

ST. DOMINIC and HIS WORK

By Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.

Translated by
Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P.



St. Dominic
Santa Sabina, Rome

[CONTENTS](#) | [FOREWORD](#) | [INTRODUCTION](#) | [TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE](#) | [PROLOGUE](#)

Contents

PART ONE

St. Dominic and the Order of Preachers

- I. [CHRISTENDOM IN THE EARLY THIRTEENTH CENTURY](#)
- II. [THE ORDER OF PREACHERS IN FORMATION](#)
- III. [YEARS OF EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVITY](#)
- IV. [CONSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATION](#)
- V. [CHARACTER OF ST. DOMINIC](#)
- VI. [NATURE OF THE ORDER OF PREACHERS](#)
- VII. [DEVELOPMENT AND ACTIVITY OF THE PREACHERS](#)
- VIII. [ACADEMIC ORGANIZATION](#)
- IX. [DOCTRINAL LIFE AND THE THOMISTIC SCHOOL](#)
- X. [LITERARY PRODUCTIVITY](#)
- XI. [APOSTOLIC WORK](#)
- XII. [INFLUENCE ON ECCLESIASTICAL AND CIVIL SOCIETY](#)
- XIII. [FOREIGN MISSIONS](#)
- XIV. [SANCTITY AND THE MYSTICAL LIFE](#)
- XV. [LITURGY AND ART](#)
- XVI. [THE PLIGHT OF PREACHING IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY](#)
by Reginald Ladner, O.P.
- XVII. [EFFORTS OF THE CHURCH TO REVIVE PREACHING](#)
- XVIII. [THE *Ordo Praedicatorum*](#)

XIX. [THE ACADEMIC CRISIS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY](#)

PART TWO

*From the Rule of St. Augustine to
the Rule of St. Dominic*

[INTRODUCTION](#)

SECTION ONE

The Rule of St. Augustine

- XX. [WHAT IS THE RULE OF ST. AUGUSTINE?](#)
XXI. [THE RULE OF ST. AUGUSTINE COMPOSED OF TWO TEXTS](#)
XXII. [THE RULE DECAPITATED](#)

SECTION TWO

The Augustinian Rule of St. Dominic

[INTRODUCTION](#)

- XXIII. [THE RULE OF ST. AUGUSTINE, TEACHER OF THE APOSTOLIC LIFE](#)
XXIV. [THE LEGISLATION OF THE PREACHERS](#)
XXV. [THE PROJECT OF THE RULE](#)

APPENDIXES

- I. [AN EMBASSY INTO THE MARCHES by M. H. Vicaire, O.P.](#)
II. [THE BIRTH OF ST. MARY OF PROUILLE](#)
III. [THE *Sancta Praedictio* IN NARBONNE](#)
IV. [INNOCENT III, DIEGO, AND DOMINIC IN 1206](#)
V. [ST. DOMINIC AND THE POPE IN 1215](#)
VI. [*Domini Canes* by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.](#)

[BIBLIOGRAPHY](#)

[CLICK HERE TO DOWNLOAD
THIS ENTIRE WEBSITE AS domwork.zip](#)

To My Brethren of *Le Saulchoir*
Foreword
by Marie-Humbert Vicaire, O.P.

Father Mandonnet died January 4, 1936, bearing away with him the treasure of knowledge he had amassed on the thought, the men, and the institutions of the thirteenth century. Available as witness to the labor of the fifty years he devoted to history, some admirable but only too few studies remain. Where, it may be asked, is the monumental work on St. Dominic and the beginnings of his Order, the design of which Father Mandonnet cherished and consistently forwarded with an enthusiasm and an understanding others could only half appreciate? His intellectual life, his tastes, and his judgments were largely inspired by this precious design. A library, manuscript notes patiently gathered, some penetrating reflections drawn up on occasion for a critical study, and a general outline stand as the material for a book that was never achieved. The posthumous work composed from such material by one of his disciples can in no way fill the void. Nevertheless, however fragmentary the sketches here collected may be, and however considerable our personal contribution, we are persuaded that the St. Dominic we give to the world does not fall too far short of the concept of our master. The very nature of the collected studies gives us that hope. The possibility of this will be the more readily granted, if the thought of Father Mandonnet and a sense of his historical method are grasped.

It was not by chance that Father Mandonnet died without achieving this work. For a long time those about him were aware, and he was aware -- because he knew himself -- that he would not write it. At the close of his life, talking with some of his "petits frères," he accused himself of idleness. His bibliography dispenses us from having to absolve him of this accusation. As a matter of fact, he had even physically a kind of distaste, which age had deepened, for the toil of writing. What is meant would be appreciated if only he could have been seen at his desk manipulating a heavy fountain pen in his awkward fingers. One day on a slip of paper he wrote the whole secret: "To read, joy; to think, delight; to write, torture."

It was all that. If he detested writing -- each of his books was forced from him -- he loved to read and think. When his *Siger de Brabant* appeared, critics praised, among other features, the bibliographical knowledge revealed in it. Father Mandonnet had not acquired that knowledge on school benches, but in reading with industry and intelligence. One day a brother who brought some books from a library found him in bed sick. Passing through the room again some minutes later, he saw the sick man seated at the table in his bathrobe, reading in spite of a fever. Father Mandonnet examined whole collections from end to end. Never did he open a book merely to look for a reference; he read it completely, or rather he had already done so. In this way, going straight to the point, he read and annotated the numerous volumes of medieval history which he had collected, one by one, from all the rare-book dealers of Europe.

Thus he developed that keen sense of the tangles and stumps in the field of history which enabled him to avoid snares when he did not have time for minute exploration: "Mandonnet . . . ran into difficulties here, but shrewdly walked round them according to his custom," remarked a certain scholar in a vein of bad humor. Father Mandonnet had cultivated that fruitful intuition which enabled him to put his finger on a decisive document, an essential fact, a hidden cause, which, according to their own lights, either as they were or were not of a stature to appreciate the accuracy and value of these finds, historians were tempted to ascribe, now to an amazing historical flair, now to an efflux of unverifiable hypotheses. Experience has convinced us that our first scandalized reactions at the audacious insight of the master rose only from our ignorance. It happened at times that he followed the lead of his intuitions and seemed to be constructing unwarranted theses; but we did not know all that he knew. If our reading on the theologians of the twelfth century were what his was, would we have questioned, so lightly at times, the equivalence he maintained between the *ordo praedicatorum* and the *ordo doctorum*? His solid reliance on documents justified a certain boldness: "Come, my friend," he said to a disciple, who he knew would not abuse the counsel, "off the ground now, get on the trapeze."⁽¹⁾

What is more profoundly significant, his vast knowledge was not haphazard. On the contrary, it followed the itinerary of an intelligence which directed it over the leading roads of history; the vast network of these roads embraced the field as a whole. Father Mandonnet's intelligence was eminently synthetic. He did not believe that fidelity to a document dispensed from reflection, and his historical thought was at once total, organic, and balanced. He had weighed all human values and ranged them in a pyramidal hierarchy from the base in "our daily bread" to the topmost "peak of civilization," ascending always through the Bread which does not perish. In this edifice of reciprocal causality, every problem, every element, however small it might be, had to take its own place, or, more exactly, find its true dimension. In his eyes, an historical fact was never the fruit of pure scholarly research, but a stone in a pyramid, a link in a chain, a point of convergence; for him that fact had a meaning and a context infinitely extensive.

That is the point to be laid hold of here. Erudition may be multiple and far-reaching, but thought, like truth, is one. In fact, there is not a single one of the learned articles published by Father Mandonnet and collected here which does not contain in substance the whole of his thought. If he lingered on the record of Vitry, the symbol of the dog, or the *Summa of Master Paul*, it was not for the joy of identifying an anonymous writer or of elaborating on a detail of sacred heraldry; it was to substantiate in the concrete of reality one of his noble ideas about the Order of Preachers. All these studies were complementary and in sequence. They ran the whole length of the life of Father Mandonnet as along the bank of a stream, in the very rhythm according to which his idea developed. They bore the reflection of the intuition which gave them birth. They had only to be linked, like the two segments of Peter's chain, to form but one book.

It would not be rash to suggest that the very force of Father Mandonnet's reflective genius may have caused the sterility of his editorial power. Facts spoke to him of too many things; soon he paused to listen, and delayed for the examination of a point which his historical sense found more weighty still. The incalculable number of projected studies left in his files bear witness to this. A title, a brilliant introduction, then ten blank pages with new titles, indispensable steps in the development of the thought, but these pages remained blank; the article would never be written. It would have taken all the dimensions of a book and would have required ten years of supplementary research. Nevertheless, neither prelude nor title was in vain. Chosen by his synthetic intelligence, it marked out exactly the veins to be worked, those which would render most treasure and contribute necessary ore to attain a balance in the subject. A few lines from his pen held an extraordinary power of suggestion. Father Mandonnet was a stimulator of minds.

One day unexpected circumstances induced Father Mandonnet to put in writing his ideas about St. Dominic. The work was urgent; there was no call for notes. *Saint Dominique, l'idée, l'homme et l'oeuvre* soon appeared in a spiritual collection in Belgium in the form of a little book. Short as it was, the idea was there, whole and entire. We are conscious of a certain temerity in attempting to transform into a learned and critical work what was written with the freedom of style authorized by the literary genre of a booklet. How it has supported the experiment is evident. Well indeed has it played that role of light and form which characterize the writings of Father Mandonnet.

Toward the close of Father Mandonnet's life, some reading on the Rule of St. Augustine suddenly reviewed before his eyes several centuries in the history of religious orders and in that of the Preachers in particular. He began to compose a study. Later on when we had completed the work, for it was interrupted by his death, it seemed to us that in its totality the thought of Father Mandonnet had therein found the fulcrum which it had long envisioned and required.⁽²⁾ In composing the article on the *Ordo Praedicatorum*, Father Ladner felt the same conviction. Some titles on a folder left by Father Mandonnet opened the way for another study which was, from the first, comprehended in the idea

which had conceived the book, St. Dominic.⁽³⁾ The last word I heard from the mouth of the master, two days before he died when I spoke to him of this project, was that these two studies should form part of it. I have had no hesitation in compiling the whole under his name. *St. Dominic and His Work* is truly Father Mandonnet's book, though another hand helped to shape it. In spite of its multiple origin it is one, like the idea which inspired it. That the master may not be charged with responsibility for the mistakes of the disciple, we have endeavored always to note the change of hands. At the beginning of each study the name of the author is given.

NOTES

1 Those who have used the great works of Father Mandonnet know how serious and extensive was his labor over documents. We shall cite an instance hitherto unknown. Before treating of the origin of our Constitutions he thought it indispensable to engage in a minute comparison of the first Dominican legislative texts. He performed this task, preparing a new edition of the Constitutions of Rodez and of Humbert; each phrase was analyzed, traced in various editions, and dated when possible. The enormous manuscript compilation resulting from this heavy labor, loaned by him to Father Lemonnyer, disappeared in Rome at the death of the latter (1932). Fortunately a duplicate of it had been kept by Father Destrez who kindly loaned it to us.

2 Cf. *infra*, "The Academic Crisis," chap. 19.

3 Cf. *infra*, *Domini Canes*, appendix 6.

Introduction

On several occasions at Fribourg while Father Mandonnet was professor at the University, I had opportunities to question him about St. Dominic and the Order of Preachers to which he was wholeheartedly devoted. I recall the occasion when my inquiry was, to this eminent historian and loyal son of Dominic, a stunning blow. I asked whether the report were true that he did not hold in high esteem St. Dominic as a founder of a religious order. First his silence showed how such a charge wounded a son aflame with love for a father who was his incomparable hero; then, gravely these striking words fell from Father Mandonnet's lips: "You may quote me whenever you wish. I consider St. Dominic as a religious founder the greatest organizer that has ever trod this earth after the Lord Jesus Christ."

Even though the posthumous volume of Father Mandonnet, *St. Dominic and His Work*, has not come from his pen as his finished product, it is a unique biographical creation as well as a monumental historical survey. We are indebted to a scholarly confrere and disciple who appreciated fully the outlines indicated by Father Mandonnet and who filled them in according to his mind and spirit. Little is said of what is personal to St. Dominic, but his character grows to magnificent proportions viewed on the changing social, economic, and religious horizons of the medieval world. A summa of Dominican beginnings, the volume compellingly shows how the greatness of the ideal of the Order of Preachers consists in reflecting perfectly the mind of the Church.

New and significantly conclusive are the facts about the Rule of St. Augustine, proving that what has been almost universally regarded as drawn from the Epistle to religious women is identical with the primitive Rule formulated by the saint for his first community of men. This proof will recommend

Father Mandonnet's study, not only to Dominicans but to all orders and congregations living under the age-old but perennially youthful guide -- the Rule of St. Augustine.

The present volume, as a vital picture of the Church effectively solving crises in an age which battled with chaos for want of the truth even as our own does, should interest both clergy and laity. Viewed in the light of the ever-present apostolic mission of the Church, Father Mandonnet's study should be a challenge to us to meet the conditions of our day, even as the heroic Dominic and his sons met those of their age.

+ **John T. McNicholas**
Archbishop of Cincinnati
Feast of St. Rose of Lima, 1943.

Translator's Preface

ST. DOMINIC AND HIS WORK is a translation of *St. Dominique, l'idée, l'homme, et l'oeuvre* by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P., with notes and critical studies by Marie-Humbert Vicaire, O.P., and Reginald Ladner, O.P., published by Desclée de Brouwer & Cie, Bruges, Belgium.

This translation appears as a result of the interest and zeal of the Mother General of the Sinsinawa Dominican Sisters, at whose word it was undertaken. In the spring of 1939, shortly after the publication of the French edition, our Mother General met Father Vicaire in Fribourg, Switzerland. He then granted permission for the translation.

Five of the more erudite and technical *Studies* have not been included in this English edition. The matter of the Studies is otherwise comprehensively treated, and the historical specialists to whom they would primarily appeal will have access to the original.

The translator has added references to Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils by H. J. Schroeder, O.P.

All who have forwarded the preparation of this English volume by any word or work are assured of deep gratitude. Special acknowledgment is due to the Very Reverend Peter O'Brien, O.P., S.T.Lr., Ph.D., Prior Provincial of the Province of St. Albert the Great, River Forest, Illinois, for the examination of the English text of the restored primitive Constitutions of the Preachers, passages from which occur within the work. Appreciation is also due for the scholarly scrutiny of the Reverend Edward L. van Becelaere, O.P., S.T.Lr., who Studied under Father Mandonnet in Corsica half a century ago and saw him at Le Saulchoir not long before he died; and for the invaluable suggestions of the Reverend Patrick M. J. Clancy, O.P., S.T.Lr., J.C.D., in proofreading.

The book is placed under the patronage of Mary Immaculate, *Virgo praedicanda*, and St. Dominic, *Praedicator gratiae*, as a prayer that an army of new apostles may arise to carry out the command of Christ: "*Praedicate evangelium.*"

St. Clara Novitiate
Sister Mary Benedicta, O.P.
Sinsinawa, Wisconsin

Prologue

An Order is but the immortal reflection
of a man raised up by God. **Lacordaire.**

The history of a creative spirit finds its most perfect reflection in the institution it has brought into being. In that achievement all the energies of the genius converge and reach their goal. A lofty and clearly visioned end to be attained; a practical judgment in the choice of means to be employed; an unfaltering will in the use of resources at command: thus, generally and permanently runs the sketch for the life story of the men who have achieved great things during the ages.

The deeds and exploits of these heroes of sacred and profane undertakings capture the attention of the historian to the degree to which they are integrated in the essential problem of their age. The historian regards an anecdote, questionable as it often is, merely as a symbol to indicate a ratio between what was dreamed of and what was achieved. Only in the light of such principles can there be an approach to lives like those of St. Dominic, the Founder of the Order of Preachers, and St. Thomas Aquinas, the creator of Christian philosophy and theology: a master of action and a master of contemplation.

In this work there is an attempt to throw into relief the character of St. Dominic as Founder of one of the great religious orders in the

Church by showing how his work was inspired by the needs of Christian society and how it provided for them in a marvelously adequate way. Emphasis has been laid also on the dominant part which the Church took in the foundation, organization, and propagation of the Order of Preachers; for that is an undeniable truth, and it is but justice to recognize it and proclaim it. St. Dominic sought only to support the Holy See in its designs for the religious reform of the Christian world and for this service to place at its command the force which it had seemed unable to find. The writer of profane history would call him a man of valiant heart; to the historian of the Church he is a hero of apostolic soul. The glory of Dominic, the canon of Osma, will not be dimmed because his person and his deeds are viewed in the sphere of eminent ecclesiastical figures traveling over the perilous state of the world in the early thirteenth century. St. Dominic moved, without effort and with love, within the very orbit of sovereign authority, and thereby became a new star round which satellites rose without number to radiate their light and power in Christendom.

Since his work represents the terminus of his creative energy, the achievements of the Order during the first century are recorded for the purpose of illuminating further the life of St. Dominic, which is sketched but briefly. Thus will be vitalized the account of the development and progress of the institution born of the thought and toil of the holy Founder of the Preachers. It is but natural for one who has watched the planting of a tree to desire also to see it bear its first flowers and yield its first fruits.

B. HERDER BOOK CO.
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY,
ST. LOUIS 2, MO. AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C. 1948

[TOP](#)

[TRADITION INDEX](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

PART ONE

SAINT DOMINIC AND THE ORDER OF PREACHERS

CHAPTER I

Christendom in the Early Thirteenth Century

Religious life as an institution rose out of the pursuit of evangelical perfection, and this deep-rooted purpose of religious life was continually maintained in the midst of those societies called religious orders. It was this aim, whatever their apparent diversity, which grounded them in a common principle and constituted their generic unity. This aim was realized primarily by the practice of the three vows of religion, and secondarily by liturgical prayer and monastic observance.

After the fall of the Roman Empire in the West, during the ten centuries that spanned the history of the Middle Ages, the development of Christian society involved weighty problems at each new turn of civilization. In their solution the Church employed the active energies of the religious life, which, as a collective force, could open the way to great general achievements. Whereas the members of the hierarchy of the Church and the secular clergy were engaged in a local and uniform apostolate and represented the static power in the life of the Church, religious institutions exerted a dynamic activity, applicable in the special exigencies which, one after the other, they strove to meet.

In the very heart of the Church and under her authority, the successive emergence of religious orders thus represents a gathering of instrumental energies adaptable to the particular needs of an era. For that reason the great religious institutes bear the mark of the very purpose imposed upon them by the age that gave them birth. The end for which they were established accounts for the nature of their activity as well as for their social organization.

In the order of their appearance, religious societies took shape in groups. The first in each period usually bore the impress of experiments or new ventures. These were followed by the "type" orders, which embraced more adequately the means calculated to effect a solution of the problems of their time. Finally, still others emerged, which copied more or less closely the model of those which had attained stability.

In this evolution of religious life, bound up as it was with the change and progress of European civilization, institutions gradually modified and finally suppressed the secondary elements of early monasticism: the choral life and monastic observance. On the other hand, greater emphasis was placed on an active ministry in the service of Christian society.

Three centuries, or three periods, mark the great stages in the growth of the active religious life. It will simplify the understanding of this change to sketch it briefly. The sixth century witnessed the rise of the classic form of Western monasticism in the establishment of Benedictinism. The thirteenth century marked the advent of the mendicant orders, and the sixteenth the rise of the clerks regular. Institutes of later origin, though different in title, adhered to the forms already realized in religious life.

MONASTICISM

Established exclusively for the sanctification of its members, Oriental monasticism came into the West in its primitive form. But the fall of Roman civilization and the condition of Europe during the barbarian and feudal centuries called forth its program of manual work and its social organization.

The feudal system, already virtually established in the age of the barbarian kingdoms, and the Franco-Carolingian conquest imposed upon the European world a regime of universal agricultural labor in the economic order, and government by local personal lords in the political order. In the ecclesiastical domain the need most generally evident was for a sound system for spreading the Gospel in countries not yet converted. Monasticism made its contribution, especially in the sixth century, when the Benedictine Rule, superseding the older rules, perfected the organization of religious houses and created numerous centers of new religious life. To attain its end, the monastic regime followed a form analogous to that of the feudal order, then required by the state of society.

