Gregory X placed them under his personal protection several weeks before the conciliar debates began, <sup>162</sup> they were suppressed by reason of canon 23. In a style much less bitter than is his custom, Salimbene provides certain facts that may help clear up the mystery of this suppression. In particular, he recalls the economic aspect, citing a noblewoman from Modena, who was a devotee of the Franciscans and who deplored this "proliferation of mendicants in her city." Given their solid organization and major supporters, the Brothers of the Sack were as much a nuisance to the Friars Minor—to whom they were serious competitors—as to the secular clergy, who

<sup>159</sup> Chronicle I, 367: "Porro frater Hugo multos habebat in Ordine suo et maxime in Provincia emulos et mordaces, et propter doctrinam abbatis Ioachym, et quia imponebant ei quod Ordinem Boscariolorum fecisset (et non fecerat eum aliter nisi occasionaliter dicendo: 'Eatis ad nemora et adiscatis comedere radices, quia tribulationes apropinquant'), et quia noluit eos ad Ordinem recipere, cum bene posset. [Brother Hugh had many critics and opponents in the Order, especially in Provence, both because he adhered to the teachings of Joachim and because, they asserted, he had founded the Order of the Sack—although he had done so only incidentally by saying, 'Go ye to the woods and learn to eat roots, for tribulations are at hand'—and because he would not receive them into the Order when he could easily have done so.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>160</sup>Alexander showed a certain affection toward this new group. On July 29, 1255, he authorized them to preach; on July 31 he officially recognized them by confirming their rule. On July 31, 1257, he placed them under his personal protection. Finally, on April 30, 1260, he prohibited anyone from using their habit to beg, under pain of grave sanctions (G.M. Giacomozzi, *L'Ordine della Penitenza*, 201).

<sup>161</sup> G. M. Giacomozzi, L'Ordine della Penitenaza, 254.

<sup>162</sup>G. M. Giacomozzi, L'Ordine della Penitenaza, 284.

<sup>163</sup> Chronicle I, 368.

regarded them as a new order threatening to encroach upon their privileges.

In fact, as Micheline de Fontette has correctly explained, the Brothers of the Sack were in effect "sacrificed on the altar of concord" during the council of 1274. <sup>164</sup> They obediently accepted their sentence, as Salimbene likes to emphasize in the *Chronicle*. <sup>165</sup> But even if our chronicler praises them more than he criticizes them, the Brothers of the Sack availed themselves of the privilege that allowed them to die out gradually. Whereas the followers of Gerard Segarello disappeared soon after the death of Fra Dolcino in 1307, it was not until 1320 and the pontificate of John XXII that the Brothers of the Sack were dissolved once and for all. <sup>166</sup>

Among Salimbene's enemies, there were also the Augustinian hermits, who were not condemned (much to his regret) by the canon *Religiionum diversitatem*. Lay-inspired and deeply dedicated to the precepts of voluntary poverty, the Augustinian hermits, who were united into a single order by the bull *Licet Ecclesiae catholicae*, April 9, 1256, were full-fledged mendicants. They escaped condemnation thanks to the vigorous intervention of their cardinal protector during the conciliar debates.<sup>167</sup>

At the basis of Salimbene's violent attack is a question that essentially concerns clothing. Our chronicler strongly disapproves of misuse of the Franciscan habit for money-related ends. The hermits were hoping to collect more gifts by sowing confusion as to their true nature. Although the question was settled by Alexander IV, Salimbene continued to feel a certain irritation in the face of the various "borrowings" that regularly plagued the Order.

<sup>164</sup> Micheline de Fontette, Religionum diversitatem, 227.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>165</sup>Chronicle I, 388: "Saccati vero obedientes fuerunt summo pontifici, et inde laudantur et precipue commendantur.... [The Brothers of the Sack were obedient to the Supreme Pontiff, and therefore they are to be especially praised and commended.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>166</sup>P. Amargier, "Les Frères de la Pénitence de Jésus Christ ou du Sac," in *Provence Historique* 15 (1975) 162-65.

<sup>167</sup> Chronicle I, 368.

To conclude this overall look at the movements Salimbene likes to attack so as to strengthen his own Order's base, we need to mention his opposition to the followers of the Order of the Knights of the Blessed Virgin Mary, whom he calls Godenti. 168 Of course, this congregation was quite unlike the mendicant orders, since it brought together rich knights who wanted to use their power and riches in the service of God. Although we would expect our chronicler to support them to some extent, given the social affinities, instead the *Chronicle* offers a five-point critique of the Order of Knights, in particular:

[A]fter lavishly and vainly spending their own riches feasting and drinking and wasting on minstrels—not at all on Christ's poor—they now petition the curia and seek to obtain from the Pope the right to take over the convents of orders better than themselves and to dispossess such men of their own houses. 169

Salimbene condemns their desire to take over the houses and goods of existing orders. They were a threat in this regard, all the more so since in 1261 Urban IV had given them their own rule. Were it not for this acknowledged fact, Salimbene would surely have remained silent, especially since in both 1233 and 1260 this institute arose under the close supervision of the mendicant orders, who for the most part ensured its direction.