Monasticism did not, at least directly, entertain the idea of the apostolate as an aim, but temporarily and secondarily it found itself engaged in such work. By reason of the level of civilization in Europe, it actually became a powerful agent in stabilizing and developing Christian society. It was neither through the ministry nor through preaching that it exerted its influence, but by the force of example, through the virtue and labor of the monks. The monastic liturgy was itself an eloquent form of preaching, the only one appropriate to the rough and uncultured period of the early Middle Ages.

Monasticism accomplished its mission by adapting itself, in its own way, to the feudal regime. The abbey, like the manor, was a center of agricultural toil; and the monk, whose life was elevated by prayer and the Christian virtues, was nevertheless a serf of the Church, engaged in the cultivation of the soil. "They are true monks," wrote St. Benedict, "if they live by the labor of their hands." The monk, like the serf legally attached to the soil, made a vow of stability in the domain of his abbey. The organization of the monastery was likewise built on the feudal frame. The abbot was, indeed, the father of the monks, but he was also their lord, *dominus*. He was the sole and sovereign master in his own domain like the lay lord over his lands. Moreover, his powers were unlimited, without control, and they were for life. Lastly, the enormous network of monasteries spread over the lands of Christendom had their counterpart in the distributed estates of the feudal world. Each abbey was isolated and autonomous; it was sufficient to itself and lived its own life.

The great reforms of Cluny and Cîteaux, and those effected in Italy on a smaller scale, held the limelight of religious life in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. By a kind of limited centralization, an attempt was made to remedy the inconvenience of the primitive isolation of the monasteries. The trend toward political concentration which was then shaping the states of Europe had a reflection in monasticism: but the essential purpose of the monastic life remained unchanged. Aimed, first of all, at ensuring what would develop the spiritual life of the monks, the reforms impressed a more intense contemplative stamp on Benedictinism. There is no doubt that, from an ethical point of view, these measures had a profound effect on Christian society by virtue of the example given, and to a still greater degree perhaps through the characters provided from monastic life for the episcopacy and the papacy. But in their concern for their old way of life consecrated by a long past and a vital tradition, the reformers made no provision for the social needs of a new age.

The end of the twelfth century and the beginning of the thirteenth saw the dawn of a new order in the life of Europe and of the Church. The center of economic life had been in the large rural estates; this center now shifted toward the towns as they grew or were founded with amazing rapidity. The commune acquired a dominant influence in the economic and political sphere. The bourgeois who, more often than not, was only a merchant or artisan, claimed rights for himself and his property and thus became a new and active agent in social life. By agreement or by force, the commune despoiled the feudal lord of part of his rights and at times succeeded in bringing about his complete eviction; at the same time the great European nationalities were emerging as centralized political entities. The passive and isolated life of the serf receded into the background before the restless working classes of the towns, and it was in the communes that new problems were created for the Church. In general, if

we consider the rapid growth of the civil institutions which opened the new era, we see that ecclesiastical institutions were notably behind the times, set as they were in the forms of the feudal period.

The secular churchman lived under a regime of property, absorbed in the affairs of temporal business; this condition made for a materialization of his way of life, a neglect of his ecclesiastical duties, and a weakening of his morality. He was wanting in zeal and learning. The people of the communes, in their frequent struggles over the rights and privileges of the churches against ecclesiastical feudal lords, were caught up in a current of opposition toward the clergy and the hierarchy. According to their own notion of the apostolic ideal, they took the measure of the clergy of their time, and in the course of the twelfth century there arose attempts among the laity to be their own pastors. The heresies of the Cathari and the Waldenses in turn strengthened and aggravated these separatist tendencies. The anti-ecclesiastical theories of the heretics furnished a convenient weapon for the strife against the organization of the Catholic Church. Adherence to heresy took a disturbing and disastrous toll in southern France and in northern Italy, and the bishops were powerless to defend their Churches against this assault.

The only remedy for the situation lay in the formation of an apostolic clergy, zealous, virtuous, and poor. Preaching, and there was none then, would have to be well organized to instruct the Christian people, to lead them back or keep them in the faith, to enter upon the struggle against heresy. Schools of theology, and there were none apart from a few great scholastic centers like Paris, would have to be instituted and multiplied in Christendom for the education of the clergy. A learned clergy would have to be created, to meet the invading rationalist philosophy of Aristotle, Avicenna, and Averroes in its menace to Christian thought, and likewise to promote the progress of the sacred sciences, theology in particular. Lastly, the failure of the Christian armies in the East challenged a recourse to less material crusades in which the spiritual sword of the Gospel message would be substituted for that of the crusaders and the military orders.

THE MENDICANT ORDERS

Out of these needs rose the mendicant orders, especially the two most important, the Friars Preachers and the Friars Minor. Yet their respective positions in relation to the general problems of the Church were markedly dissimilar at the time of their foundation. The first to be established, with great freedom of action in their organization, were the Preachers, who at once adapted themselves adequately to the numerous needs then agitating society; and there they exercised intense activity. Thus they became the typical order; on this model other religious groups of the thirteenth century, to a greater or less degree, shaped their activity and their organization. In fact, the preachers alone had a clerical membership, that is, a personnel educated and ready for the varied ministry required by the needs just surveyed. Without exception, all the other orders of the thirteenth century were composed of lay elements or were formed around simple lay fraternities, which later evolved partially and slowly toward the grades of ecclesiastical life, before taking a notable part in the service of Christian society.

With the Preachers began the intensive contribution of the religious militia in the service of the Church. With them the monastery came up out of the valleys and down from the hills to the heart of the great cities; from the solitude of the country to the bustle of the public square. For the work of the bands, they substituted the strong labor of the mind: preaching and teaching. With them the unlettered monk changed into a religious scholar, no longer a man bound perpetually to his abbey, but a citizen of the Christian universe. In contrast to monastic agricultural wealth, the Preachers set up voluntary poverty and begging. The regime of feudal government gave way in their organization to a regime of election, conferring power of short duration, such as was the practice in communes and universities.

They also adopted a system of representative assemblies, such as were then making their appearance in a few countries of Europe. The scattered and isolated position of the monasteries yielded to a close centralization under the direction of a single head. Thus was effected a unity comparable to that built up in the French monarchy, but its limits extended to the very ends of Christendom; later it was to pass beyond these limits for the evangelization of the pagan world.

The evolution of religious life reached its term in the sixteenth century. With the institution of the clerks regular, the choral office and other monastic observances, already modified by the mendicant orders, were dropped. In the customs of their life, the clerks regular conformed to the practices in use by the secular clergy. In this last stage, religious life branched off in two different directions. One trend moderated the older social organization by a suppression of the vows and reduced the form of religious life to the simple principle of the common life; the other trend not only preserved the former social structure, but strengthened it further by a more authoritarian regime, like that then prevailing universally in the constitutions of the European states, a form of government called by historians political absolutism. The plan of Oratorian life exemplifies the first trend; the organization of the Society of Jesus is typical of the second. The purpose of this evolution was to effect a more complete freedom of action for the religious and to impress upon that action a more intensified character. This change was influenced by the conditions of the Christian society of that time, a society that was disabled by the violence of heresy and that required a powerful reaction by the Church. But let us now turn back to the thirteenth century for a closer survey of conditions in the Christian world at that period.

The march of civilization, sometimes advancing and sometimes halting or receding, had, in the course of the centuries, confronted the Church from time to time with new problems in the exercise of her divine mission in human society. As the close of the twelfth century and the beginning of the thirteenth, these problems were numerous as well as serious, and demanded an urgent solution. They arose in great part from the acceleration of the economic, political, and intellectual activity of Europe in the midst of the unchanging permanence of ancient ecclesiastical institutions which were products of historical conditions that had partially disappeared or were on the verge of disappearing. The old order of things could suffice no longer; it could neither provide for new needs nor even withstand the dangers which were rapidly growing worse. A thorough readaptation of the forces at the command of the Church was imperatively necessary. Apparently it might even be too late to meet the subversive action. Yet the Roman Pontiffs with anxious concern attentively studied both the new needs of Christendom and the cumulative dangers arising from problems left without a conclusive adjustment. In truth, the Holy See taxed all its ingenuity to meet a critical situation; but the available remedies, scarcely more than transitory palliatives, were of slight efficacy. Indeed, a study of the action of the papacy in these attempts at the restoration or adaptation of the life of the Church in social changes, shows us that the Church was reduced to a kind of impotence when she appealed to certain men of good will or called for new helpers to support her views and her projects. Religious life, with its great institutions, had from the beginning furnished the papacy with a strong arm for the work of conquest and sanctification in the countries of Europe. Once again and more directly Rome would place that religious life at her service in the crisis through which the Church was passing.

CHRISTIAN EUROPE

The Middle Ages, which it would be more exact and more fitting call Christian Europe, made a slow ascent toward a new civilization after that of the ancient world had fallen with the breakdown of the Roman Empire and the Germanic invasions. The attempts to found barbarian kingdoms, which were later absorbed into the Frankish conquest and finally into the Carolingian empire, were due to the civilizing remnants of the ancient Roman world, struggling to survive through a last unstable and

quickly defeated effort at social unification. Feudalism, a rudimentary system, adapted to the first social needs of man, came into possession of the parceled soil of Europe in the late ninth century. Meanwhile that crude age of farm labor advanced little by little toward higher forms of social life. The increase of population and the accumulation of the labor of generations resulted in an intensification of the riches of the soil and of the products of domestic animals. Local overproduction stimulated commerce and industry. Intelligent and courageous serfs by their initiative in remunerative enterprises liberated themselves from the necessity of living on the soil and became merchants and artisans. The nature of their activity tended to bring them together and to establish them in urban centers, which sprang up or took shape round their settlements. The first wealth of Europe grew out of commerce and the trades; the merchants, or the international bankers, became the creditors of secular and ecclesiastical princes. This economic advance, which increased the conveniences of life and developed a general taste for luxury, also nurtured the higher activities of civilization: political life, the sciences, and the arts. About the middle of the thirteenth century, Florence, a mercantile city of precocious genius, struck the first gold coins, the florin, the standard of exchange value and the symbol of universal prosperity.

Grouped and federated from the beginning by the community of their interests and the nature of their enterprises, business men and traders united for the protection of their person and their property against the local feudal authority. By agreement or by compulsion, sometimes after long struggle they obtained real concordats, if not full independence. With the help of charters of liberty or letters of franchise, the new class of bourgeois, or citizens of the commune, was henceforth constituted; but the united front for the gaining of municipal rights quickly gave place to rival factions within the life of the city. Struggles ensued among them even to the overthrow of an opposing party, whose leaders were banished and their goods confiscated. The commune often found internal peace only to usurp power over one or other of the neighboring and rival communes; and this war was carried on by these men in pursuit of gain with a violence and a ferocity that had no match in feudal barbarity.

Meanwhile, as the movement for communal independence ran on, lines began to be drawn in various parts of Europe marking the first national formations that would give birth to the great states of modern times. Greater feudal powers absorbed the lesser ones by conquest, marriages, inheritance, and donations. Princes, animated by the same ambitions as the bourgeois of the communes, began rival wars that often tended to upset the peace of Christendom and to crush subject peoples. Among the national ambitions then kindling, there would be no fire to equal that which burned in one already ancient, that of the Holy Roman Empire. With Frederick II it would burst out again in its claims to the restoration of the rights and spirit of the pagan imperial power.

THE TOWNS

The dangers threatening the Church from the princes still appeared slight or remote in the first years of the thirteenth century. Quite otherwise, however, was the attitude stirring among the Christian common people in the town, the center of the social activity of the time. Even at the close of the preceding century there appeared a movement of deep and sometimes of general antagonism toward the ecclesiastical hierarchy, particularly toward the lower clergy, who were in immediate contact with the people in the towns.

The causes of this disaffection were numerous. In their struggle for emancipation, the communes had frequently engaged in conflict with the religious authority. When the bishops and abbots were also temporal lords, it was directly against them that, often by force, the commune had to struggle in its aspiration for independence. In this conflict it despoiled them of part of their rights. Under other conditions the commune, in its internal organization and the management of its affairs, frequently

trespassed on the rights of churches and religious groups. Thus arose quarrels and incessant strife. And there developed deep-seated animosities, which passed from the temporal sphere into the spiritual and were manifested in criticism, abuse, and open contempt of the clergy.

Still, the chief source of the ill feeling between the urban population and the ecclesiastical authorities was deeper than a mere conflict of interests. The bourgeois and the common people of the towns represented a wide-awake class, very different from the inert and passive rural population of the preceding age. Their shrewd energy in business, the dealings of shopkeepers and workmen, and the daily ebb and flow of town life, made the urban population a flexible body, inquiring and talkative. At heart, however, it remained deeply religious and in certain places very pietistic. Apart from his interest in personal or collective business, the ordinary man, at that time illiterate, occupied his alert mind only with things that concerned religion. Society had long been Christian, and profane amusements were not yet numerous. On the other hand, material progress and the increased conveniences of life, along with the ceaseless friction in business and the trades, had notably quickened minds and souls. On all sides there arose a cry for religious light and spiritual consolations. The clergy, who should have provided for this need, permitted the initiative of heretical sects to anticipate or supplant their own service in important centers of Christendom. In many localities the heterodox propaganda debarred the official clergy from their traditional positions.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century two great sects shared in the diffusion of heresy. Descendants of the ancient Manichaeans, coming from the East, after a long stand in the Balkans, penetrated northern Italy and southern France: Lombardy and Languedoc were the provinces of their choice. For more than a century they had been propagating their teaching under the name of Cathari and Albigenses, with the result that they exercised a dominating influence in many places. Far removed from Christian thought by their belief in a double principle in the origin of things, the Neo-Manichaeans had a clergy, comprising a class called the "perfect," whose life appeared to be one of extreme rigor, real or affected. For them, all that pertained to matter and the physical life (eating of meat, marriage, and procreation) was the work of the evil principle.

The Waldenses, founded at Lyons about the last quarter of the twelfth century, owed their origin to an impulse of lay piety, but within the Church and on the basis of orthodoxy. Aspiring to lead the apostolic life, the "perfect" Waldenses met refusal from the Catholic clergy when they offered their services as self-appointed apostles. They cut themselves off in schism and tried to organize a counterpart of the Catholic Church, which they regarded as having failed in her mission and as having forfeited her rights. The Cathari departed far from Catholic doctrines and practices; the Waldenses held close to these and were therefore the more dangerous. But it was easier to effect the reconciliation of the Waldenses and their return.

At times, when the two sects met, they clashed through their rival teachings; but often, even without previous intent, they made a concerted attack upon the Church. A ruthless criticism of the clergy, their morals, their wealth, and their ignorance, was the regular theme in the preaching of the "perfect" in both sects, and they contrasted the austerity and detachment of their own life in imitation of the apostles with the lax conduct of the Catholic clergy, who were weighed down and obliged to be concerned with material interests by the temporal administration of the property with which the feudal regime had endowed the churches.[\(1\)](#)

Devout people listened gladly to these new apostles, who were ever ready to instruct their hearers and to denounce the corruption of that mighty Babylon, the Roman Church. Magistrates of towns and certain great lords, who had little religion and coveted the possessions of the Church, secretly or even

openly favored a propaganda which would support and gratify their greed by proclaiming that the true Church should possess nothing.

In southern France some ecclesiastical provinces embraced the heresy or wavered between the truth and heresy. In the first years of the thirteenth century the evil seemed desperate.

THE CLERGY

In the face of this lamentable condition, what were the clergy doing? Little or nothing. (2) The bishops, who by their office were responsible for the defense of the faith, the reform of morals, and the religious instruction of priests and people, were engrossed in business affairs; they lacked adequate knowledge of theology and ordinarily were well acquainted only with canons and laws. Many of the bishops were inert and unconcerned with conditions. In southern France, some of them courted or were suspected of courting heresy. Innocent III had to depose several of them.

The clergy, who lacked zeal and solid instruction, pursued a worldly life; many a parish was without its lawful pastor, who hired a vicar to perform his duties. The hunt for benefices was the curse of the time, and often Church offices were conferred on children who had ecclesiastical or secular dignities as their patrons. This condition was not universal. Here and there might be found zealous prelates and edifying pastors. Some even shone with the radiance of holiness in the firmament of the Church. Unfortunately they were rare stars in a dark night.

Preaching, the only means of instruction for a Christian people still unlettered, was rare. For the most part, the clergy limited the instruction of the people to the recitation of *The Apostles' Creed* and the *Our Father* on Sundays, with occasional short commentaries. At the close of the twelfth century there appeared the strange phenomenon of preaching leased in certain dioceses to lay associations, often unorthodox. The Third Council of the Lateran had forbidden this practice. Innocent III recalled this canon and, in his letter (May 27, 1204) to his legates in Languedoc, urged its application in the case of the Archbishop of Narbonne. Such abuses testify to the desire for religious instruction, and to the usual inability of the clergy to provide that for which the people hungered.

In the midst of this general indifference, the papacy alone was fully conscious of its mission and obligations. It tried, according to the means at its disposal, to ameliorate the condition of Christian society and to ward off the more pressing dangers. Ever since the end of the twelfth century, it had sought to exert influence through councils, individual warnings to bishops, and the action of chosen men of good will. It resorted to the sending of legates and appealed to the cooperation of the civil power. Particularly with the monks of Cîteaux, the strongest religious group of the time, it tried to direct monastic life to a service for which it was neither instituted nor prepared. It even went so far as to use the converted Waldenses, whom it established in religious orders, as propagators and defenders of the Catholic faith.

The Roman Church was openly alert to the needs that troubled Christian society. It would have to give the world the spectacle of a virtuous and zealous clergy, detached from the goods of this life and conformed to the evangelical ideal. It would have to provide instruction by preaching, the only means of reaching an illiterate people, especially in the large urban centers where they were tossed by the fever of emancipation from the Church. Step by step, to contest the ground won by heresy, it would have to adopt the propaganda methods of heresy. It was imperative, if possible, to strike at the root of the evil, by providing for the clergy schools of sacred science, scarcely any of which existed except at Paris, where for a century the study of the liberal arts and of theology had centered, as canon and civil law had flourished in Bologna. What would have to be developed in Paris was an intellectual life,

strong in the faith, leaders to cultivate the morals of the students and assume the direction of philosophy and theology, threatened as these were by the introduction of pagan thought and science into the schools and into Christian teaching.

In the last quarter of the twelfth century, the papacy tried to effect at least a partial realization of this program, but in an intermittent and haphazard way. Lack of continuity and a scattering of forces made the results almost inappreciable. This was the state of affairs in 1198 when Innocent III, a genius, ascended the papal throne. From the beginning of his pontificate he was given remarkable support in his undertakings by his nephew, Cardinal Ugolino Conti. Later on Cardinal Conti, as Gregory IX (1227-41), would continue with even greater intensity the religious policy which he had proposed and carried out during his uncle's pontificate and that of Honorius III (1216-27).

APPEAL TO CÎTEAUX

No sooner had Innocent III assumed the government of the Church than he took steps to solve the grave problems besetting Christendom. To him no question was more urgent than that created by heresy in southern France. Whenever it was a question of heresy, the views of the Pope were clear and firm. Convinced that the clergy were not without responsibility for the causes which engendered heresy, Innocent III, at the opening of his pontificate, addressed an earnest appeal to the erring, and paternally implored the heretics to return to the fold of the Church. He made the way easy for them, and with the newly converted he even tolerated customs that were a little suspect but that in no way affected doctrine. A large group of Lombard Waldenses responded to the papal appeal, and with them the Pope established the Order of the Humiliati (1201) to which, in spite of preventive measures taken by the bishops, he entrusted the service and defense of the faith.

To win Languedoc, where the danger seemed especially grave, the Pope dispatched his agents and urged the bishops and the princes to give them their support. Toward the close of the year 1203, two Cistercian monks, Peter of Castelnau and Raoul of the Abbey of Fontfroide, were appointed legates for the protection of Catholic interests in Languedoc; but they at once encountered indifference or ill will on the part of the bishops and the lay lords. Convinced beforehand that the work of his legates would not be enough, Innocent III at the same time thought of organizing a mission composed of a body of preachers for work in the midst of the people tainted with heresy. For the practical execution of this plan, he thought it necessary to recruit members of the Order of Cîteaux, from which he had already chosen his two envoys. On January 29, 1204,⁽³⁾ he wrote to the Abbot General, Arnold Amaury, asking him to find in his Order religious who could preach and to send them to the legates when the latter would be ready for them. Since preaching was foreign to the work of the Cistercian Order and since St. Bernard had expressly forbidden it, the carrying out of the Pope's project would be difficult. He soon determined to associate the Abbot of Cîteaux with the other legates and put him at the head of the whole undertaking. Thus, in a way, the whole Cistercian Order was morally engaged for the mission in the person of its head. The Pope, in his letter appointing Arnold Amaury (May 31, 1204)⁽⁴⁾ presented a distressing picture of the ravages of heresy and the inertia of prelates. He then paid a beautiful tribute to the Cistercian Order, saying that in it there might be found many zealous men, powerful in word and work, full of faith and charity, who would be ready to give their lives if the needs of the Church required it. Addressing the first two legates, Innocent III praised them, remarking that their labor had not been in vain, and finally he placed Arnold Amaury at the head of the legation. The duties of the Abbot of Cîteaux as head of a religious order would allow but little time for concentrated action in another field. The condition of the undertaking was such that at the end of the year Peter of Castelnau was thoroughly discouraged and asked the indulgence of Innocent III, requesting that he be permitted to return to his abbey.⁽⁵⁾

Just when the legate's discouragement had created a stir in papal circles and had probably saddened the undaunted spirit of the great Pontiff, divine Providence brought to the Curia two noble Castilian souls whose presence and power would change the whole course of events.

NOTES

1 See *infra*, chap. 23.

2 For details, see *infra*, chaps. 16 and 17.

3 Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 2103; PL, CCXV, 273; Villemagne, *Bullaire du Bienheureux Pierre de CasteInau*, pp. 49 ff.

4 Potthast, no. 2229; PL, CCXV, 358; Villemagne, pp. 52 ff.

5 For the Pope's reply, see Potthast, no. 2,391; PL, CCXV, 525; Villemagne, p. 64 (January 29, 1205).

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER II

The Order of Preachers in Formation (1205-14)⁽¹⁾

It was late in the year 1204 when Diego de Acebes, bishop of Osma, arrived in Rome, homeward bound from a mission which he had just completed in Denmark (1203-4).⁽²⁾ Alphonso IX, king of Castile, had asked Valdemar II for the hand of a Danish princess for his young son, Ferdinand. In the summer of 1204, when the prelate undertook a second journey for the purpose of conducting the princess to Spain, he found that death had claimed her.⁽³⁾ Having notified his sovereign of the unhappy event, Diego went on to Rome accompanied by his suite. He intended to make his *ad limina* visit and resign his see in the hope of going to preach the gospel among the Cuman Tartars.⁽⁴⁾

Innocent III was not used to hearing such requests from the bishops of the time, and he must have looked with awe upon the exceptional man whom Providence had directed to his throne in the very hour when his solicitude for the evangelization of Languedoc was battling for endurance over the discouragement of his legates.

THE TWO CASTILIANS

Prominent in the train of Acebes was the young thirty-five year old subprior of the cathedral chapter of Osma, Brother Dominic of Calaroga.⁽⁵⁾ His brow radiated intelligence; his countenance, strength and kindness. Perhaps the Pope already knew something of the tenor of ecclesiastical life at Osma, for early in his reign (May 11, 1199)⁽⁶⁾ he had by letter encouraged and confirmed the petition of the chapter to be transformed into a chapter of canons regular; at that time Acebes was the prior of the chapter under the episcopacy of Martin de Bazan. From the beginning the priests of Osma seemed disposed to second Innocent's reforms which he sought to introduce among the clergy everywhere when he took possession of the Apostolic See.

It was not to the work of converting the Cumans that the Pope assigned Diego de Acebes after refusing to accept his resignation, but to the conversion of the heretics in the south of France. In answer to the plea of his disheartened legate, Peter of Castelnau, that he be allowed to return to his abbey, Innocent III wrote a little later (January 26): "Stay where you are; at this hour action is better than contemplation." In this same spirit the Pope persuaded the generous Bishop that it was more urgent to preach to the Christians of Languedoc, who were in the way of perdition, than to the pagans along the Dnieper and the Volga. The Pope was aware of the Cistercians' disinclination to the ministry of preaching and their unpreparedness for it, especially in such untoward circumstances. Under the direction of the Bishop of Osma and with the cooperation of his young subprior, the project had some chance of success.

Innocent's favor and hopes must have centered particularly on Brother Dominic, whose zeal, knowledge, and virtue had been recommended by Acebes. "Even then he shone like a brilliant torch among the other canons,"⁽⁷⁾ wrote Jordan of Saxony, Dominic's first historian and his successor in the government of the Friars Preachers. Acebes was then probably already a man of advanced age, since he died two years later. On the other hand, though of remarkable maturity, Dominic was in the full vigor of youth and appeared to have a long future before him.

The Castilian pilgrims were well acquainted with southern France since, in fact, they had already traversed it three times in less than two Years. Dominic had even converted his heretical host, as he passed through Toulouse.⁽⁸⁾ With the two Osma the Pope decided upon a plan for an apostolic mission. Before going to Languedoc they were to visit Cîteaux to induce the Cistercians to give the collaboration requested by the Pope in his letters to the Abbot General, Arnold Amaury, on the preceding January 29 and May 31.

The Bishop of Osma and his companions left the Eternal City at the close of 1204 and started on the road to Burgundy. At Cîteaux, Diego and Dominic aroused interest in the project of sending missionaries as soon as the way would be opened by the two new apostles. To maintain unity in the undertaking which had been entrusted to Cîteaux, Diego himself took the habit of the Order before his departure⁽⁹⁾ and set out with his followers for Languedoc.

At Montpellier, a very Catholic city, the travelers found the three legates, who were thoroughly discouraged. That was, it seems, either in December, 1204 or January, 1205. When the papal legates had recounted the story of their failure and their weariness, the Bishop of Osma pointed out the need of changing their method: no longer to rely, or to rely less, on the uncertain support of the bishops and the civil authorities, but to appeal directly to the people by preaching and example; in a word, to begin an evangelical ministry. The new way of life proposed by Acebes required their daily travel on foot as mendicants, instruction of the faithful by frequent sermons, and public discussion with the ministers and leaders of heresy.

The legates objected to the novelty and the practical difficulties of this program. Devoted as they were, however, to the Catholic cause, they were ready to support the enterprise if the Bishop and some of his followers were willing to start the program and lead the way. The public business to which the legates had to attend by order of the Holy See and the adjustments involved as a consequence, did not leave them much time for more than an intermittent collaboration in the mission work. Nevertheless they planned to give their cooperation where it would be most useful.

THE MISSIONERS

The legates and the Bishop of Osma dismissed their equipages and their numerous servants, the ordinary accompaniment of travel with high ecclesiastical dignitaries; in the manner of the apostles, the mission band left Montpellier to enter the districts infested by heresy.⁽¹⁰⁾ The missionaries' itinerary can be traced for more than a year, marked as it was by the holding of public debates which history has recorded. The apostolic preachers contended with the leaders of each heresy successively at Servian, Béziers, Carcassonne, and Montréal; but these were only the principal points. Between times along the way they preached to the faithful and to the heretics.

A great debate had just been held at Montreal, and the mission was still functioning in that vicinity in the month of March, 1206, when the first legate, the Abbot General of Cîteaux, arrived, accompanied by twelve abbots, who had brought with them several monks in the hope that their assistance would be useful. The need of this collaboration had been foreseen by Innocent III when he requested it of the Abbot General two years before. It was what the latter had agreed to give, once the Bishop of Osma and Dominic had prepared the way.

To the work of this new and important contingent of missionaries was added the active collaboration of the new Bishop of Toulouse, Foulques, himself a Cistercian, who had taken possession of his see a month earlier (February 5).⁽¹¹⁾ Foulques was destined to take a most important part in the religious history of southern France. When at length St. Dominic found himself alone as the last heir of the

Mission enterprise, the Bishop would be his strongest support in his efforts to plan and realize the project of founding the Order of Preachers.

The suddenly augmented band of missionaries was dispersed, each being assigned his field of labor and his activities. Doubtless the Cistercian abbots worked with all good will in their apostolic venture, and some good resulted from it. Nevertheless, according to the testimony of several contemporaries, in their endeavor they encountered serious obstacles. The tenacity of the heretics on the one hand, and on the other their own inexperience in a ministry alien to their vocation, thwarted the impotent efforts of the dozen abbots. Early in the summer, after three months of service, they returned to their monastery. The burden of the mission again fell on the shoulders of the Bishop of Osma and Brother Dominic and their few first-hour followers.

Dominic was then exercising his zeal at Fanjeaux and neighboring places. This town, built on a rugged height, was one of the most active centers of the heresy. In the month of July, Dominic won back to the faith, "by his word and example," so say contemporary chronicles, an important group of girls and noble women. With nine of them, he founded a convent a short distance from Fanjeaux. For this purpose the Bishop of Toulouse gave him the church of Our Lady of Prouille, near which the new convent was established.⁽¹²⁾ By this move Prouille became the first stronghold in the midst of heretical country. This house would serve as an operational base and a radiating center for the apostolate of Dominic and his few companions. From the beginning, the monastery received a name which was later transmitted to the Dominican monasteries of the fathers; that name well describes the part it was to play. In the legal documents of the time, Prouille was usually referred to as *Sancta Praedicatorio* (the Holy Preaching).⁽¹³⁾

The departure of the Cistercian abbots, the efficacy of St. Dominic's preaching, and the establishment of Prouille convinced the Bishop of Osma of the necessity of providing more liberally for the new developments. He decided to return to his own diocese, from which he had been absent for two years and a half, in order to collect spiritual and material help for the work in Languedoc.

THE POPES IDEA

Diego de Acebes had taken upon himself the management of the apostolic preaching and the responsibility for it. His going left the mission without a head. In the absence of their Bishop, Dominic and his companions dared not assume authority to continue the work alone; the office of preaching, according to canon law and custom, was to be carried on only under the direction of the ordinary of the diocese. The legates themselves possessed no official written instruction for this purpose and, after the failure of the mission of the twelve abbots and the departure of Acebes, perhaps they were inclined to doubt whether the undertaking could survive. At this juncture, Raoul, the third legate, who was evidently in closer contact with the missionaries, referred the matter to Innocent III and asked for instructions. The Pope did not hesitate an instant. In his letter of November 17, 1206,⁽¹⁴⁾ he strongly ordered his agent to promote preaching with all his power through the ministry of men judged fit for this office. Evangelical preaching, as defined by the Pope, corresponded to what Diego de Acebes and Dominic had established and practiced: imitation of the poverty of Christ, simplicity of garb, an ardor to instruct the people by the example of their lives and the teaching of the word. It was the first time in feudal Europe that the Holy See sanctioned such a procedure. The canons had forbidden begging by clerics and monks; but the present was a time for momentous decisions, and Innocent III was equal to taking them. By a single stroke of the pen, he revived the primitive form of the apostolate in Christian society. The startling innovation was deemed necessary to cope with the dangers of the hour. Following a summary of this letter of November 17, 1206, a recent biographer of Innocent III appends this observation: "These few lines expressed exactly and precisely the habit of thought which produced

St. Dominic and created the first mendicant order."(15) If a slight chronological error had not concealed a part of the truth, Luchaire would have seen that this letter had, in fact, been issued in direct confirmation of the mission of St. Dominic and his companions after the departure of the Bishop of Osma. This letter would even have been an express foundation of the Order of Preachers, if it had been addressed to Brother Dominic instead of the legate Raoul; but the Curia had its designs on Dominic and was awaiting the propitious moment, which seemed not yet to have struck. At any rate, the letter of November 17 was a prelude and a kind of virtual foundation of the Friars Preachers, the idea of which, we are told in the primitive sources, was already conceived in the first days of the apostolate of Acebes and Dominic, and, it might be added without fear of error, in the mind of Innocent III.

Acebes died (February, 1207)(16) shortly after his return to Osma, where he had gone on foot. Perhaps his arduous labors in Languedoc prematurely hastened his end. The legate Raoul preceded him in death. One after the other, every support had given way round Dominic, and the great apostle was left alone in the field, having worked, more faithfully than anyone, in the shadow of his Bishop.

There began for Dominic in 1207 what might be called the "Prouillian" years. It was a period of eight years, hidden from the view of history by the tumult of the Albigensian crusade. After the assassination of his legate, Peter of Castelnau (January 15, 1208), Innocent III finally called the Christian barons to arms against the heresy and its instigators. Meanwhile Dominic was living apart from the whirl of the armed struggle and its political complications, dedicating himself without rest to the apostolate.

He devoted himself first of all to the formation of the nuns at Prouille and to the organization of their convent. The bishops, Simon de Montfort, leader of the crusade, his lords, and even ordinary folk contributed donations of various kinds in favor of the sisters and the "Holy Preaching." Dominic preached to the faithful of the environs and by his word and example converted a notable number of heretics to the Catholic faith. About fifteen official documents give a record of the conversions and enable us to estimate the importance of the results.(17) The Catholic people openly showed their esteem for Dominic, and several times he was obliged energetically to refuse election to bishoprics. By vocation an apostle, he prayed, worked, and waited. He knew his hour would come, and each day brought it nearer.

The time was at hand early in 1215 when, with heresy vanquished, calm began to appear in the stormy sky of southern France.(18) A great council opened on January 8 at Montpellier. When it was over, the papal legate, Peter of Benevento, returned with the Bishop of Toulouse to his episcopal city. The council had legislated on matters of heresy and the reform of the clergy. Foulques was eager to put into execution the designs of the council. By appointing Dominic and his companions preachers in the Diocese of Toulouse, he sought to execute the instructions which the legate had brought from Rome. The former subprior of Osma thus found himself at the head of the first group of diocesan missionaries known to Christian Europe. The bull of convocation for the Fourth General Council of the Lateran had been issued April 19, 1213. Evidently Innocent III, in formulating the program, determined to present as already realized the project he intended to impose upon the bishops of the council. Fully cognizant of the difficulties the bishops would face in instituting diocesan preachers, he would propose the "Friars Preachers" to solve the problem for the whole Christian world.

THE ACT OF TOULOUSE

By an official document, which is still extant,(19) Bishop Foulques constituted Brother Dominic and his companions preachers in the Diocese of Toulouse. They were to extirpate heresy, combat vice, teach the faith, and train men in good morals. For the attainment of this end, they proposed to travel on foot, religiously practicing evangelical poverty and preaching Christian truth. Bishop Foulques granted

the preachers and those who would join them a part of the ecclesiastical tithes required for their needs, with the condition that they restore at the end of the year what they had not used. He felt bound thus to provide for those who chose evangelical poverty for Christ and were laboring by word and example to enrich others with heavenly gifts. Among the needs to which they would have to apply these funds, Jordan of Saxony listed books as of first importance.⁽²⁰⁾ Thus the name, the office, and the means which, in a short time, would constitute the Order of Preachers were clearly defined in Bishop Foulques' official document. A few months later⁽²¹⁾ the Holy See simply extended to the universal Church the institution which Foulques had established in his diocese, borrowing not only the thought, but even, so to speak, the very formula of his decree.

While Foulques was raising the spiritual structure for preaching in his diocese, a material foundation was also being secured. On April 25, Peter Seila, a rich bourgeois of the city, divided his property with his brother. To St. Dominic and his successors he gave his own house, one of the city's most beautiful buildings, where the community of new Preachers was already installed. Finally, he himself joined the band of missionaries.⁽²²⁾

The Toulouse Preachers must have numbered seven at that time in accordance with Dominic's plan for their doctrinal instruction they attended the lectures of Alexander Stavensby, whom Foulque had to put at the head of his episcopal school to conform to the academic decrees of the Third Lateran Council (1179) and to demonstrate, as already complied with, a measure which the next council (Fourth Lateran) would re-enact and define. Master Alexander who afterward became a professor at Bologna and later bishop of Coventry (1224-38), in a dream saw seven stars appear, rise in the heavens, and increase in magnitude to light up the whole world. The next morning Dominic and his six companions came to him and took their places among his hearers.⁽²³⁾

The founding of the apostolic missionaries of Toulouse marked a step toward the institution of a body of preachers according to the evangelical spirit for the service of Christian society. The desires of Innocent, Diego de Acebes, St. Dominic, and Bishop Foulques were approaching realization. Toward the beginning of September, 1215, Foulques, minister of the Church of Toulouse, and Dominic, minister of preaching, as they styled themselves in their official documents,⁽²⁴⁾ set out for the Fourth Lateran Council.

| CHRONOLOGY (1204-8) ⁽²⁵⁾ | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | Certain | Probable |
| Judiciary commission of Diego into diocese of Astorga | Jan. 12, 1204 | |
| First journey into the Marches | | summer, 1204? |
| Diego in Castile (?) | Dec. 8, 1204 Feb. 17, 1205 | |
| Second journey into the Marches | | summer, 1205? |
| At Rome | | winter, 1205-6 |
| At Montpellier | 1206 | end of May |
| Disputes at Servian, Béziers, Carcassonne, and departure of Peter of Castelnau | 1206 | June-July |
| General chapter of Cîteaux | Sept. 14, 1206 | |
| Peter of Castelnau signs peace at Villeneuve | October 27, 1206 | |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------|
| Dispute at Montréal | late March, early April, 1207 | |
| Arrival of the dozen abbots | April, 1207 | |
| First charter of Prouille | April 17, 1207 | |
| Peace overtures in Provence by Peter of Castelnau | late April, 1207 | |
| Abbot of Mt. Ste. Marie at Pamiers | June 12 | 1207 |
| Guy of Cernai at Carcassonne | June 24 | 1207 |
| Death of Raoul de Fontfroide | July 9, 1207 | |
| First departure of Cistercians | 1207 | July |
| Diego at Pamiers | 1207 | August |
| Arnold goes to Marseilles | Aug. 21, 1207 | |
| Diego in Spain | 1207 | October |
| Departure of most of the abbots | 1207 | October |
| Death of Diego | Dec, 30, 1207 | |
| Assassination of Peter of Castelnau | Jan. 14, 1208 | |

NOTES

1 The chronology of the years 1205-8 presents serious difficulties; nearly every historian attempts a new system. That of Father Mandonnet, skillfully worked out, seemed acceptable. We feel now, however, that we should question it as we have that of Scheeben. See table at the close of this chapter.

2 Perhaps 1204-5.

3 See pp. 355 ff.

4 For all that followed, see *infra*, pp. 405 ff. 20

5 Jordan of Saxony, *De principiis ordinis praedicatorum*, no. 14; Laurent, *Historia diplomatica S. Dominici*, no. 2.

6 Laurent, no. 1; Potthast, no. 697.

7 Jordan, no. 12.

8 *Ibid.*, no. 15.

9 *Ibid.*, no. 18. This taking of the habit may be viewed as a symbolic act. In all probability Diego did not wear the habit; otherwise Peter of Vaux de Cernai would not have failed to note it, as Scheeben rightly observes. Cf. *Der heilige Dominikus*, p.429.

10 Cernai, *Historia Albigensis*, nos. 20 f.; Jordan, no. 20; Bourbon, *Anecdotes historiques*, nos. 82, 251. See *infra*, pp. 405-21.

11 Puylaurens, *Historia albigensium*, no. 7; Gams, *Series episcoporum*, 638; Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, 488.

12 Jordan, no. 27; Humbert, *De vita regulari*, no. 19; Laurent, nos, 5-7, 11.

13 Laurent, no. 6.

14 Potthast, no. 2912; Laurent, no. 3. According to our chronology, this letter arrived before Diego's departure and has another significance.