### Expressions of Lay Devotion in the Thirteenth Century

The thirteenth century, under the new influence of the mendicants, witnessed the growth of religious fervor among the laity. In Italy this culminated in the spontaneous devotional movements of 1233 and 1260. As a curious spectator in 1233 and a protagonist in 1260, Salimbene was a privileged witness to these events. The evidence provided by the *Chronicle* is thus extremely valuable in approaching

<sup>168</sup> Chronicle I, 678.

<sup>169</sup> Chronicle II, 679-80: "...postquam consumpserunt divitias suas faciendo magnas expensas et largas in multis vanitatibus et comessationibus et comedendo cum histrionibus et non cum Christi pauperibus, ipsi petunt ab Ecclesia Romana et volunt obtinere a papa et invadere loca meliorum religiosorum, quam ipsi sint, et illos de domibus suis expellere."

<sup>170</sup> Chronicle II, 681.

these phenomena. Salimbene's work shows a resolute desire to extol (and exaggerate) the activity of the Franciscans at the time of these events.

Salimbene was twelve years old when the manifestations of religious fervor "later called the Alleluia movement" began. <sup>171</sup> He had a ringside seat, since his native Parma was one of the cities where people expressed their religious feelings most strongly. Thus our chronicler is able to furnish us with a picturesque description of the first episodes. He paints a very colorful portrait of the *laicus religious*, Benedict, who triggered the enthusiasm of the faithful with his "interactive sermons." <sup>172</sup> At first, no mention is made of any participation on the part of the Friars Minor. In fact, as André Vauchez indicates, at first it was nothing more than "a popular, spontaneous and joyful manifestation." <sup>173</sup> Later it was taken over by the mendicants "who knew how to channel this general outburst of devotion and take advantage of it to accomplish their own objectives." <sup>174</sup>

Salimbene tries to provide some information about each of the "notable preachers who were famous at the time of the Alleluia," whether Franciscans (such as Leo of Milan or Gerard of Modena<sup>176</sup>) or Dominicans (such as John of Vicenza<sup>177</sup>). Never again does Salimbene recall the events except through these religious, some of whom managed to work their way to the highest positions of responsibility in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>171</sup>V. Fumagalli, "In margine all' 'Alleluia' del 1223," in *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 80 (1968) 257-72; D. A. Brown, "The Alleluia. A Thirteenth Century Peace Movement," in *AFH* 81 (1988) 3-16 [also in *Greyfrairs Review*, 7 (1993) 109-120].

<sup>172</sup> Chronicle I, 100-01.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>173</sup>A. Vauchez, "Une campagne de pacification en Lombardie autour de 1233. L'action politique des ordres mendiants d'après la réforme des statuts communaux et les accords de paix," in *Mélange d'Arch. et d'Hist.* 78 (1966) 504.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>174</sup>A Vauchez, "Une campagne de pacification," 504.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>175</sup>Chronicle I, 101.

<sup>176</sup> Chronicle I, 104-06.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>177</sup>Chronicle I, 110.

the communes.<sup>178</sup> He tries to present the role of the Franciscans in the best possible light, glossing over the other things that were at stake in the movement. The events recounted by Salimbene give us an idea of the politics of the movement of 1233—especially through the various peacemaking activities led by the preachers in each city. But they fail to tell us that the mendicant orders were instruments of the papacy in this situation of unrest, since they were charged with restoring the position of the Roman Church, which had become very precarious in that region. Moreover, in spite of what Salimbene says,<sup>179</sup> the phenomenon was limited to Lombardy and did not spread at all to other areas after 1233.

In fact, the mendicants were supposed to restore the Church's freedom, so often trampled on by the various powerful communes. This aspect of the Franciscan and Dominican intervention becomes perfectly clear if we examine the communal statutes of the time. The friars also used the opportunity to insert into these statutes harsh measures against the "heretics," for in the past these cities and their rulers had shown very little sensitivity to this serious problem.