15 Luchaire, *Innocent III*, p. 89.

16 Perhaps December 30, 1207.

17 Balme and Lelaidier, *Cartulaire ou histoire diplomatique de S. Dominique*, I, 171-73, 187, 271 f., 468, 470, 484.

18 See *infra*, pp. 422-46.

19 Laurent, no. 60

20 Jordan, no. 39.

21 Lateran Council, can. 10. See Hefele-Leclereq, *Histoire des conciles*, V, 340 Schroeder, *Councils*, p. 251.

22 Laurent, no. 61.

23 Cf. Humbert, *Legenda Sti. Dominici*, no. 40; Nicholas Trivet, *Annales sex regum Angliae*, p. 222; Echard, *Scriptores O.P.*, I, 11; Balme, I, 509-12. It was probably this master who signed a charter of the Preachers at Bologna, June 7, 1221. Cf Laurent, no. 150.

24 Balme, I, 484; Laurent, nos. 11, 60.

25 This table represents Father Vicaire's concluding page for his Study on the Chronology of this four-year period. The Study is one of those not included in this English edition. See Pierre Mandonnet, *Saint Dominique*, Paris, 1938, "Etude I," pp. 83-88. (Translator's note.)

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER III

Years of Experimental Activity (1215-19)

Foulques and Dominic anticipated by some weeks the opening of the Council, which was convoked for November 2. They arrived in Rome early in September,⁽¹⁾ and gave the Sovereign Pontiff a full report of all that had been accomplished in Toulouse. The possibility and the timeliness of extending the foundation of the Preachers to the universal Church claimed their consideration. At the moment it was difficult to forecast the attitude of the Council toward the projects of ecclesiastical reform. While awaiting developments, Innocent III, by his letter of October 8, confirmed the foundation of the monastery at Prouille and took it under his protection.⁽²⁾

The Fourth Lateran Council saw the largest assembly of clerics ever gathered in Christian Europe, and the legislation then enacted has affected many matters of ecclesiastical law even to the present day. In the bull of convocation (April 19, 1213), Innocent III assigned as the principal purposes of the Council, "the reform of the universal Church, the reform of morals, the extirpation of heresy, and the strengthening of the faith."⁽³⁾ It was the very ground on which Dominic had been spending his zeal for eleven years. The Council held three public sessions between the eleventh and the thirtieth of November. Among its decrees relative to the reform of Christian society, some of the most important revolved directly around the work undertaken by St. Dominic and his fellow workers. Such were those aimed at placing the Church in a position to provide for the great needs reviewed in the introduction to this study: the preaching of the gospel to the Christian people and the instruction of the clergy

TENTH CANON

On the first point, the tenth canon provides as follows:

Among other things that pertain to the salvation of the Christian people, the food of the word of God is above all necessary, because as the body is nourished by material food, so is the soul nourished by spiritual food, since "not in bread alone doth man live, but in every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God." It often happens that bishops, on account of their manifold duties or bodily infirmities, or because of hostile invasions or other reasons, to say nothing of lack of learning, which must be absolutely condemned in them and is not to be tolerated in the future, are themselves unable to minister the word of God to the people, especially in large and widespread dioceses. Wherefore we decree that bishops provide suitable men, powerful in work and word, to exercise with fruitful result the office of preaching; who in place of the bishops, since these cannot do it, diligently visiting the people committed to them, may instruct them by word and example. And when they are in need, let them be supplied with the necessities, lest for want of these they may be compelled to abandon their work at the very beginning. Wherefore we command that in cathedral churches as well as in conventual churches suitable men be appointed whom the bishops may use as coadjutors and assistants, not only in the office of preaching but also in hearing confessions, imposing penances, and in other matters that pertain to the salvation of souls. If anyone neglect to comply with this, he shall be subject to severe punishment.

The regime established at Toulouse six months earlier by Foulques with the institution of the diocesan Preachers was thereby extended to the whole episcopate. The tenth canon of the Council was evidently framed on the letter of Innocent (November 17, 1206) for the establishment of the apostolic missionaries of Languedoc, and on the letter of Foulques (1215) for the institution of these missionaries as preachers

in the Diocese of Toulouse. The only difference was that to the general requirement of preaching by word and example, Dominic and his companions, as revealed by the two documents cited, added to their program the practice of evangelical poverty.

The Bishop of Toulouse must have had an influential place in the congregation which elaborated this canon of the Council, and the Pope as well as Cardinal Ugolino, to show the practical possibility of it, must have emphasized the example of what Foulques had accomplished in his diocese. The Curia was convinced that the bishops would not find men available to carry out what the Council required. After imposing the obligation and enacting the ecclesiastical law in the matter, the Holy See reserved to itself the power to provide the bishops, within a short time, with the preachers whom they themselves could not procure.

Dominic, who had consecrated a dozen years to the apostolate and, for the first time in the history of the Church, had formed a permanent body of preachers, must have attracted the attention of a great number of prelates and must have made the personal acquaintance of many of them. A few years later, he met them again in his journeys through France, Spain, and Italy, and they were disposed to welcome the new Preachers who were willing to discharge the office of preaching without even asking for the material aid⁽⁴⁾ which the Council had prescribed. In making such a stipulation, the Council was conforming in one more detail to what the Bishop of Toulouse had already arranged for his diocese.

In the acts of the Council, the eleventh canon, which immediately followed that on the appointment of preachers, provided for ecclesiastical academic instruction, the only kind known at the beginning of the thirteenth century. The canon entitled *De magistris scholasticis* contains a reference to the scholastic statute of the preceding Council of the Lateran (1179), which had remained ineffectual. The previous measure was reiterated and defined with greater precision. The bishops and their chapters were to install, in each cathedral church, and elsewhere if possible, a master capable of giving free instruction in grammar to the clerics of that church and other churches. Moreover, the metropolitan see was to provide a theologian to teach Sacred Scripture (*Sacra pagina*) to the priests and candidates for holy orders that they might have proper training in whatever concerns the ministry of souls. The chapters were to assign a prebend to these two classes of masters during the term of their teaching.

NEW DECREES

The reform of clerical education, or rather its organization, was: "an indispensable preliminary if the Church hoped to cultivate preachers able to instruct the people and to contend with heresy. Unfortunately masters of sacred science were even more rare than preachers. If this were not otherwise known, it would be evident enough when the Fourth Lateran Council declared that the moderate scholastic program of the preceding Council had not been carried out and then limited its hopes to the establishment of a master of theology for each ecclesiastical province. Yet that prescription would also be a dead letter. With the program of preaching ordained by the Council, Dominic embraced that of instruction in the sacred sciences and took a responsibility for the execution of the two reform measures to a degree far exceeding the import of the ordinances of 1215.⁽⁵⁾ The *Ordo Praedicatorum* would also become the *Ordo Doctorum*, terms found to be identical in ecclesiastical tradition and in the language of the period. They expressed the teaching mission of the Church, confided by right to the bishops and ordinary prelates, as shown in another chapter.

One of the conciliar decrees, however, seemed to run counter to the projects of the Curia and Dominic. The thirteenth canon, relative to the foundations of the new religious orders, says: "Lest too great a diversity of religious orders lead to serious confusion in the Church of God, we strictly forbid anyone in the future to found a new order. Whoever is desirous of entering an order, let him choose one

already approved. Similarly, he who should wish to found a new monastery, must accept a rule and institution already approved."

This decree was passed by the Council at a time when the two greatest orders of the late Middle Ages were just emerging from their cradle and when the first, in the person of its head, was even then in Rome, ready with a petition for recognition. Almost certainly the thirteenth canon was not inspired by Innocent III. It is even highly probable that the Pope opposed it, before finally yielding to the insistence of the bishops.(6) Representatives of the orders of monks and of canons, who were present in large numbers at the Council, might be expected not to favor any move that would divert from their own establishments the religious impulse everywhere stirring. The old institutions were in a state of decadence, and by a natural instinct of self-preservation, they stood against whatever might cause a greater loss of strength. But the opposition to the establishment of new religious orders, as expressed in the ecclesiastical decree, proceeded rather from the bishops of northern Italy and southern France. From a company of the reconciled Waldenses, Innocent III had established in Lombardy in 1201 the Order of the Humiliati, and in 1208 in Languedoc the Poor Catholics. These new religious, who had retained some of their old antipathy toward the clergy, did not conceal their sentiments in propaganda, and quite generally attracted the disfavor of the bishops in the dioceses where they were carrying on their work as neophytes.(7) Innocent III, whose experience had taught him that the regular and secular clergy was incapable of providing the preachers required to carry on the work of reform, energetically defended his new creations. The opposing bishops found an occasion in the Council to take their revenge and to protect themselves from what they considered a real danger; their viewpoint was perhaps selfish, and in any case somewhat narrow. But an untimely canon of the Council could not stop Innocent III and the Roman Curia from pursuing plans for reform which the state of Christendom rendered urgent, especially since the Council had recognized the need of the reform and approved the program as a whole.

From the Curia, Dominic received formal encouragement to pursue the work begun, and it suggested his return to Toulouse to consider certain pressing problems with his followers. One of these problems was the choice of a rule.(8) Foulques and the leader of his apostolic missionaries left Rome and were back in Toulouse early in 1216.(9) The new Preachers had full liberty to go ahead.

THE CUSTOMS

They turned first to the choice of a rule and then proceeded with preliminary measures for the organization of their institution. In the Latin Church there were, properly speaking, only two rules, that of St. Benedict, legislator for monastic life, and that for canons regular, known as the Rule of St. Augustine. For a company of clerics like the new Preachers, only the latter would be adaptable. There was no room for hesitation. Brother Dominic had made profession according to this Rule in the chapter of the canons of Osma. He still had the title of canon and, even after the establishment of his Order, continued to hold it,(10) just as he retained and transmitted to his spiritual posterity the habit of a canon regular.

Further, the Rule of St. Augustine was pre-eminently a rule of spiritual life and implied no other obligation than the common life and individual poverty. It left the way open for all the particular observances a body of religious would choose to adopt.(11) The Preachers of Toulouse, therefore, compiled a set of supplementary rules which they called Customs.(12) This legislative document, incorporated in the primitive Constitutions, formed the first part or division of it under the title *Liber consuetudinum*, a title that it kept until the general chapter of 1249.

The scope of the Customs was limited to the practices of conventual life, or what might be called monastic and canonical observances. No attempt was made to determine the governmental organization of the institute. The new Preachers were creating a work which in end and means had no counterpart in Church history. Therefore they preferred to let experience prove what would be possible, and thus practically to determine the final shape of their institution. Never was a spirit less aprioristic than that of St. Dominic and his first Preachers. But, possessed as they were of a pure and lofty ideal, of intense training in the Christian apostolate, and of a form of life already approved, their progress would be rapid and far-reaching in the realization of a plan clearly conceived and even then partly executed. Experience would show them the changes to make, the adaptation to effect, and the solid foundation on which finally to establish their institution.

In drawing up their Customs, St. Dominic and his companions borrowed parts, notably substantial, from the legislation of Prémontré, the last great reform of the canons regular. That circumstance has induced certain historians, even Dominicans, to say, and quite incorrectly, that the Constitutions of the Preachers reproduced in part those of Prémontré. The section borrowed related exclusively to the canonical Office and monastic observances, the foundation common to all religious life at the time. Whatever was essential to the Order or characteristic of it, its end, means, organization, and government, belonged distinctively to the institution of the Preachers, and nothing like it existed either at Prémontré or in any other community which had yet figured in the history of the Church.

Moreover, even in taking verbatim various elements from the text of the Customs of Prémontré, the Preachers supplemented the articles by notations corresponding to their own end, signaling what was essential to their purpose. The ministry of preaching was to be zealously promoted, and study was to be intense. A particular urgency marked this last prescription. The Preacher was to study day and night, at home or on a journey. To facilitate the exercise of study, the rule of dispensation was even then applicable for many points, while later it was to become general. Thus dispensation controlled the regime of rigorous asceticism, adopted to rival that of the Cathari clergy. The needs of study also dictated that the choral office should be recited rapidly, and that silence should be rigorously observed in the convent.

The question of poverty, or rather the extent of its practice, was then raised, as we are told by the first historian of St. Dominic.⁽¹³⁾ From the beginning of his apostolate in Languedoc, the subprior of Osma had lived on alms in the course of his evangelical journeys and would continue this custom to the end of his life. Moreover, it was the method agreed upon a year earlier in the act of constitution for the Preachers of Toulouse. But would it be possible to impose such a rule on a great body of clerics who were to live in the heart of great cities unsupported by the fruitful manual labor of the ancient monks? Would the material assistance offered by the faithful in exchange for the spiritual benefits of the friars be enough to ensure their subsistence? Everything depended on the success of their enterprise and on the reception given them by the people of the cities. Meanwhile they adopted provisionally the plan established by

Foulques for the diocesan missionaries of Toulouse.⁽¹⁴⁾ They would have revenues, but no property. The administration of property would hinder the friars in the exercise of their apostolic mission, while the example of their detachment from the goods of earth was a condition for the efficacy of their preaching. Experience would show to what degree they could push the application of the principle of poverty.

THE FIRST PREACHERS

In possession of the Rule of St. Augustine and their Customs, the Preachers were about to realize another step toward their establishment. The Bishop of Toulouse, devoted patron of the work of apostolic preaching, urged the chapter of his cathedral to give the chapel of St. Romanus to Dominic and his companions. The number of the Preachers had increased; "they were about sixteen in number," says Jordan of Saxony.⁽¹⁵⁾ No longer was the house of Peter Seila large enough, and they required a place for preaching. Near the church the Preachers immediately built their first monastery. The deed of gift executed in the presence of the Bishop in the month of July is very remarkable. Before his journey to the Roman Curia Dominic had had the title, "Minister of Preaching"; here it reads "Master of the Preachers" (*Magister Praedicatorum*).⁽¹⁶⁾ It was the official title ultimately conferred on him by the Holy See. Doubtless the change occurred in consequence of the negotiations at the Curia relative to the new foundation. In this one point of detail we catch a glimpse of the wise policy of Innocent III and his associates in the establishment of the Order of Preachers: to have the institution at work before creating a law in its regard; to be guided by the light of an experience consciously preordained and promoted.

Dominic supervised the construction of their convent and attended to the installation of his friars at St. Romanus. Once the work was materially and spiritually under way, he set out for Rome and arrived there late in November or early in December, 1216. Innocent III, the pontiff without peer, had died on July 16, and Cardinal Honorius Savelli succeeded him two days later. The tiara rested on another head, but the policy of the Curia remained unchanged. Cardinal Ugolino, a nephew of the deceased Pope, who would handle the gravest ecclesiastical business of the new pontificate, would have maintained, himself alone if necessary, a perfect continuity of policy. Dominic's arrival was expected in Rome and, we may say without fear of error, anticipated with high hope.

CHAMPIONS OF THE FAITH

In face of the conciliar prohibition of new religious institutions and of the choice of the Rule of St. Augustine by the Preachers, the Order was to be established as a foundation of canons regular. On December 22, Honorius promulgated in favor of Brother Dominic, prior of St. Romanus, and of his companions, a solemn bull of constitution.⁽¹⁷⁾ It was in every way similar in style to that used in the bulls issued for the canonical foundations of the late twelfth century. And yet the life of Dominic from the year 1205 on, his achievements and his projects, one as they were with those of the Curia, marked the new Preachers as distinctly different from the clerics of the former chapters of canons regular. Recognizing the character of their new role, Honorius on the same day issued a bull, unusual in style, and more astonishing in import than unusual in form, in which he proclaimed the mission of the Canons of St. Romanus of Toulouse. The Pope, addressing Dominic, said: "Considering that the brethren of your Order are to be champions of the faith and the true lights of the world (*pugiles fidei et vera mundi lumina*), we confirm your Order and take it under our government."⁽¹⁸⁾ The expression *vera mundi lumina* is taken from the hymn for the feast of the Holy Apostles.

Passing over certain minor features peculiar to this document, such as its superscription, dated exceptionally from Santa Sabina, the Basilica in which Honorius was to establish the Order of Preachers a few years later, our attention centers particularly on two points. For purposes of brevity we shall begin with the last.

THE POPE'S CONFIDENCE

In the first bull, *Religiosam vitam*, Honorius, according to the traditional formula, placed the new foundation under his protection. In the second, issued as a letter of confirmation of the preceding, the Pope declared that he personally took in hand the government of the Order -- *ipsum ordinem suscipimus sub nostra gubernatione*. Honorius could not have more clearly said that he regarded the

new militia as his own instrument and his own property and that he would watch over it that it might realize the high destiny he had just decreed for it with prophetic accent. In fact, the Pope had in a few words illuminated the eminent and exceptional vocation of the Preachers, not as to their mission only, nor even as to the end assigned to the Order, but he heralded their vocation as something of which he was perfectly sure, as if the realization of it were already open to his vision: "Your brethren will be the champions of the faith and the true lights of the world."[\(19\)](#)

The purpose of the Order was here determined with express finality: to fight for the faith and to enlighten the Church. All ecclesiastical tradition had recognized that as the office of preachers, and it seems that the Pope might have been content to declare, as he often did, that Dominic and his brethren were official preachers in the Church. But even that would not have embraced all that the papacy desired and intended. The call was not simply for preachers, but for champions of the faith, invincible athletes of Christ, as another announcement a month later showed;[\(20\)](#) the hope was not merely for educated clerics in an age when such were rare, but for those who would be luminaries in Christendom. In the course of the thirteenth century, the successors of Honorius III repeated these comparisons and emphasized them further in describing what was then being achieved by the sons of St. Dominic.

It is difficult for us to understand expressions such as these from Honorius III in regard to an institution still in the formative stage, when we are aware of the extreme reserve of the Church in encouraging religious groups that appealed for or received from her a first indication of favor. In saying that Dominic and his followers would be the champions of the faith and the lights of the world, did the Church not fear to crush a modest institution under the weight of an unlikely destiny? Was not the Church incurring the risk of an enormous deception?

Honorius III was not of such a mind. Not for an instant did flinch; nor was there a shadow of doubt. His words do not express a wish nor a hope: they tell of certitude. But if the Holy See was ready to proceed with such confidence when Dominic appeared in Rome in the month of December, 1216, Dominic had inspired the Church with unbounded trust. Rome already knew every fiber in the being of this canon of Osma, who had struggled alone for twelve years against all obstacles without any sign of weakness. His was a zeal and a faith which the Church had not found in any of his contemporaries. Thus the attitude of the Holy See toward the institution of the Preachers casts more light on the past of Dominic and on what he was then about to do than could all his contemporaries, although their evidence is the same.

From what has just been reviewed with painstaking care, it will be evident how far from the truth are the historians, Dominicans or others, who judged that the Church was hesitant in entertaining Dominic's projects, because Innocent III required him to choose a rule already existing. It would be nearer the truth to say that, when Dominic proposed his plans, the Holy See uttered a sigh of relief and cried: "At last!" But that would not be the whole truth. The Roman Curia had known Dominic since the year 1204,[\(21\)](#) when it had sent him with his Bishop into Languedoc and had created in his favor, for the first time in the history of the Church, apostolic preaching. From then on, through her legates or through Foulques of Toulouse, the Holy See had never lost sight of the man of her hopes. When the time came, she confirmed a work in which it would be impossible henceforth to distinguish the part of the Church's band from that of Dominic.

Unaware of the general pattern that shaped the life and action of the Founder of the Preachers, historians have not thoroughly understood a problem which is utterly simple once the leading thread is found. To regard Dominic as the agent and the liegeman of the Church detracts neither from his merits nor from his glory; quite the contrary. The former subprior of Osma, who thought of preaching the

gospel to the Cumans with his Bishop, had only one aspiration: to win souls, to win them with and through the Church. Therefore, when Honorius III officially established the Order of Preachers and undertook the government of it himself, he gave release to a power in reserve and long latent, but henceforth free to spend its force in the full light of Christendom.