Having established the importance of the mission entrusted to the Franciscans and Dominicans, we can understand better why they were not afraid to use certain deceptive tactics. Salimbene tells—not without some embarrassment—how different preachers would agree ahead of time on the subject of their sermon. Then, in the middle of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>178</sup>Chronicle I, 106: "Huic, tempore illius devotionis predicte, Parmenses totaliter dominium Parme dederunt, ut eorum esset potestas et concordaret eos qui guerras habebant ad pacem. [At this time Brother Gerard became podestà of Parma, exercising absolute power in order to bring peace between the warring factions.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>179</sup>Chronicle I, 99: "In omnibus civitatibus Ytalie ista devotio fuit. [And this spirit of devotion was abroad in all the cities of Italy.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>180</sup>In Parma, for example, the commune had been established to the detriment of the powers of the bishop. In 1230, the whole city was excommunicated, and the agreement reached in 1232 was so unfavorable to the interests of the Church that Gregory IX called for a process to be initiated against the bishop Grazia, who was accused of having sold out the privileges of the Roman Church (A. Vauchez, "Une campagne de pacification," 529-30).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>181</sup>A. Vauchez, "Une campagne de pacification," 523.

their homily, they would pretend to break off. Exploiting the gullibility of their audience and in a state of pseudo-ecstasy, they would summarize the words of another friar who was preaching dozens of mile away. The latter, in turn, would practice the same trick with regard to the words spoken by another friar. 182

Except for these rather anecdotal incidents, Salimbene seems anxious to portray the conduct of the Friars Minor as highly praiseworthy. Moreover, he plays down the action of the Dominicans, even though they had been the real leaders of the movement in most of the cities. A desire to praise the Franciscans can be found in those passages where Salimbene deals with the flagellant movement of 1260.

It was in the year 1260 that a new devotional movement arose in Italy, more precisely in Perugia. 183 From the Umbrian capital the phenomenon spread to Rome, Bologna, Emilia, Venezia and much of Lombardy, before later reaching Piedmont, the city of Genoa, and France—thus essentially in an urban milieu. 184 Many hypotheses have been advanced to explain the success of the preaching of Raniero Fasani (the layman from Perugia behind the movement), but none seems entirely acceptable. 185 One thing alone is sure: peacemaking

<sup>182</sup> Chronicle I, 108.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>183</sup>Il movimento dei disciplinati nel settimo centenario del suo inizio (Perugia 1260), Spoleto 1962, and Settimo centenario della morte di Raniero Fasani, Perugia 1981.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>184</sup>G. Alberigo, "Bilancio e prospettive sul movimento dei flagellanti," in Settimo centenario della morte di Raniero Fasani, 138.

<sup>185</sup> In 1960, R. Morghen emphasized the profound shock to the collective consciousness caused by the Battle of Montaperti . ("Raniero Fasani e il movimento dei Disciplinati del 1260," in *Il movimento dei disciplinati*, 29-42). In the course of these same discussions, R. Manselli compared the appearance of the devotional movement to certain Joachite prophecies regarding the year 1260, but he concludes that there was no link between the two ("L'anno 1260 fu anno gioachimitico?" in *Il movimento dei disciplinati*, 99-108). There is, in fact, a passage in the *Chronicle* concerning prophecy. It follows the passage that deals with the flagellants, but Salimbene indicates no cause-and-effect relationship (*Chronicle* II, 677). In 1981, G. Alberigo revived the discussion a bit, showing himself aware of the fact that, in the end, the key to the mystery of the appearance of the flagellants lay in the particular contemporary urban milieu ("Bilancio e prospettive," 135-39).

played a part, as in the movement of 1233, and there was an attachment to religious values. In short, there was coexistence between politics and religion.

The chief outcome of the movement was that the various rival factions in the cities were reconciled. This political dimension is very evident when Salimbene relates how Lord Uberto Pellavicino, podestà of Cremona, protected his city from all contagious disease. Is such a measure not motivated by political interests? Although essentially the same as that of 1233, the movement of 1260 involved one innovation: the widespread practice of flagellation among all levels of the population. 186 For the laity, such practices were an attempt to relive personally the passion of Christ and to foster a direct relationship with God, the mediation of the clergy being relegated, as it were, to a position of secondary importance. 187 Consequently, the movement grew among the ranks of the people, following "the example of the mendicant orders, but independently of them."188 In fact, in his brief account of the flagellants, Salimbene spends his time showing that it was led by the clergy: he places bishops and priests at the head of the processions, 189 but above all he emphasizes his own personal participation in the events. 190