Dominic was still in Rome, devising plans for action with the Curia when Honorius III addressed to him and to the Preachers of St. Romanus, the letter of January 21, 1217, [\(22\)](#) in which the Pope earnestly urged them to pursue their mission as preachers, and, if necessary, even to the giving of their lives. He praised the fragrance of their reputation and their eloquence, calling them invincible athletes of Christ and his special sons. [\(23\)](#) A few days earlier (January 19), Honorius III had dispatched letters to the University of Paris, inviting the masters and students to establish schools in Toulouse. [\(24\)](#) Evidently by this measure the Pope hoped to bring an academic personnel into the path of Dominic that he might therein find recruits. It was early in Lent when Dominic left Rome again and journeyed toward Toulouse.

DISPERSAL

After a few months in the company of his brethren, Dominic told them that the time for their dispersal had come. His friends remonstrated. The work had scarcely begun; it would come to ruin. The master of the Preachers answered: "Let me do what I will; I know what I desire. Hoarded, the grain rots; cast to the wind, it brings forth fruit." [\(25\)](#) While he himself maintained the general direction of the Order, he suggested that his companions designate Brother Matthew of France as abbot. [\(26\)](#) Matthew was a man from the North who had come into the Midi as chaplain to Simon de Montfort. On August 15, feast of the Assumption, the friars were dispersed. Four were sent to Spain and eight to Paris under the leadership of the abbot of the Order. The first members of the Parisian band arrived there September 12. [\(27\)](#) That autumn Dominic himself set out for Rome. He was there for the opening of the new year. [\(28\)](#) On February 11, Honorius III addressed encyclical letters to all the prelates of Christendom to recommend to them the ministry of the Preachers and urge provision for their needs, because their only title was poverty. Friars who came from Spain and Paris brought Dominic tidings of the two groups sent out from Toulouse. Without delay, the master dispatched the three messengers to Bologna to establish a convent there. [\(29\)](#) During this time the saint himself opened near the Colosseum the monastery of St. Sixtus, which the Pope placed at his disposal. [\(30\)](#) Thus, within six months Dominic's friars were established at Toulouse, the capital of heresy; at Paris and Bologna, the two great university centers of Europe; at Rome, the center of Christendom. "And these men," writes Jordan of Saxony, [\(31\)](#) "were for the most part moderately lettered and simple; but the prayers of Dominic supported them and divine power multiplied them."

Dominic's stay at Rome was signalized by a precious conquest, that of Reginald, dean of St. Aignan of Orléans, a former master of the University of Paris where he had taught canon law. Cured miraculously, he entered the Order and, after a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in the company of his Bishop, he joined the friars at Bologna, December 21, 1218. [\(32\)](#) Difficulty had attended the beginnings of the Preachers in this city; but, on hearing the eloquent voice of Reginald, students and celebrated masters flocked in numbers into the Order, which abandoned its first dwelling and established itself in the quarter of the schools at St. Nicholas of the Vineyard. [\(33\)](#) Among those won by Reginald to the ways of perfection was a young girl belonging to one of the first families of Bologna, Diana of Andalò. St. Dominic received her vows in the following year, and she became the cornerstone of the Convent of St. Agnes.

FOUNDATION AT PARIS

Meanwhile, after Reginald took passage for the Holy Land early in the autumn of 1218, Dominic left Rome for Spain, where the mission of the friars sent from Toulouse had encountered reverses.⁽³⁴⁾ On the way he visited the friars of that city and chose some of their number to establish a convent at Lyons.⁽³⁵⁾ In Spain, Dominic repaired the failure of the preceding year, establishing two convents at Segovia and Madrid;⁽³⁶⁾ then he directed his steps toward Paris. It was early in 1219,⁽³⁷⁾ when he arrived and found a flourishing house there. The eight friars who had reached Paris in September, 1217, settled in a modest dwelling near Notre Dame. At the request of Honorius III, John of Barastre, dean of St. Quentin and professor of theology at the University, and also the University itself had granted to the Preachers the chapel and the hospice of St. Jacques in the street of that name, near the Porte d'Orléans. That placed them in the University quarter; for they had been sent to Paris to found a convent, to preach, and to study theology. John of Barastre became their professor, perhaps before Honorius expressly asked this service, as revealed later in the Pope's letter of May 4, 1221.⁽³⁸⁾

The foundation of the Parisian Preachers had prospered rapidly. At the time of Dominic's visit, the friars numbered thirty, and some had been assigned the previous year to Orleans to establish a convent there.⁽³⁹⁾

True to his practice of prompt dispersal, Dominic appointed Peter Selia of Toulouse to go from Paris to open a house at Limoges.⁽⁴⁰⁾ Plans were then made for foundations at Reims, Metz, and other places, all of which were realized in a short time.⁽⁴¹⁾ Four years later, even with all the new foundations provided for, there were one hundred twenty religious in the convent of St. Jacques.⁽⁴²⁾ Dominic might well have thought that his friars had found their land of promise in the heart of the Parisian academic world. The rising University, in turn, recognized in the active collaboration of the Preachers a power and a support in the attainment of that concentration and autonomy which it sought to secure, after the manner of the communes in their efforts at emancipation.

Dominic, with his clear penetration, quickly grasped the Parisian situation and evaluated the forces at play. After a short stay there, he set out for Italy and soon reached Bologna.⁽⁴³⁾

FOUNDATION AT BOLOGNA

In this great university city the Preachers, under the magnetic influence of Reginald of Orléans, had acquired a position superior perhaps even to that achieved at Paris, thanks to the exceptional recruits won by the vicar for Dominic, not only among the students but even among the masters, some of whom were already celebrated. This recruiting continued under Dominic's encouragement. With a view to accelerating the Parisian growth, Dominic transferred Reginald to Paris, to the great desolation of the friars in Bologna. The former master at the University had time only to make his appearance again on the banks of the Seine. He died a holy death soon after, but not before he had gained to the Order, Jordan of Saxony with two of his friends. Jordan, a master of arts and bachelor of theology, became the first successor of Dominic and the great recruiter for the Order in the universities and schools of the time.⁽⁴⁴⁾

Very soon after his arrival in Bologna, Dominic entered into communication with Cardinal Ugolino, at that time legate in Lombardy. He gave the prelate a report on the progress of the work as he had just examined it in the course of his journeys. One of the first questions discussed between the legate and Dominic was that of absolute poverty. In the case of the convents established, experience had shown the possibility of their subsisting even without revenue. It was concluded that the Order would henceforth live by begging. In consequence of this resolution, Dominic had a document destroyed by which a wealthy inhabitant of Bologna had just made an important donation to the convent of St. Nicholas.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Here, as elsewhere, the Master of the Preachers gave time and energy to the intellectual

and religious training of his brethren and then, as was his custom, he scattered the grain which had been heaped at St. Nicholas. The friars departed from there to open new houses at Bergamo, Milan, and Florence.(46)

In the month of October,(47) Dominic left for Viterbo, where the Curia resided. During his stay, he founded a convent in that city and gave Honorius III an account of the general state of the institution of the Preachers and of the problems that had arisen. On November 15, the Pope wrote again to the prelates, as he would write many times, to recommend the Order and its apostolic ministry.(48) The next day, doubtless after the report on the Parisian schools as made by Dominic, but with a more positive intention of preparing the way for the universal influence of the Order through its schools of theology, Honorius III addressed letters to the Church in Paris and other centers, urging the execution of the academic decrees of the Lateran, which were nowhere being carried into effect.(49) In their first general chapter, the celebration of which was near, the Preachers would provide for this need by making each of their convents a school of theology, finding inspiration for their academic organization in the papal letters.

FOUNDATION AT SANTA SABINA

Dominic went on to Rome and there gave new life to the establishment of the friars. First he transferred all the religious to the ancient Basilica of Santa Sabina on Mount Aventine,(50) near the palace of the Savelli, the family of Honorius III, and he gathered together in the Convent of St. Sixtus, left free after the departure of the friars, the nuns of several Roman convents whose reform the Holy See had long desired.(51) Cardinal Ugolino presided over the ceremony of the transfer, and the rule of Prouille was introduced into the new Convent.(52) In the plan of the Curia, St. Sixtus was to become a model house, and subsequently the Sovereign Pontiffs granted its rule to numerous convents of women under the name of the Rule of St. Sixtus of Rome.(53)

It was during his stay at Santa Sabina that the master of the Preachers gave the habit of the Order to two young Polish clerics, Hyacinth and Ceslaus, who had come to Rome with their uncle, the Bishop of Cracow. They were destined by Dominic to establish the Order in their native land, and the first, as St. Hyacinth, has received the title of "Apostle of Poland."(54)

When Dominic left Rome it was to revisit Bologna, where the first great assemblies of the Order would be held on the feast of Pentecost, May 17, 1220.(55)

NOTE

THE BULL *NOS ATTENDENTES* (56)

The original of this bull has not been preserved; furthermore, it was not registered (the formality being onerous, the registration of the consistorial privilege *Religiosam vitam* normally sufficed). Since the bull is unsupported by the classic evidence of authentication, it is, from the documentary viewpoint, not so good a proof as the privilege, which does possess such evidence. The matter was examined recently in a judicious and erudite study by Father Bihl (*Archivum Franciscanum*, XXVII [1934], 262-63). He rightly avoided concluding that the bull was not authentic, The difficulty we encountered in getting access to certain works of the sixteenth century prevents our treating this question fully here; nevertheless we think we can sufficiently establish the authenticity of the bull.

Though original sources fail, the literary tradition stands. The two texts, *Religiosam vitam* and *Nos attendentes*, have a continuously common history. Both were published only at a late date. They were

not available in any document we examined for the thirteenth century in particular, or in the bullary of Rodez (*Archivum O.P.*, V [1935], 441), or in that of Dresden (*Archivum O.P.*, VI [1936], 225 ff.). This may be explained by the fact that the collections of medieval charters had a practical purpose: these two documents, which were soon replaced by others giving more extended privileges, no longer had immediate interest; they were forgotten. Early in the fourteenth century, Bernard Guidonis noted a privilege of confirmation of the Order, given at St. Peter's, December 22, 1216 -- this might have been the consistorial privilege (Martène, *Script.*, VI, 401); it is certain that the Holy See confirmed most of the orders of the thirteenth century by the grant of the privilege *Religiosam vitam* or an equivalent. We do not quote Scheeben's opinion in regard to this privilege, or his unjust criticism of historians who had previously considered the question. (Cf. *Der heilige Dominikus*, p. 211; *Archivum O.P.*, VI [1936], 218, n. 2). St. Antoninus contributes nothing further.

The first editions of our texts seem to date from some time not earlier than the sixteenth century. In the course of his travels at that period, the General Vincent Bandelli made a choice collection of juridical documents. Under his direction these two texts appeared for the first time and simultaneously in 1504, in a collection of 118 diplomas, edited by Albert de Castillo "Palmerio Botonto procurante" (*Privilegia majora et principaliora . . . ordinis . . .*, Venice, 1504; *Bullarium O.P.*, I, 47 no. II, n. 1; cf. Echard II, 10, 48; *Bullarium O.P.*, I, xi).

Brémond-Ripoll indicate the date as 1506 instead of 1504; perhaps there was a second edition. We have not come across this work, but think that very likely the Bollandist Cuyper (*Acta Sanctorum*, August, 1, 444) was referring to it when he noted the inclusion of the bull *Nos attendentes* in the principal edition of the Dominican Constitutions by Vincent Bandelli (*Regula S. Augustini*, etc., Milan, 1505). It is certain that Bandelli's text does not contain this bull, nor do the later editions in the sixteenth century. We have consulted two different editions of 1505 in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, as well as editions of 1507, 1515, 1565, 1650. This last edition alone contains the text of the bull, interpolated in a dissertation of Bandelli; the copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale which belonged to Father Quétif, as well as most of the other copies mentioned, has in this passage a note by this celebrated scholar, indicating the interpolation. The bull is included in the 1690 edition, edited by Father Cloche; further, there is the possibility that in 1505 Castillo's collection may have been added to the Constitutions of Bandelli in one or other volume; we have not found evidence of this, but the case is probable. Bandelli's work is not a single whole, but consists of a collection of tracts with separate pagings. For several years Castillo was the editor of the publications of the Master General. This explains Cuyper's statement, which led to some lack of precision in the note of Father Bihl.

After the year 1504, many editions of these two documents were published, and they were almost always published together.

From the first, the editors gave a record of the originals from which the copies were made. Albert de Castillo (Botonto) took the bull *Nos attendentes* from an original preserved at Prouille with its leaden seals (*Acta Sanctorum*, loc. cit.) Étienne Usodimare (cf. *Bullarium O.P.*, I, 4, no. 2, n. 1) edited it among the documents which he described thus: "only those which have been procured from archetypes or authentic transcriptions of them" (Echard, II, 143).

Two centuries later Bremond-Ripoll stated that Prouille possessed the original of the bull, and there was also at Rome an authentic copy. In fact, the cartulary of Prouille compiled sometime before that by Cambefort (*Histoire et cartulaire du prieuré de Prouille*, 1659, a manuscript which the religious fortunately recovered after the Revolution, but which we have not been able to consult; they have, however, kindly answered all our questions about this bull) contains the bull *Nos attendentes*, although it does not mention the privilege *Religiosam vitam*, the original of which our authors agreed in placing

at Toulouse, where it still is. During the Revolution the charter room of Prouille was demolished and the loss was great (cf. Guiraud, *Cart.* I, v-viii); then disappeared the leaden-sealed bull which was used from the time of the first edition to guarantee the text of *Nos attendentes*. Though the disappearance is regrettable, we do not think it authorizes our rejecting the authenticity of the document in question. As to the reference to the future which surprised Father Bihl (*futuros pugiles fidei*), such expressions are not unusual in the bulls of popes to the Preachers (cf. Laurent, no. 101: *novella plantatio, quae speratur fructum multiplicem allatura*, "a new garden which is expected to bear abundant fruit").

The authenticity of the traditional date (*apud sanctam Sabinam; XI Kal. ianuarii*) presents a more difficult problem; a study of the different editions on this point has revealed surprising anomalies. It must remain an open question, since we are still without certain information needed for its solution. All things considered, however, the bull can certainly be dated before July, 1217, the first anniversary of Honorius III, and probably before the month of February, when St. Dominic left Rome.

In conclusion, we add that the text of the bull contains the words *et protectione* in all the old editions, Cambefort included. Balme (II, 88) is, we believe, the first who suppressed it, without explanation or apparent reason: perhaps by a mere *lapsus calami*.

NOTES

1 They saw the Pope early in October. See Laurent, no. 62.

2 *Ibid.*

3 Potthast, nos. 4706 f.; Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, XXII, 961.

4 The Pope emphasized this point in the bulls of recommendation of the Preachers, "who, explaining the word of God freely and faithfully, have adopted the title of poverty" (Laurent, nos. 84, 87, 97, 103, 112, 123, 127, 129). Conrad, bishop of Metz, echoed this: "since the Order of Preachers seeks nothing from its preaching, but the lucre of souls" (Laurent, no. 136).

5 The Order of Preachers could evidently not pursue anything short of what was projected in the program accorded by Innocent III to the Poor Catholics, who seven years earlier in the same province had devoted themselves to the same task, in the face of the same urgent needs, a task for which they were, however, vastly less well prepared. This was their program: "Since a great number of us are clerics and nearly all educated, we have determined to engage assiduously in reading, exhortation, teaching and disputation against all sects of error. The disputations, however, should be tried on by brethren who are more learned, proved in the Catholic faith, and instructed in the law of the Lord so that the adversaries of the Catholic and apostolic faith may be confounded. Moreover, with the assistance of those more upright and enlightened in the law of the Lord and in the writings of the Holy Fathers, we have decreed that the word of God should be taught in our schools to members of our company and our friends, with the license of prelates and with due veneration, by skillful brethren trained in Sacred Scripture, that by sound teaching they may have power to convince an erring people and use every means to draw them to the faith and recall them to the bosom of the Holy Roman Church" (*PL*, CCXV, 1513). This undertaking represents the whole extent of instruction in that epoch; it was limited in its exercise, only because of the necessity of keeping in its own sphere within the ecclesiastical order this group of converts which included laymen. None of these restrictions applied for the Order of Preachers.

6 Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, pp. 140-53.

7 Pierron, *Die Katholischen Armen*, pp. 32 f., 109-13, 132 f.; Grundmann, pp. 113-16.

8 See *infra*, pp. 291 ff., 422-46.

9 It seems that Dominic was already at Prouille on March 2 (Laurent, no. 66).

10 Most of the charters of Prouille give him the official title *Dominus Dominicus oxomensis canonicus* ("Lord Dominic, canon of Osma"). He called himself simply Brother Dominic (Laurent, nos. 5, 7, 24); Brother Dominic, preacher (no. 10); Brother Dominic chaplain of Fanjeaux (no. 54); Brother Dominic, prior of Prouille (no. 41); cf. Jordan, no. 21.

11 See *infra*, pp. 241 ff.

12 Jordan, no. 42; see *infra*, chap. 24, where there is a study of these first Customs. The name *Liber consuetudinum*, was officially suppressed only in the chapters of 1249-51 (*Acta capitulorum generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum*, I, 43, 48, 55).

13 Jordan, no. 42.

14 Laurent, no. 60.

15 Jordan no. 44; see Mamachi, *Annales Ordinis Praedicatorum, App.*, pp. 362 ff.; Altaner, *Der heilige Dominikus*, p. 16. Scheeben (p. 189) reckons twenty or twenty-two friars.

16 Laurent, no. 70. The term "master" was used frequently in the twelfth century, and especially with religious, to designate the head of a group or community (master of monks, master of lay brothers, master of boys, master of the granges, master of bakers). Unlike the titles of lord and abbot, it had the advantage of not being associated with power or temporal business. Robert of Arbrissel had selected it for himself through humility, in preference to any other title for a superior (*Vita; PL*, CLXII, 1052). It was used also among the hospitallers and in certain orders of women (for example, the Order of Sempringham; Laurent, no. 100), and in military orders in consequence of their origin among the hospitallers. The leaders of the Preaching in Narbonne likewise had the title of *Master*. Dominic himself used it in a charter of 1213 (Laurent, no. 41, where the title is equivalent to prior; and it has the same meaning in nos. 124, 126, 134). It was quite natural that Dominic, who revived the old papal preaching, should have had the title, *magister praedicatorum*, "master of preachers" (Laurent, no. 70; or even "master of preaching," *ibid.*, no. 134) and, when the Preaching of Toulouse developed into a world order, "Master of the Order of Preachers" (1221; Laurent, nos. 138, 151). The title, therefore, was finally used to designate the head of the Preachers, and the terra "prior of the Order," employed until then by the Pope, was dropped. Once again the humble title of "master" took the place of that of "abbot," a term which their canonical origin might have suggested to the Preachers (Jordan, no. 48).

17 *Religiosam vitam*; Laurent, no. 74,

18 With regard to the bull *Nos attendentes*, see the note at the close of this chapter (pp. 49-51).

19 The biblical allegories used in the bulls of the popes in the thirteenth century should not be compared with the hyperbolic images and extravagant forms of the humanist style that had its effect even on the language of the Church. In that age, biblical and ecclesiastical symbols had a precise

meaning determined by the allegorical theology then in full flower; it was a truly technical language, To give still more weight to the papal bulls, there was the strong, prudent, and minute wording of the pontifical documents. To describe the Preachers by a verse from the hymn of the Apostles was to confer the title on them with its traditional meaning. To understand the import and challenge of the appellation, attention should be given to the activity of the schismatics and heretics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, from the Cathari to the Apostolics of Gerard Segarelli, to say nothing of the Waldenses, in their efforts to arrogate to themselves the name and prerogatives of "successors or vicars of the apostles": an unlimited right to preach independent of the bishops. It was precisely this prerogative and this title which up to that time the popes most energetically refused.

20 Laurent, no. 77.

21 Or 1205, or the beginning of 1206.

22 Laurent, no. 77.

23 He assigned their apostolic labor, moreover, "unto the remission of sins," which was equivalent to the indulgence, granted for the crusaders.