<sup>186</sup> Chronicle II, 675.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>187</sup>A. Vauchez, "Ordo Fraternitatis," confréries et piété des laïcs au Moyen-Age," in idem, *Les laïcs au Moyen-Age*, Paris 1984, 95-104.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>188</sup>Mariano D'Alatri, "Il fenomeno penitenziale sotto l'aspetto ecclesiologico e teologico nella seconda metà del Duecento," in *Settimo centenario*, 34.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>189</sup>Chronicle II, 675.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>190</sup>Chronicle II, 675: "Et homines de Saxolo in principio istius devotionis abstulerunt me cum licentia guardiani de loco fratrum Minorum de Mutina, ubi habitabam tunc temporis, et duxerunt Saxolum, quia me intime diligebant, tam viri quam mulieres; postea duxerunt me Regium, postea Parmam [And at the beginning of this movement the citizens of Sassuolo, by permission of my guardian, took me out of the convent of the Friars Minor in Modena, where I was living at that time, and led me to Sassuolo, because they—both the men and the women—loved me dearly. Later they took me to Reggio, then to Parma.]" The fact is that even though these autobiographical elements are designed to strengthen his "clerical" position, they show more the movement's independence, since here Salimbene seems more of a traveling companion than a guide. Besides, as Mariano D'Alatri emphasizes, if

Finally, the Franciscans sometimes clashed with the devotional movements. Far from receiving them into their bosom, they were determined to fight against their power. First there was the uproar of 1251 in France, whose aim was to avenge the defeat of the crusade led by Louis IX. Known as the "Pastors," this movement recruited its troops from the lowest classes of society and threatened the mendicant orders, whom it held responsible for the defeats suffered in the Holy Land.<sup>191</sup>

If Salimbene is happy to see them destroyed, 192 it is because he was genuinely afraid at the time of the events.193 In Italy, the Franciscans had to face a new and more destabilizing type of popular religiosity: the enthusiasm surrounding the establishment of the cults of lay saints. This new way to perfection began with the canonization in 1199 of a certain Omobono, a citizen of Cremona who was known locally for his love for the poor.194 Repeating the words of Bishop Sicardo, Salimbene alludes briefly to this event, but he does not in any way criticize a cult officially recognized by the Pope.

He does, however, condemn some more questionable cults established in the cities of Cremona, Parma and Reggio around Albert

Salimbene had taken an active part in the various events, "he would not have failed to say so explicitly, since he is always ready to flaunt anything that would bring him praise" (Mariano D'Alatri, *La cronaca di Salimbene. Personaggi e tematiche*, Rome 1988). But even though they played only a small role in this affair, in the end the Franciscans derived certain advantages from this situation, since in most cases they were the ones who were put in charge of associations of the faithful stemming from the movement.

<sup>191</sup>Chronicle II, 645: "Credidit eis vulgus Francie, et contra religiosos et maxime Predicatores et Minores terribiliter insurgebant, eo quod ipsi predicaverant crucem.... [Yet the common people of France had faith in them, and they rose up in anger against the religious orders—especially the Preachers and the Minorites—because they had preached the Crusade....]"

<sup>192</sup>Chronicle II, 646: "Verum dixit quia eodem anno ad nichilum sunt redacti, et penitus omnis illa congregatio est destructa. [These words are true certainly, because in that same year that entire multitude was brought to naught and almost completely destroyed.]"

<sup>193</sup>C. Violante, Motivi e caratteri, 139.

<sup>194</sup>A. Vauchez, Les laïcs au Moyen-Age, 79.

the wine carrier, in Padua around Antonio Peregrino, and in Ferrara around Armanno Punzilovo.<sup>195</sup> Although he tries to explain the spread of these cults,<sup>196</sup> Salimbene denies not only their legal status, but even their worth. When discussing the cult of Albert of Villa d'Ogna, which became widespread in Cremona in 1279, he does not hesitate to speak of "deceptive miracles."<sup>197</sup>

But our chronicler can only note the success of these cults, which were routinely taken over by the local clergy in order to counter the rising power of the Friars Minor in the cities. <sup>198</sup> In fact, without the collaboration, if not the instigation of the bishops and canons, such manifestations would never have started. In the final analysis, all these affairs must be seen as a local result of the quarrel that poisoned relations between secular clergy and Franciscans throughout the thirteenth century. <sup>199</sup>

On the other hand, in their desire to win first place in the urban environment, the Franciscans set out in the second half of the thirteenth century to take systematic control of the local cults and so

Cremonenses et Parmenses et Regini in Alberto brentatore modo stultizaverunt, sic Paduani in quodam Antonio Peregrino et Ferarienses in quodam Armanno Punçilovo stultizaverant plus. [Take note and consider well that just as the citizens of Cremona, Parma, and Reggio were made fools of at this time through Albert the wine carrier, so had been in previous times the Paduans through Antonio Peregrino and the Ferrarese through Armanno Punzilovo.]"