24 Laurent, no. 76.

25 *Processus* (Bologna), no. 26; Jordan, nos. 47, 62; Ferrand, no. 31. The last words quoted are not those of St. Dominic; they are a reflection of Peter Ferrand.

26 Jordan, no. 48. Matthew was known at the time of the dispersal as Abbot of St. Romanus of the Order of Preachers (Laurent, no. 92), Prior of the Order of Preachers (title also given by the Pope to St. Dominic, no. 101), then Abbot of the Order of Preachers at Paris (no. 111). Before the dispersal, the superior of St. Romanus held only the title of Prior of St. Romanus. (Laurent, nos. 70-75, 77, 79, 80.) The title of abbot was inspired by the canons, among whom the abbot represented a person superior to the local prior. In this title Matthew found himself in a position similar to that of the abbot of St. Victor or the abbot of Prémontré, at the head of an incipient canonical congregation. It was but a provisional office, an experiment, which in fact did not exclude the higher authority of St. Dominic. It disappeared from the juridical constitution of the Order in 1220.

Scheeben (pp. 238-39) was wrong in contesting the value of Jordan, no. 48. If, as he thinks, he is warranted in affirming, contrary to Jordan, that Matthew was elected abbot in 1217 only to provide a local prior at St. Romanus, there would be no reason for sending him at once to Paris.

27 Jordan, nos. 48-52. For the date of August 15, see Salanhac, no. 11.

28 December 13, 1217, safe-conduct given at the siege of Toulouse by Simon de Montfort (Laurent, no. 82); February 11, 1218, he obtained a bull at the Lateran (no. 84).

29 Jordan, no. 55.

30 It is unquestionable that an installation of friars at St. Sixtus preceded the founding of the sisters' convent (Froger de Peña speaks of *conventus romanus*) (cf. *Processus* of Bologna, no. 46). Constantine (no. 37), directly informed by the procurator of the friars of that time, mentions forty religious (cf. nos. 35-39, 54; Altaner, p. 63); this number as included in the story of a miracle is probably exaggerated; so evidently are the one hundred friars of Sister Cecilia (Mamachi, App., P. 250; cf. pp. 247, 252, 262). As Echard (1, 82 ff.) and all the modern historians placed the transfer of the nuns to St. Sixtus early in

1220, it was natural to assign to the preceding sojourn of St. Dominic in Rome (1218) the temporary installation of some friars in the church left vacant on account of the negligence of the incumbents, the Canons of Sempringham (Laurent, no. 88). In fact, in that very year, when steps (perhaps Protestations) were made by these canons, the Pope began proceedings which ended in their vacating St. Sixtus and his granting it to the Preachers (Laurent, no. 100).

Scheeben (pp. 293, 328 ff.) places the transfer of the sisters in the spring of 1221. Busy in Bologna in 1218, Dominic did not have friars to leave in Rome (*ibid.*, p. 252); if there was any friar at St. Sixtus, it was only after 1220. The arguments adduced seem solid; attention must be given to the publication on Jordan (App. nos. 28, 37), where the author sets forth his critical proof. In spite of what is held by Scheeben (p. 448, n. 164), we may suppose that the Roman convent of the friars was Moved to Santa Sabina before 1222, when it was necessary to vacate their Place for the sisters. Whatever disdain may be felt for the embellishment in the story of Sister Cecilia, the substance of her information on this point cannot be disregarded (cf. Altaner, p. 168). See also Zucchi, *Le origini del Monastero di S. Sisto* (1937), pp. 142-57.

31 Jordan, no. 62.

32 *Ibid.*, nos. 56-58.

33 *Ibid.*, no. 60; Laurent, no. 93.

34 Jordan, nos. 49, 59.

35 Mamachi, pp. 486 f.; Bourbon, no. 7. The date, 1218, is not certain. It is indicated by Bernard Guidonis and estimated according to the place occupied by the representatives of this convent at the provincial chapter.

36 Jordan, no. 59. .

37 Dominic was in Segovia for Christmas, 1218 (Frachet, 71). He left for Paris in 1219 (after March 25); cf. Jordan, no. 59. As he remained only a short time in Paris (Jordan, no. 60) and arrived in Bologna in summer (*Processus* [Bologna], nos. 41, 46), it must have been near the month of May when he reached Paris. The charter (Laurent, no. 95) shows that at that date he was no longer in Madrid.

38 Laurent, no. 140.

39 Jordan, nos. 54, 59. The erection, properly so called, of a convent took place later. In the provincial chapter (Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, I, vi) Orléans rank after Reims, Metz, and Poitiers, a fact which places its foundation at the earliest in 1221.

40 Martène, *Veterum scriptorum . . . collectio*, VI, 463 ff.; Frachet, *Vitae Fratrum, passim*; Salanhac, *Tractatus brevis*, no. 7.

41 Bishop Conrad of Metz, "following the example of the Pope," gave a house to the Preachers (April 22, 1221) for a convent within the city (Laurent, no. 136). Reims had been founded before Metz (Echard, *loc. cit.*).

42 According to a bull of Honorius III, September 15. 1224. See Denifle, *Archiv für Literatur*, I, 189.

43 In the summer of 1219. See Jordan, no. 60; *Processus canonizationis* (Bologna), no. 41.

44 Jordan, nos. 65, 67 ff.

45 *Processus* (Bologna), no.32. Ugolino was at Bologna in June and July, 1219, then at Florence and Perugia. Levi, *Documenti ad illustrazione del Registro del Card. Ugolino*, p. 245.

46 Bergamo was founded before Milan; Galvagni de la Fiamma places in 1219 the undertaking of St. Dominic which began the foundation in Milan (*Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica*, 11, 23). The friars were established there in 1220 (*Processus* [Bologna], nos. 6, 20, 22; Laurent, no. 118). Florence was a station for the friars before 1221 (*Processus*, no. 46).

47 He arrived there before November 15 (Laurent, no. 97). It is possible that from that time the friars had a foothold in Viterbo, but there is no mention of a convent.

48 Laurent, no. 97; the bull is addressed to the prelates of Spain.

49 Denifle, *Chartularium universitatis parisiensis*, p. 93. An identical letter was addressed to the Churches of Palestine six days later (Laurent, no. 98).

50 If the installation at Santa Sabina does not date from 1220, at least it is from 1221. The official grant was made only in June, 1222 (*Bullarium O.P.*, I, 15). But the terms of the bull show that there had been a concession earlier. Before that concession the Pope said that the friars had no *hospitium* in Rome. At that time St. Sixtus was no longer theirs; Conrad of Metz could not have alluded to St. Sixtus, therefore, when he said in 1221: "the Pope has conferred on them a house in Rome" (Laurent no. 136). It is possible that the Pope was waiting for the completion of the building that he was having done at Santa Sabina, before giving the title to the property, on June 5, 1222, to the new Master of the Order, elected not many days before.

51 Laurent, no. 137. These texts substantiate in the main the account of Humbert of Romans (see *infra*, note 86), of Sister Cecilia (Mamachi, p. 262) and of Brother Benedict of Montefiascone (Echard, I, 83).

52 Laurent, no. 104. We do not agree with Scheeben (pp. 328-29), that the presence of the cardinals, whom Sister Cecilia speaks of (Mamachi pp. 248-63), is unlikely and should consequently be disregarded. The violent opposition by the sisters' relatives to the establishment of the new regime, especially their opposition to the cloister, and their invectives against the *ribaldus ignotus*, so deeply impressed on the contemporary memory, renders only too legitimate Dominic's desire to be supported by the authority of some cardinals. It was not a commission managing the affair but official representation intended to preside at the ceremonies of the transfer and installation of the sisters. Even the most distinguished cardinals of our day not hesitate to perform such offices. It is very remarkable that Sister Cecilia, in Bologna, more than sixty years after the event, named without any mistake the three cardinals in Rome in 1220 and at the beginning of 1221. See Potthast, nos. 678-79 and Levi, p. 245-48. There are the signatures of Ugolino, Etienne, and Nicholas on an act of May 3, 1221 (Potthast, no. 6576). According to Sister Cecilia, the transfer occurred on February 16, 1220, or February 28, 1221 (Mamachi, P.262).

53 "For in the world there were various unobservant houses of nuns. That they might live more worthily, by the authority of the Pope he assembled these nuns and gave them enclosure at St. Sixtus. On the model of this convent, many others were created in different countries, and there would have

been more had the Friars Preachers been disposed to undertake them." Humbert of Romans, *Sermones ad diversos status* (1508), sermon. 48. on the influence of their Rule, which in the first part of the thirteenth century, along with the Rule of Cardinal Hugh and the Cistercian constitutions, governed most of the regular houses of women, see Grundmann, pp. 233-37. It is significant that Prouille, whence the Rule first spread, was said in a later charter to follow the Rule of St. Sixtus (Guiraud, *Cart.*, I, 7). The Rule had a great influence in Germany.

54 Mamachi, p. 578. No author of the thirteenth century speaks of these Dominican beginnings of St. Hyacinth. The classic record is based entirely on the unverifiable testimony of Stanislas of Cracow, which in this matter and in many others contains many evident and serious errors. (See Mamachi, p. 578.) Scheeben (p. 332) quite rightly refused to rely on this document. See Altaner, *Die Dominikaner missionen des 18. Jahrh.* (1924), pp. 196 ff., 203 ff.

55 In the thirteenth century the feast of Pentecost was the constitutional date for the general chapter of the Order of Preachers. The chapter of 1220 inaugurated the tradition, according to Jordan (nos. 75, 86); he left Paris to go to Bologna somewhat more than a month before Pentecost (May 17); that was the length of time spent on the journey. Dominic, it seems, was still at Viterbo on May 6 (Laurent, no. 112).

56 Laurent, no. 75.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER IV

Constitutional Organization (1220-21)

FOR the celebration of the general chapter, Dominic convoked friars from different convents of the Order. Among the four from Paris was Jordan of Saxony. With numerous foundations, several years of experience, and the counsel of the Church, Dominic and his companions proceeded to the enactment of firm legislation for the final organization of the Order. The chapter of 1220 elaborated the Constitutions which form the second part, or "distinction," of the law of the Preachers.

Compared with the style and contents of earlier or contemporary rules, the form of the Dominican Constitutions is striking. As formulated, the Constitutions of the Preachers are a work of pure law. It would be vain to search in them for the ethical elements that are treated, more or less fully, in the ancient rules, without contributing to an effect of organic unity. Among the Preachers of Bologna, there were former professors of law in the University, and their competence was utilized, no doubt, in framing the Constitutions of 1220. But what makes this work of Dominican legislation an exceptional juridical monument is that it represents the nature and organization of an association firmly founded and already mature. It reads not as a possible ideal; it stands as the reflection of a reality achieved. We cannot help being struck by the enormous difference between the Constitutions of the Preachers and the rules or statutes which served as a point of departure for other religious orders established in the thirteenth century. Whereas the legislation of the Preachers is solid, precise, and detailed in regard to the end of the Order, its organization, and the determination of means, that of other societies is rudimentary, indecisive, and silent on numerous points already clearly and definitively settled in Dominican legislation. This can be accounted for by the fact that the Order of Preachers was founded by a churchman with a personnel of educated clerics whereas all the other religious companies of the thirteenth century were started by laymen with their lay followers, persons without intellectual culture and unprepared for the ecclesiastical ministry. Hence the rudimentary character of their early association and of their legislation simply reveals the tenor of their primitive way of life. Under the influence of the Church, these groups evolved into organizations with forms of ecclesiastical life which more or less approximated the type characteristic with the Preachers. Then their legislation gradually shaped itself with varying degrees of difference on that of the Preachers, and a number of these new orders took substantial parts from the Dominican Constitutions and embodied them into their own.

THE CHAPTER OF 1220

The legislative work of the general chapter of 1220 had a purely negative and accessory aspect, as well as a positive, fundamental, and essential result. A certain number of practices inherited from regular canonical life were abandoned; these will be enumerated later when the nature of the Order of Preachers is treated. Then, too, there will be a review of the organization of the Order as it was established by the legislation of the chapter of 1220. The chapter of 1221, held likewise and exceptionally at Bologna, would accomplish more important legislative action than subsequent chapters; but it is certain that the essential articles in the law framed by the Preachers were the work of the first general chapter. Dominic, the Roman Curia, and the Preachers had delayed four years in the enactment of their Constitutional law in order to test, through practical living, propositions already fully developed in 1216. Schooled in experience, the Preachers assembled for the first general chapter with precise and conclusive ideas and found no difficulty in formulating laws on all the basic matters affecting their institution.

At the chapter of 1221, the Order was divided into eight provinces.⁽¹⁾ Probably the move had been postponed a year to give time for further increase in a membership that was growing rapidly, though too slowly for the zeal of Dominic and Honorius III. This was likewise the year of the great dispersal. After the chapter, twelve friars under Gilbert of Fraxinet left to open a house at Oxford, the great academic center of England;⁽²⁾ another group went with Paul of Hungary, a former professor of law at Bologna, to his native country.⁽³⁾ The Danish friar Solomon set out for Denmark and the Scandinavian countries;⁽⁴⁾ others embarked for Greece. This notable expansion in 1221 had been planned by Dominic and the Roman Curia, and nothing is more informative than the two appeals made by Honorius III after Dominic's report to the Curia in the first months of 1220.

In April of that year, just before the convocation of the general chapter, the Pope through personal letters successively addressed urgent appeals to nearly all the bishops of the Christian world, but particularly to the archbishops and bishops within the boundaries of Europe. He asked them to find within their dioceses four, three, or even two men of good will of any religious order whatever, but recommending Cîteaux, who would be ready to work in the vineyard of the Lord by preaching, and if necessary to suffer martyrdom. He reproved those religious who were devoting themselves to the repose of sterile contemplation, instead of working for the propagation of the kingdom of God. The bishops could disregard any opposition forthcoming from the superiors of these religious, whom the Pope expected to assemble in Rome for the next feast of St. Martin, (November 11, 1220) to be dispersed at his appointment among the different nations.⁽⁵⁾

PAPAL MISSIONS

At the same time letters were sent on May 12 to six religious, designated by name, the members of six Italian monasteries, from the collegiate Church of St. Victor, near Bologna, to the Cistercian Abbey of Flora in Calabria. Honorius III told them that he had learned from Brother Dominic of the Order of Preachers, that the grace of preaching with which they had been endowed could be very useful for the salvation of their neighbor, and he commanded them, while retaining the habit of their own order, to place themselves under the leadership of Dominic, to cooperate with him in the ministry of the word of God.⁽⁶⁾ This double appeal made to the prelates of Christendom and to particular religious in Italy shows how the Curia again took measures to promote an enterprise, attempted more than once from the outset of the pontificate of Innocent III, that of organizing great missions in Christendom and even among infidel nations. When the Holy See found Dominic in 1204, it recognized the man of its hopes; and when the Preachers were established in 1216, it had in its hands a powerfully organized force which quickly proved its strength. But the needs of Christendom were immense, and the numerical development of the Preachers, notwithstanding an accelerated growth, was not sufficient to make a rapid change in such a world. The Church had a leader and a select company of Preachers. Would it not be possible to raise up auxiliaries to help them in a campaign in Lombardy and northern Italy, infested as it was by heresy, and could not others be found to cooperate in the missions of the friars who were to be sent to distant places the following year?

The Curia and St. Dominic probably considered this plan on the occasion of the last journey of the Master of the Preachers to Viterbo and to Rome. The new mission was undertaken in conditions undeniably more favorable than were those of former missions attempted again and again by the Holy See, from the time the first was organized in 1199 under Foulques de Neuilly in Paris and the neighboring places. There was no way to foretell what response would be made to the papal appeal for missionaries.

There is nothing to authorize our saying that it met any other response than silence. In 1220 it was still as hard to find apostles as it had been when Innocent III began his pontificate. The clergy as a whole

were inert and sterile, engrossed in concern about temporal interests. Only unlettered but religious laymen volunteered their services everywhere and continued to do so throughout the century. Unfortunately the experience with the Waldenses made ecclesiastical authorities wary and often rendered most difficult the problem of using the new volunteers. Yet Pope Honorius' appeal was not a total failure. The episcopate, faced once more with the knowledge of its duty and of its own powerlessness to preach the gospel to the people, was prepared, at least, to receive with favor the Preachers provided by the Church.

After the chapter of 1220, Dominic and his friars, with or without other auxiliaries, started the work of preaching the gospel in Lombardy. Following the general chapter of 1221, the Patriarch went to Venice to continue his customary conferences with Cardinal Ugolino, the permanent legate in northern Italy.⁽⁷⁾ Dominic would abandon his ministry only under the attacks of a malady that rapidly exhausted him. Furthermore, in 1221, he could give to the apostolic ministry only a small portion of his time. Instruction of the friars and their religious training in a continually growing community, the foundation of new convents, and the organization of mission bands for the far ends of Europe, all this activity greatly absorbed his time. But what he could not himself do, he attempted, even through the least of his disciples, with an amazing confidence and extraordinary energy. The testimony of one of them at the process of canonization (August, 1233) is significant. Buonviso of Piacenza had been received into the Order at Bologna. When he was still a novice, Dominic sent him to preach in his native city. The young man protested his lack of ability; he had never preached or even studied theology. Gently the master persuaded him to obey: "Go confidently," Dominic said to him, "the Lord will be with you and He will place on your lips the word of preaching." Buonviso obeyed and departed. As he himself said, God gave such great efficacy to his word that he won three friars to the Order of Preachers.⁽⁸⁾

Dominic had prematurely spent himself in the toils of his apostolic ministry, the incessant labors attending the establishment of his Order, and his own heroic way of life. To show with what a spirit of faith and serenity of soul he endured suffering, witnesses of his life mention attacks of illness during his journeys. In 1220 he had an attack of fever at Milan, and early in the summer of the following year he returned from Venice, seriously ill.⁽⁹⁾ During the few days still left to him he gave instructions to his brethren and, like a dying patriarch, consoled them at the prospect of his approaching death. Again and again he said: I shall be more useful to you after my death than during my life."⁽¹⁰⁾ His sons have kept the memory of this sacred promise in the antiphon of their office: "*O spem miram quam dedisti mortis hora te flentibus.*"

Dominic died in the peace of the Lord, August 6, 1221.⁽¹¹⁾ He rendered to his Creator the soul of one of the greatest servants and apostles of the Church. Cardinal Ugolino officiated at the funeral, surrounded by many bishops and abbots. Later, as Gregory IX, Ugolino in the bull of canonization recalled "the great intimacy" which reigned between him and Dominic. Their souls, as he said elsewhere, were united "by the bonds of charity."

NOTES

1 The appointment of Jordan as Provincial of Lombardy in 1221 was the one inaugural decree of this new assembly (Jordan, no. 88).

2 *Ibid.*

3 Pfeiffer, *Die ungarische Dominikanerordensprovinz*, pp. 143 ff.; *Analecta*, I, 325.

4 Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen des 13. Jahrh.*, pp. 205 ff.; according to a chronicle written about the middle of the thirteenth century (*Scriptores rerum danicarum m. a.*, V, 500; Altaner, p. 207). In regard to Greece, the only thing absolutely certain is that convents of the Preachers existed there before 1228 (Altaner, P. 10).

5 This bull is addressed to "*Strigonensi episcopo Colocensi archiep. et singulis terris et provinciis et regnis archiep.*," etc. It may be found in A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam, sacram illustrantia* (Rome, 1859), 1, 27 f. The editor, without giving details, places it chronologically among the documents of April, 1220.

Within the text, however, the expression, in the fifth year of our pontificate, seems to place it between July, 1220, and July, 1221, Potthast (no. 6042), places it between the first and fifteenth of April, 1219; and again (no. 6599), on March 25, 1221. It is certain that at this date the Curia dispatched identical letters to a great number of prelates, the list of whose names is given by Potthast. Everything points to a great mission; to suppose otherwise is out of the question, according to Theiner.