<sup>196</sup> Chronicle II, 736.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>197</sup>Chronicle II, 733: "Item eodem millesimo apparuerunt miracula truffatoria cuiusdam Alberti qui stabat Cremone.... [In that same year took place the deceptive miracles of a man from Cremona named Albert....]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>198</sup>Chronicle II, 733: "Quod videntes sacerdotes parrochiales procurabant ut iste Albertus in eorum ecclesiis pingeretur, ut melius oblationes a populo obtinerent. [And when the parish priests saw this, they had this Albert painted in their churches so that they would receive better offerings from the people.]"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>199</sup>A. I. Galletti, "I francescani e il cultro dei santi nell'Italia centrale," in *Francescanesimo e vita religiosa dei laici nel* '200, Atti dell'VIII Convegno internazionale di studi francescani, Assisi 1980, 320-21.

impose their own model of conduct. Consequently, Salimbene's discourse seems more like a response meant for the clergy, who at this time believed in the appearance of cults without the backing of the mendicant orders. But, on the whole, Salimbene is articulate on the question, as we can see from the way he deals with the cult of Armanno Punzilovo in Ferrara.

Indeed, our chronicler passes over in silence the accusation of public heresy: testimony was available to the inquisitor as early as 1270 regarding the bad company Armanno had kept during his lifetime. If Salimbene does not go beyond simple criticism, it is because at the time he wrote his work the Order was conscious of its supremacy in this dangerously contested area. What is more, we can see from the case of Armanno Punzilovo that the Popes at the time no longer possessed the same unyielding desire to defend the Friars Minor. Salimbene deplores the situation, not without a certain bitterness:

Those bishops, therefore, who allow such abuses to be practiced in their diocese merit removal from office; that is, they should have the dignities of the episcopal office taken away from them. But there is nobody to correct those errors and abuses.<sup>204</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>200</sup>The religious history of Tuscany, Umbria and Lombardy is full of examples. To cite just two: Ambrose of Massa, a layman close to the Franciscans, who died April 17, 1240, and whose cult developed, with papal approval, in Orvieto during the days following his death; or Peter Pettinaro, a Franciscan tertiary who died in Siena in 1289 (A. I. Galletti, "I Francescani e il culto dei santi," 331-36).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>201</sup>Chronicle II, 734: "Et fratribus Minoribus et Predicatoribus seculares clara et viva voce dicebant: «Vos creditis quod nullus possit miracula facere nisi sancti vestri, sed bene estis decepti ut nunc apparet in isto.» [Some men of secular life said to the Friars Minor and Preachers with a loud, clear voice, 'You think that nobody can work miracles but your own saints, but you are clearly deceived, as has been made clear through Albert.']"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>202</sup>G. Zanella, *Itinerari ereticali: patari e catari tra Rimini e Verona*, Rome 1986.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>203</sup>The first accusations of heresy brought against Armanno Pungilovo are contemporary with his death. But it was only after countless delays that the affair ended in a condemnation, March 22, 1301 (G. Zanella, *Itinerari ereticali*, 65).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>204</sup>Chronicle II, 733-34: "Quocirca episcopi, qui tales abusiones fieri

#### Conclusion

With this last question, the critical situation the Order faced at the end of the thirteenth century seems very clear. After many decades of success, with scattered stormy periods, the Friars Minor were running into difficulties disturbing enough to challenge their role in society. Aside from some bitter reflections, Salimbene is constantly striving to rebuild the tarnished image of the glorious beginnings. Faced with growing threats to his vision of the Franciscan Order, he seems to go on the attack, composing a polemical chronicle in which he tries to advance his position by criticizing his adversaries, often bitterly.

Able to take advantage of a life full of journeys and meeting people, sifting through a century of Franciscan history, with the consummate skill of a compiler he was as able to take into account the part played by events likely to serve his interests—even when the challenge to his position came through too strongly—in order to construct a monumental work in the service of the party favoring clericalization (which was opposed, at the turn of the century, to the second-generation spirituals).

Perhaps the polemical nature of the *Chronicle* explains why, not long after it was written, the work was very little used. Indeed, as early as the first years of the fourteenth century, the Order was once more united when the movements threatening it from within and without were officially and definitively condemned. Our chronicler, who probably died around 1288, did not have the pleasure of savoring the victory of his position.

permittunt in suo districtu sive in sua diocesi, digni essent ab episcopio removeri, id est dignum esset quod episcopali dignitate priverentur omnino. Sed non est qui errata corrigat et abusiones emendet."