Altaner (*Die Dominikanermissionen des 13. Jahrh.*, 1924) considers this letter a proof that in 1221 the Cistercians continued to be the missionary order par excellence in the eyes of the Pope, and that the mendicants still had no rating in this field. The conclusion is surprising. The missionaries desired by the Pope had to be preachers. How could Honorius prefer the Cistercians, who did not conceal their attitude in this matter, to the Preachers and the Minors who had already given proof of their apostolic power? In reality, the Pope appealed in these letters only for religious other than mendicants. The Preachers and Minors were, in a way, considered out of the running. Their centralization and direct dependence on the Holy See gave the Pope a liberty of action in their regard more immediate and efficacious than the encyclicals in the case of the bishops. It would be difficult to admit that the expansion of the Preachers and Minors, as it was realized in that very year and just a few weeks later, was foreign to the plans and direct decrees of Honorius.

6 Laurent, no. 113 (May 12, 1220).

7 *Processus* (Bologna), nos. 7, 30, 41. Ugolino was in Venice on June 13 and again after July 1; at Padua and Treviso on the eighth and fifteenth; at Reggio the twenty-fourth; at Bologna the twenty-eighth; he remained in the neighborhood of that city during the month of August (Levi, pp. 253-54). Dominic might have accompanied the Cardinal on his journeys during July, according to indications in the Process of Canonization. This would explain, too, how Ugolino was able himself to celebrate the obsequies of St. Dominic. Under these circumstances, this death must indeed have grieved him deeply.

8 *Processus* (Bologna), no. 24.

9 *Ibid.*, nos. 7, 20 22; previously, in the journey to Rome (end of 1219), then at Viterbo in 1220 (*ibid.*, no. 12). It seems to have been a case of chronic enteritis, aggravated by acute attacks..

10 *Ibid.*, nos. 8, 33.

11 *Ibid.*, no. 8.

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER V

Character of St. Dominic

THE deeds and aspirations of Dominic in his apostolic labors and in the foundation of the Preachers represent him fully enough to enable us to know him and portray him; moreover, we have numerous views of his character from those who lived and labored with him. The depositions during the process of canonization at Bologna and at Toulouse leave nothing to be desired in this regard. In their clear, short, and precise testimony, the witnesses engrave in perfect harmony all the lines which compose the moral and religious features of the Founder of the Preachers.

One of his religious daughters, Cecilia Cesarini, to whom the saint gave the habit of the Order at St. Sixtus, has traced a detailed word-portrait of her spiritual father: "The Blessed Dominic was of medium height and of slight build. His countenance was beautiful, of fair complexion, with light auburn hair and beard and luminous eyes. A kind of radiance shone from his brow, inspiring love and reverence in all. Full of joy, he seemed ever ready to smile, unless moved to pity by the affliction of his neighbor. His hands were long and shapely; his voice strong, noble, and sonorous. He never was bald, and his corona was complete, sprinkled with a few white hairs." ⁽¹⁾ Dominic, no doubt, would have smiled at this description of him: "Cecilia," he would say, "there is only one beauty: that of the soul."

Rarely have nature and grace apportioned their gifts so generously as to Dominic, and rarely has a man been as faithful in cultivating the seed sown by Providence. His constant effort was to develop the growth to perfection. Born to be a leader and guide of souls, never did he forget the great principle that gives power to authority: act by force of example and do more yourself than you ask of others. The Church had placed him at the head of a militia of "invincible athletes of Christ," her own earliest name for them. The head of these athletes of the faith had to be himself a model of athletes, an apostle par excellence, powerful in word and work. Faith and charity animated the whole career of Dominic in his personal life and in his public activity. These divine talents cultivated his natural gifts and made them fruitful; for he esteemed these goods as coming also from God. Viewing them constantly vitalized by grace, we, too, can appreciate and admire their native splendor.

Dominic had a nature of exquisite sensibility and profound force. Those who knew him and lived intimately with him emphasize equally his spirit of joy and his flow of tears at the sight of suffering. He was one of those generous souls that live only for others; hence his gift for compassion and consolation. Without effort he communicated the spirit of his own soul to the soul of his neighbor.

Dominic guarded perpetual virginity. The spiritualized character imposed upon their senses by souls that submit neither to the tyranny nor to the caprice of the flesh, had refined his sensibilities and purified his affections. To maintain a continual mastery over his body, the Founder of the Preachers followed a program of extreme rigor. Watching, fasting, mortifications of every kind along with the privation and fatigue of long journeys on foot had made a supple instrument of a servant so rebellious as is the flesh of man. Nor is it surprising that a soul like Dominic's, at once gentle, strong, and ardent, radiated its inner strength through such feeble and transparent clay without loss or diminution.

THE CHURCHMAN

This power of persuasion won for the saint his victory in founding the only religious Order of the Middle Ages established among clerics and churchmen, the class at that time most opposed to sacrifice

and dutiful devotion. The reiterated appeals of Sovereign Pontiffs had been powerless to draw from their great benefices, or their scholarly vanity, even a handful of ecclesiastics for the apostolate, at a period when ruin threatened the Christian world, and the faithful were dying for lack of spiritual nourishment. The subprior of Osma worked this miracle. The young William de Montferrat, a follower of Cardinal Ugolino, whom Dominic knew at Rome and attracted to his Order in the house of his great friend and protector, later told of the impression made upon him by Dominic. Dominic's manner, he said, Pleas'd him greatly and he began to love him. He had never met a man so religious and so zealous for the salvation of souls.(2)

In their perfection the higher faculties of the Master of the Preachers seem to have excelled his exquisite sensibility. Not only were his intelligence and his will of the first order, but their balance and harmony found expression in a remarkable unity of action. The progress of events and the vocation of St. Dominic called into full play the qualities of his practical judgment, while his achievements attest the breadth and height of his spiritual vision.

Dominic's education was that of a well-trained cleric of the late twelfth century. It was almost exclusively theological, that is, Scriptural, for the Bible was the principal work studied. The subprior of Osma meditated continually on the New Testament, particularly on the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Epistles of St. Paul, which he always carried with him and knew almost by heart. In his sojourns at Rome, Bologna, and Paris he interpreted certain books of the New Testament for the brethren, and thus he was, so to speak, the first Master of the Order. As he nourished his own soul on Sacred Scripture, so, by his letters, his words, and his example, he encouraged his brethren to imitate him.(3)

Vowed to the labors of the apostolate from the year 1205 under almost desperate conditions, he had acquired from everyday life an appreciation of difficulties and the art of overcoming them. Continual association with ordinary people and association with the most eminent men of his time gave him wide views of the problems harassing the Christian world. He had been enveloped and carried along, as it were, by all the great movements of the age: the religious aspirations of the people and the heretical propaganda, the troubles of the communal life of the large cities, the policy and the war at the time of the crusade, the intellectual ferment in the schools of Paris and Bologna, and the sorrowing solicitude of the Church, whose many efforts for reform were still without success. Dominic understood and, in a certain sense, likewise shared intimately the reform views of such great lights as Innocent III and Cardinal Ugolino. He put to the test and ultimately realized the most cherished designs of the papacy, which were likewise his own.

To carry to completion an extremely difficult undertaking, Dominic had at his command an incomparable strength of will. Aware of realities and taught by experience, his practical judgment had the seal of full maturity; his decisions were precise and firm, their execution swift and sure. His disciples tell us(4) he never reconsidered a determination once made. Considering that an Order of Preachers, judged almost impossible, was started and within a few years instituted and extended to the distant frontiers of Europe, we recognize what an expenditure of energy was demanded of St. Dominic. Of all his moral virtues, lofty and balanced as they were, that of fortitude most impresses the historian. Then there is his evenness of spirit in success and reverses, his confidence in his enterprises and his scorn of danger. Even to the most timid and hesitant of his disciples, he imparted his own sense of security in his boldest undertakings. By nature and vocation he was magnetic.

THE BOOK OF CHARITY

From what source did such energy proceed? His companions and disciples have told us over and over again: from an almost uninterrupted union with God. Either he was speaking to God, they say, or about

God. The greater part of his nights was passed in the church in meditation or prayer. On his long journeys over a vast stretch of Europe, he often went aside from his companions and, alone, engaged in the divine communication from which issued his great strength and its continual renewal. In this incomparable love for God, he breathed a love for souls and rekindled his desire for their conquest. He loved them all, those of his sons and his daughters, those of all religious families, those of faithful Christians, those of Jews and pagans, to whom he showed a great affability, because, born outside the Church, they were not tearing her bosom asunder. He loved the souls of the heretics and spent himself to convince and win them. He loathed heresy, which loosed such evils in society and led Christians to perdition. Whatever may be said to the contrary, Dominic never exercised the office of a judge delegated for the prosecution of heresy, an office instituted by Gregory IX twelve years after the saint's death, one which a number of Preachers were required to exercise.

A young student of the University of Bologna who did not know which to admire more, the grace of his word or the eloquence of his speech in the use of Holy Scripture, once asked him toward the close of his life, in what book he had studied most. Dominic answered: "In the Book of Charity more than in the books of men."⁽⁵⁾ St. Paul would have given the same answer.

Dominic's holiness, like the grandeur of his mission, became evident to men by those miracles that confirm the presence and the power of God in great souls. In the life of the Founder of the Preachers, many striking prodigies are recorded: from the vision in which his mother, before his birth, saw him under the appearance of a dog -- it had long been the symbol of preachers -- that held in its mouth a lighted torch to set fire to the world, on to the marvelous fragrance which his dust and bones exhaled when they were taken from his first tomb to be translated to a more worthy sepulcher. We have purposely omitted the recounting of these prodigies as well as of numerous anecdotes. The purpose and brevity of these pages forbade their inclusion. An account of all these marvels will be easily accessible in biographies and histories dealing with a detailed study of the saint's life.

NOTES

1 Sister Cecilia was very old, over eighty no doubt, when she described St. Dominic, who had received her in her youth at St. Sixtus. But do we have to think, as Altaner does (p. 171), that in her word-portrait, she was not inspired by her personal recollection of the saint but was influenced by the picture of him hanging in the church of St. Agnes, as in every church of the Preachers (*Acta capitulorum generalium O.P.*, 1254, 1, 70)? Her description is so simple! The most interesting features are traced in Jordan, no. 103. If the case were our own, we feel we could live to be ninety and still be able to draw a similar portrait of Father Mandonnet, whom we too knew at the very beginning of our religious life.

2 Processus (Bologna), no. 12.

3 *Ibid.*, nos. 3, 22, 29; Frachet, p. 82.

4 Jordan, no. 103.

5 Frachet, p. 82.

CONTENTS

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER VI Nature of the Order of Preachers

THE purpose of the Order of Preachers was determined by the life and activity of St. Dominic subsequent to the year 1205. His one quest was for the salvation of souls. The earliest Constitutions of the Preachers, in a text issued by the general chapter of Bologna in 1220, state that the Order, from the beginning, was instituted especially for preaching and for the salvation of souls; that the work of its members was to be directed chiefly, zealously, and supremely toward what would be helpful to the souls of their fellow men.⁽¹⁾ The intensity of the effort to be expended in pursuit of their purpose could not be more forcibly and briefly stated, and no other institution of the Middle Ages expressed its apostolic aim so explicitly. As a natural consequence, the purpose of the Preachers determined the nature of their apostolate and dictated the character of their organization.

Their activity assumed many forms; but these had their own degrees of importance and were carefully graded, so that the whole possessed an organized and integral character. According to their contemporaries, the Preachers were apostles, clerics, canons, and monks. Of these constitutive elements of their state and their life, the first two were most essential, and totally new in a religious order. The other two were of ancient lineage, and were reduced to an auxiliary and modified influence, intended to sustain and foster the principal work. The Preachers were, first and foremost, apostles and scholars.

The regime of the apostolic life was officially instituted in the Church by Innocent III in his letter of November 17, 1206, in favor of St. Dominic and his companions. The apostolic life meant work for souls by word and example. It meant imitation of the poverty of Christ, the wearing of coarse raiment, and labor in a spirit of zeal. This mission was defined further in the letter of Honorius III (January 21, 1217)⁽²⁾ as well as in other letters of later date. In the papal and Dominican documents of the period it has a current formula: the Preachers had a mission to effect by word and example, *pariter verbo et exemplo*. The guaranty of example was aimed at by the adoption of monastic observances. Their office as Preachers could not have been more explicitly stated than it was in their official title, *Ordo Praedicatorum*, conferred by the Holy See.

CLERICS

Previous to that time the term denoted the teaching activity of the episcopal order, upon which lay all responsibility for the instruction of the people. In his letter of February 11, 1218,⁽³⁾ Honorius III declared that the Friars Preachers were deputed to the office of preaching. In the letter of February 4, 1221,⁽⁴⁾ enlarging on the earlier formula, he announced to all the bishops that the Preachers were deputed without reserve to that office: *totaliter deputati*. The Church did not confer the office of preaching on any other religious order so expressly and absolutely. In ecclesiastical tradition, the bishops, who were the ministers of theological training for the clergy, claimed also the collective title, *Ordo doctorum*, and it was considered identical with *Ordo praedicatorum*. Consequently, in their teaching functions the Friars Preachers were called *doctors*. This title was conferred on them by the first Constitutions, which provided that a convent could not be founded without a doctor, that is, without a professor of sacred science.⁽⁵⁾

In embracing the clerical life, the Preachers did not take upon themselves the care of parishes and the administration of the sacraments, except penance and the Eucharist. On the other hand, they introduced into clerical life, in a most intense form, the obligation of study and of teaching sacred science.

Instituted as canons regular in 1216, the Preachers, in their chapter of 1220, finally abandoned several elements of the canonical life: possessions and revenues in common;(6) the title of abbot, which Matthew of France had used as the first superior of the convent in Paris;(7) the surplice, for which the monastic scapular was substituted;(8) travel on horseback and the carrying of money.(9) From the practices that were regular in the canonical institution, they retained the habit, life in common, and the choral office, to be recited *breviter et succincte*. Exercises of piety and the spiritual life, such as the individual celebration of Mass, were left, according to the custom of the time, to the choice of each religious, who performed them privately according to his devotion. The title of canon, already rendered obsolete by that of Preacher, was virtually dropped by the general chapters from 1249 to 1251.(10)

There were changes from the traditional monastic practice in regard to manual work, the vow of stability, and foundations in isolated places. The Preachers belonged not to one convent but to Christendom, though ordinarily they were assigned to particular provinces which were vast in extent, but the monasteries were established in the heart of the great cities, as the normal scene of their preaching. In accordance with monastic tradition, the friars took the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, the common basis of the life of all religious. Like that of the monks, their observance included silence, concerning which St. Antoninus wrote: "Silence is the father of preachers"; perpetual abstinence, the fast from September 14 to Easter and on all Fridays of the year; the exclusive use of wool for clothing and bed-coverings, the discipline, the daily chapter of faults with a code of penance for infractions of the Rule.

Such practices of asceticism, which might appear out of harmony with a life so intensely active as that of the Preachers, were prompted by the desire of preaching by example, of training athletes for the Church, and of countering heretical sects conspicuous for their extreme penances, particularly the Cathari of southern France, in the midst of whom the Order was born. Since the rigor of observance might easily constitute an obstacle to the aim and work of the Order, the legislative authority provided, as a moderating principle at the very beginning of the Constitutions, the right of dispensation vested in the conventual prior. Moreover, to free the conscience of religious and superiors in any perplexity about the use of dispensation, the Chapter *Generalissimum* of Paris in 1236 declared that the Constitutions did not bind under pain of sin.(11)

What was dominant in Dominican life, therefore, was the apostolic activity of the preacher and the doctrinal activity of the professor of sacred science. This end was effected by an intense application to study, by a life of prayer and a severe asceticism, happily moderated by a system of dispensation which was usual for students and professors.(12)

GOVERNMENT OF THE ORDER

As the purpose of the Order of Preachers determined the nature of its activity, so the nature of the activity influenced the character of its organization; and as the apostolic and academic ministries were new in the life of religious, the Constitutions of the Preachers framed a type of government which further differentiated the Order from the earlier monastic institutions.

Structurally, the Order of Preachers was divided into convents. The convents were grouped in provinces, and all the provinces together constituted a strong unity which formed the Order.

The legislative power belonged to the general chapters. They were held annually at Pentecost. Each year from 1220 to 1227 inclusive, they were constituent assemblies, and a single chapter could promulgate an article of law. For greater stability, the Chapter *Generalissimum* of Paris in 1228 decreed that, to establish a new article in the Constitution, to change or abolish one, the intervention of

three successive general chapters would be required.⁽¹³⁾ From then on, the general chapters had sequence in the following way: the first was composed of provincial priors and the next two of representatives, including a delegate from a province for each chapter. This representative, known as a *definitor*, was elected by the provincial chapter. Only twice in the history of the Order,⁽¹⁴⁾ did a Chapter *Generalissimum* occur, once in 1228, and again in 1236, at Paris. Such assemblies were composed of the members of three consecutive chapters, including the provincial and two delegates from each province. During their tenure, the general chapters held supreme power: they could correct and depose the master general. They also had full administrative and judicial authority. They brought the term of office of provincials to a close.

Executive and administrative authority in the convent was represented by the prior. He was elected by all the religious of the convent. His term of office, which was for only a few years, was ended by the authority of the provincial chapter. The province was governed by a provincial prior, elected by the provincial chapter, which was composed of priors of convents, of a delegate from each of these houses and of the preachers general of the province, to which number were later added masters in theology. This chapter had full authority over whatever concerned the government of the province. It assigned religious to the convents, named the professors, and annually appointed four religious to visit and supervise the convents, and in the next chapter to give an oral or written report on the state of the religious and their work.

The Order as a whole was governed by the master general. He was elected at the general chapter by all the provincials and two delegates from each province as chosen by the provincial chapter. His office was for life. He was the great governing agent and constituted the permanent principle of unity in the Order. He had to visit the Order, supervise, correct. He could undertake, suggest, or approve useful projects, give dispensations, assume exceptional powers conferred on him by the general chapter, and confer personally with the Sovereign Pontiff, who would acquaint him with his desires or his will.

What was characteristic of the new organization of the Preachers is evident from this summary. Whereas in the older monastic and canonical orders, the prelates assumed all authority and exercised it in perpetuity without control, and subjects never participated in its exercise, with the Preachers the whole body governed itself through members drawn temporarily from its ranks and returned thither more or less promptly, according to the office held in the hierarchy. This new kind of government was made possible by the fact that the Preachers were educated men, experienced clerics, capable of understanding the general interests of their Order and trained not to sacrifice the common good to individual and personal views. It was this twofold condition that Thomas Aquinas required in civil society in order that the citizens might there enjoy the full exercise of their rights.

The monks, ordinarily unlettered, were thought of as minors perpetually in tutelage; the Preachers were of age, legally emancipated, and each individual possessed the plenitude of his rights: in the social structure of his Order, the Preacher was always an elector and eligible for election. The regime of election held on all levels and that of representation in the capitular assemblies was arranged in favor of the subjects. But as liberty without control and without check always tends to anarchy, authority in the Order was strongly supported. It confirmed or annulled elections, and terminated the office of subordinate authorities when it pleased through the medium of provincial or general assemblies. Even though elective in origin, in the thirteenth century the authority in the Order asserted itself with firmness and great decision. Through the whole of this Constitutional regime, the Order of Preachers represented a highly individualist spirit and yet a strongly centralized power. The principle of centralization was comparable to that which then characterized the Catholic Church and the French monarchy. The principle of election and eligibility, as well as that of a limited tenure of office, was similar to that practiced in the case of magistrates in the communes where the Preachers were

established and in that of the rising universities with which they were in contact or from which they had drawn a large number of their members.

By the adoption of a representative rule in their assemblies, the Preachers gave impetus to a movement already in the initial stages in some European states at the close of the twelfth century, and awaiting its acceptance in ecclesiastical circles. But nowhere, either in Church or in state, was it applied in so frequent or so firm a way as with the Preachers.[\(15\)](#)

NOTES

1 Denifle, *Archiv für Literatur*, I, 194.

2 Laurent, no. 77.

3 The formula "*officium praedicationis ad quod deputati sunt*" appeared in the letter of recommendation of the Preachers only on April 26, 1218 (Laurent, no. 87).

4 *Ibid.*, no. 129.

5 See Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 221.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 222; Jordan, no. 87.

7 Laurent, nos. 111, 121; Jordan, no. 48.

8 Echard (I, 71 ff.; thinks there was no change in the habit from the beginning. But it seems that the surplice, which is spoken of by John of Navarre (*Processus* [Bologna], no. 26) and which disappeared before 1220, was generally worn by the first Preachers, doubtless in conformity with a law of the Council of Montpellier (Hefele, V, 1300).

9 *Processus*, no. 26.

10 *Acta capitulorum*, I, 44, 49, 55.

11 *Acta capitulorum*, I, 8.

12 Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 223.

13 *Ibid.*, I, 194, 214; cf. Humbert, *De vita regulari*, II, 58.

14 The general chapter of Le Saulchoir in 1932, at which the Constitutions of the Preachers were corrected, revised, and adopted all at the same time, might deserve a title of *generalissimum* with regard to its effect, if not to its nature.

15 Before going on to the next chapter, many readers may prefer at this point to read the detailed and masterly *Studies* of Father Vicaire in the Appendix. (Translator's note.)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER VII

Development and Activity of the Preachers

BEFORE reviewing the special activity of the Preachers during the first century of their existence, it is desirable to sketch briefly the material development of the Order and its administration, to enumerate the various forms of its labor, and to note the judgment of the Church on its achievements.

The vocation of the Preachers, requiring as it did that the members come exclusively from the ranks of the educated, that is, the clerical order, might seem to limit the field for recruits. An institution established on such a foundation might be expected to have a restricted rate of development. Rather it was the very opposite trend that created a danger for the Preachers.

At the general chapter of Bologna in 1221, the Order was divided into eight provinces: Spain, Provence, France, Lombardy, Roumania, Teutonia, England, and Hungary. The chapter of 1228 added four new provinces: the Holy Land, Greece, Poland, and Dacia (Denmark and the Scandinavian countries). At the juncture of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, six provinces were divided and the total brought to eighteen.

In 1221, at the death of St. Dominic, according to Bernard Guidonis, the Order had about sixty convents of friars, and there were also four convents of sisters. According to the official census of 1277, there were then 404 houses of friars and 58 of sisters. In 1303, there were 582 of the first class and 149 of the second. In 1358 the figures were 642 and 157 respectively.

There is no record of the number of the religious in the thirteenth century. But on good grounds we may estimate that the Order, which counted sixteen members at the time of the dispersal (August 15, 1217), numbered about 7,000 in 1256, 10,000 at the end of the century, and 12,000 in 1337. These last two calculations probably fall below the correct figure.

The Order found recruits in all social classes, from royal families to simple laborers, but by way of the clerical state, a circumstance that tended to limit the plebeian element to the advantage of the aristocratic and bourgeois elements. During their great period of formation, the Preachers increased their membership mainly in the university centers, especially at Paris and Bologna, and these intellectual forces exerted a preponderant influence on the progress of the Order during a great part of the thirteenth century.

Throughout that first century, the Preachers possessed skilled administrators among their masters general. St. Dominic, Founder of the Order (1206-21), had a penetrating insight into the needs of his time. He executed his designs with an accuracy of view, a strength of resolution, and a tenacity of purpose that could not be surpassed. Jordan of Saxony (1222-37), a man of gentle character, eloquent, and endowed with a rare power of persuasion, attracted numerous and talented subjects to the Order. St. Raymond of Peñafort (1238-40), the great canonist of the age, was in office only long enough to re-codify the legislation of the Preachers. John the Teuton (1241-52), a polyglot bishop, in association with the most distinguished personalities of his era, strengthened the Order with numerous privileges. Humbert of Romans (1254-63), a genius of the practical type, a comprehensive and moderate spirit, brought the Order to its apogee, and wrote many works that perfectly reflect what he thought the Order of Preachers and Christian society should be. John of Vercelli (1264-83), an energetic and prudent man, maintained the Order in its brilliance during his long government. The successors of these

illustrious masters did their best to fulfill their task and to face situations which conditions in the Church, from the late thirteenth century on, rendered more and more difficult.

The general chapters, which enjoy supreme authority in the Order of Preachers, stand out as the great regulators of Dominican life during the Middle Ages. They were remarkable for their spirit of decision and for the firmness with which they ruled the whole body. Held alternately each year at Bologna and at Paris until 1244, afterward they were held at various places throughout Christendom. The solemnity of their celebration assumed for the places where they convened the importance of a historical event. Princes, prelates, towns, and ordinary individuals were eager, by means of alms, to support these assemblies which ordinarily numbered many hundred persons and at times reached a total of seven hundred.

THE *EQUUS PUBLICUS* OF CHRISTENDOM

The Preachers' activity was intense and took many forms. It extended first and principally to what was the immediate purpose of their foundation: study, preaching, teaching, literary productions, and missions beyond the borders of the Christian world. But the Church and the civil power added other works to this already absorbing program. The popes made heavy demands on the Order for the services of its members in interests of the Church. During one century, we find appointed nearly 450 Dominican bishops, archbishops, and patriarchs, a dozen cardinals, and two popes, Innocent V and Benedict XI. The Preachers were called on for vicars, penitentiaries and papal chaplains, masters of the sacred palace, and Inquisitors. There was a continual appeal for their help in many capacities. They were legates, nuncios, apostolic commissioners for causes of many kinds; bishops used them for the administration of their dioceses; kings took them for counselors, confessors, and ambassadors; communes made them their peacemakers; convents of religious women sought their direction, as did numerous fraternities and lay associations.

The Order soon tried to obtain relief from some of these numerous Commissions which partly withdrew it from the principal work of its vocation. After 1225 the Church permitted the Order to refuse certain requests, even those made by papal legates. But it could not free itself from a multitude of extra duties which the worth of its members drew upon it, and willy-nilly it was always the public horse (*equus publicus*) of Christendom, as Innocent IV called it (November 14, 1248).

How did the Preachers acquit themselves of their task during the first century after their foundation? How did they carry out the program mapped out for them by Honorius III in 1216, when he declared they would be "the champions of the faith and the true lights of the world"? We shall limit our inquiry to judgments voiced by the Church, since her authority is supreme and she never ceased to watch with attentive interest the action of the militia in which she had placed her highest hopes.

PAPAL TRIBUTES

We have the following words of Gregory IX in 1223, 1239, and 1240:

The conversion of so great a multitude of people in so short a time by the Order which professes the evangelical life is manifest proof that the Almighty has worked a wonder of His right hand. Holy Mother Church rejoices to be illuminated by the rays of so great a light.

We have an unshakable confidence in you.

It is evident that the wisdom of God has given you to be the light of nations.

The Friars Preachers are powerful in word and work. Their life vivifies their doctrine, and doctrine informs their life; what they teach in their sermons is readable in their conduct.

In 1244, 1245, and 1248, Innocent IV said:

From its foundation, the Order of Preachers has continued to grow with notable progress; we love it with whole-hearted affection. It is illustrious by reputation, renowned for learning, fervent in virtue.

In whatever concerns the glory of God, the honor of the Church, ecclesiastical power and liberty, the Preachers show no fear and they hesitate at nothing, once the prudent will of the Apostolic See is made known. We are proud in the Lord that He has fortified His Church with men who love to die for Christ and to suffer for justice.

The Order of Preachers has been divinely instituted to be the staff of the old age of the Church. It is like a public horse, ever ready to struggle against the malice of heretics, to correct the mistakes of the faithful, to temper the malice of tyrants, to bear the burdens of the universal Church, and above all, to come to the aid of the prelates.

The following are the words of Alexander IV in 1254, 1255, 1256, 1257, and 1261.

We have always been the friend of your Order and the fervent promoter of its honor and its welfare.

Your Order is a fertile field which produces flowers of strong religion and sanctity. It diffuses far and near the perfume of a life worthy of praise.

Nearly everywhere, the world over, your brethren are agreeable in the eyes of God and men.

The Preachers are eminent by the great uprightness of their life and illustrious for their discretion and prudence.

You are the special and beloved sons of the Roman Church.

The friars of this Order are men proved, filled with divine knowledge, efficacious in zeal, powerful in preaching, whose lips grace has touched to teach true doctrine and direct others in the way of salvation. Loud as the trumpet, their word re-echoes throughout the whole earth, and resounds to the ends of the world.

Among the other plantations of the Lord, the Order of Preachers is specially adorned by purity of life, the gift of knowledge, and the merit of virtue.

Urban IV (1261):

Your Order, illustrious for its works of piety, is like the candelabra of God on the surface of the earth.

Clement IV (1266 and 1267):

Your Order is a fortified city which guards the truth and welcomes the faithful through its open portals. It is the sun shining in the temple of God, the cypress on the heights lifting minds that regard it, the field of the Lord fragrant with celestial roses.

We can make this eulogy of your famous Order, that it possesses in itself the glory of perfect beauty and is absolutely pure of every stain.

Nicholas IV (1278):

We surround your Order with the privilege of a special affection. We delight in its beauty and find repose in its religion as a power of stability.

Celestine V (1294):

The religion of the Preachers is rich in the fecundity of its virtues and strong in the Lord by its good works. Since it was instituted to be the bulwark and the defense of the orthodox faith, it has not ceased, even to this day, by the grace of its distinguished merits and the doctrine of sacred preaching, to produce in the universal Church abundant fruits of sanctity and salvation, and this it continues to do.

Boniface VIII (1304):

The ineffable Providence of the Creator, wishing to exalt the glory of His name and procure the salvation of the faithful, has in our time produced, among the beautiful and fruitful plantations of the Church, an illustrious Order which is like a new tree of life,

watered with heavenly benediction. From its earliest years it has grown with laudable progress. Elevated by the action of divine grace, it has finally unfolded its spreading branches to touch heaven in its sublimity and reach to the ends of the earth. The brethren of the Order of St. Dominic are the chosen ministers of Christ, brilliant for their worthy consecration, illustrious for their upright life, given by the wisdom of God to be the light of nations. They are like splendid stars in the firmament of the Church, like gleaming torches in the house of God. They enlighten all men by evangelical teaching, and their spiritual beams show the way of life to mortals.

John XXII (1318 and 1325):

Among the other religious orders, that of the Friars Preachers shines by the more abundant grace of its merits, by the prerogative of its virtues, and, as a model of religion, by a greater light.

We delight in the sidereal beauty of your Order and find repose in the stability of its religion.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER VIII Academic Organization

By declaring, in the letter of foundation, that the Preachers were to be "the champions of the faith and the true lights of the world," Honorius III stated equivalently that they were to be devoted to study. St. Dominic and his companions comprehended this feature in their vocation, when they provided in their Customs, composed about six months before the publication of the papal letter, "that they were to apply themselves to study, day and night, at home and abroad," and left the religious free even to prolong their night vigils for purposes of study. The regime established by the Preachers, therefore, was one not only of study, but of intense study. The fifth master general intimated its importance when he declared that, although study is not the aim of the Order yet it is necessary for the attainment of the end, and he was careful to establish that the Preachers was the first order vowed to study, a distinction that was part of its glory. Nor did Dominican leadership in the thirteenth century cease to watch with jealous care over the intellectual growth required of the religious.

With conditions as they were in that age, study was possible only with a master or in a school. Therefore the Preachers organized their Order as a vast hierarchical academic system, an arrangement which accounts for the statement that "St. Dominic was the first minister of public education in Europe." Strictly speaking, the Preachers might have established schools exclusively for their own personnel; but they would thereby have been unmindful of the fact that they were created for the service of Christian society and that the dearth of theological schools was then one of the gravest difficulties awaiting solution by the Church. Consequently instruction in sacred science was required by the Preachers as the *sine qua non* for every conventual foundation, and that instruction was public. Recognizing this, Conrad of Scharfeneck, bishop of Metz and chancellor of the Empire, in his letter of April 22, 1221, recommended the establishment of the Preachers in his diocese, since he considered that a convent of the Preachers would be not only of great profit for the laity by reason of the preaching of these religious, but also for the clerics by reason of the lectures in the sacred sciences. Moreover, the example of the Lord Pope in giving them a house in Rome had been imitated by a large number of archbishops and bishops.

THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

The Dominican program was planned first and foremost to give theological training. The vocation of the Preachers required this, and theological knowledge was both the most necessary and the most lacking in the ecclesiastical world of the period. Nevertheless the Order conceded that it could not completely disregard profane learning, and from the beginning left an opening in the Constitutions in favor of the secular sciences, until it should give them full admittance in the middle of the century. Such a move was not in accord with established custom; that it might not seem too great an innovation, the liberal arts schools established by the Order were not open to the public. This arrangement was gradually modified, but only about the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the next century. The great development of academic life among the Preachers soon caused the office of professor to be considered superior to that of preacher. The imparting of sacred science to the clergy was a work more exalted by nature than that of giving sermons to the laity, and Humbert of Romans said there would be good preachers only so far as there were good professors. Therefore, in considering the activity of the Order of Preachers, we should examine the character of their academic and doctrinal program before speaking of their apostolic labor.

The general basis of instruction for the Preachers was the conventual school, which was frequented by all the religious of the house and by other clerics. It was directed by a doctor, called later, but not everywhere, a lector. His principal subject was the text of Scripture which he interpreted, relating to it questions of theology. Peter Lombard's *Book of Sentences*, Peter Comestor's *Scholastic History*, and the *Summa* of cases of conscience were used as secondary texts. In large convents that did not have the title *studia generalia* and were at times called *studia solemnna*, the teaching personnel was completed by the addition of a sublector, or by one or two bachelors. The principal master held discussions approximately every fortnight. Each convent had a *magister studentium*, who supervised their program, and ordinarily also a tutor. The appointment of the academic corps, masters and students, depended on the provincial chapters.

Of higher rank than the conventual school, whether ordinary or solemn, were the *studia generalia*. The first possessed by the Order was that of the convent of St. Jacques at Paris, with a first chair or school obtained in 1229, and a second in 1230. The Preachers were thus the first religious order to take part in teaching at the University of Paris. After they had received their theological degrees there and for some time, these masters were dispersed to the great schools of Christian Europe. The convent of St. Jacques was the principal academic center of the Preachers during the whole medieval period.

The development of the Order led to the establishment in 1248 of four new *studia generalia*: at Oxford, Cologne, Montpellier, and Bologna. At the beginning of the fourteenth century, with the division of several provinces, new general study centers were created at Naples, Florence, Genoa, Toulouse, and Salamanca.

The *studium generale* was organized with a master or regent, and two bachelors who taught under his direction. The master interpreted Scripture and every fortnight held a public disputation, to which were later added one or two quodlibet debates during Advent or Lent. The principal bachelor interpreted the Master of the *Sentences*, and the other the Bible, scanned rapidly. The regents and the bachelors were appointed by the general chapters, or by the master general, delegated for this purpose. Upon the founding of convents, many of these schools of theology were incorporated into the already existing universities that had a faculty of theology. This was the case at Paris, Toulouse, Oxford, Naples, and other places. But when, in the course of the thirteenth century and even later, a university was established in a city where there already existed a Dominican convent which always had a school of theology, the papal letters erecting the University did not grant the faculty of theology. That was regarded as already existing, by reason of the school of the Preachers and of other mendicant religious who followed them in their plan of instruction. In such cities the Dominican theological schools simply existed along with the universities without juridical dependence on them, although in relation to them they filled the place of the faculty of theology. But in the second half of the fourteenth century, when princes or cities petitioned the Holy See to establish a faculty of theology in a university, then the Preachers' schools of theology ordinarily became incorporated with the new faculty.

The study of the liberal arts, at first limited to a small number of religious, quickly took a place in regular academic instruction. About the middle of the thirteenth century, the provinces established in one or more of the convents studies in logic, which were supplemented a little later by lectures in the natural sciences, and finally in moral and political science.

THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

From the beginning, the ministerial work of the Order, especially in more distant places in contact with barbaric nations and in particular with the Greek, Arabic, and Jewish world, required the study of languages. The Chapter *Generalissimum* of Paris in 1236 ordered that the religious of all the convents

and provinces learn the languages of the neighboring peoples. About this time a school of Hebrew seems to have been established in Paris. The Province of the Holy Land, which was already devoting itself to the study of Arabic, added for its convents that of the languages of the peoples of Asia; the Province of Greece cultivated especially the Hellenic tongue, and the Province of Spain established on the peninsula and even at Tunis flourishing schools of Arabic and Hebrew. In 1310 the general chapter ordered the master general to establish in several provinces *studia* for Hebrew, Greek, and Arabic, to which each province of the Order was to send a student.

The academic activity of the Preachers extended beyond the limits already outlined. The archbishops who, by the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), should have established a master of theology in their metropolitan church, generally considered themselves exempt from this obligation, in consequence of the creation in their city of a Dominican school open to the secular clergy. However, when they felt responsible for carrying out the decree of the Council, or later were constrained to do so by the Church, they frequently called upon a Dominican master to fill the chair of their school. Thus it was that, until the beginning of the sixteenth century, the metropolitan school of Lyons was continually entrusted to the Preachers. Though for a less continuous period, the same arrangement occurred frequently, as in Toulouse, Bordeaux, Tortosa, Valencia, Urgel, Milan, and other places.

During the thirteenth century the popes were generally content with the schools established by the Preachers and the other religious who succeeded them in the cities where the Curia resided. The Dominican master in that position was known as the *lector curiae*. But when the Sovereign Pontiffs went to Avignon in the beginning of the fourteenth century, they instituted a school of theology in their palace. This initiative was due to Clement V (1305-14). At the request of the Dominican Cardinal Nicholas Albertini of Prato, this office was confided in perpetuity to a Friar Preacher, who had the title of *magister sacri palatii*.

When finally, in the middle of the thirteenth century, the ancient monastic orders began to enter into the academic movement of the times, the Cistercians in particular appealed to the Preachers to provide masters of theology for some of their abbeys. At the close of the thirteenth century, the Preachers had a teaching personnel of at least fifteen hundred religious, about half of whom were engaged in the public teaching of theology.

CONTENTS

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER IX

The Doctrinal Life and the Thomistic School

THE intellectual and scholastic activity of the Preachers was too intense not to exert a profound influence, within a short time, on the general trend in great doctrinal problems and a kind of final hegemony in the domain of philosophy and theology.

Two sorts of problems were uppermost in the schools and in Christian thought at the beginning of the thirteenth century: the philosophical and the theological problems. The introduction of the scientific treatises of Aristotle, along with those of Avicenna and Averroes, posited a twofold question regarding the use of their treasures for the advancement of the learning of the age and for the safeguarding of religious faith against certain of their dangerous theories: a twofold question that could be answered only by the building of a strong Christian philosophy. Theology, which had its chief source in the work of St. Augustine, had no unity in the first years of the thirteenth century. In the course of the preceding century it had been constituted materially as a body of doctrine; but the industry of individual theologians had only divided the ideas of the Bishop of Hippo into an ever-increasing number of opinions, without any attempt at a systematic unification. Such an achievement would be possible only through the medium of an established Christian philosophy. Of paramount interest for the doctrinal life of the Church, these were the fundamental problems which the Preachers were to solve with superior mastery.

It was not the first generation of Dominicans who achieved this; but, through their intense activity, they created the intellectual milieu in which was to unfold the genius of the two men whose names are forever connected with the doctrinal synthesis then effected by the Preachers: Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. The Dominican masters who taught first in the most important academic centers established by the Order had come out of the ranks of the secular professors at the universities of Paris, Bologna, and Oxford. Their scientific culture as well as their doctrinal ideas reflected what prevailed in the scholastic environment in which they had been trained, and whatever their personal power, they did not create a new philosophical or theological movement. Many of them have left an honorable name in the history of theology. We need only mention Roland of Cremona, Hugh of St. Cher, Peter of Tarentaise, at the University of Paris; Richard Fishacre and Robert of Kilwardby, at Oxford; Moneta of Cremona, at Bologna. Yet in their writings all these masters reveal the Augustinian tone which universally pervaded philosophical and theological thought during the first half of the thirteenth century.

TOWARD A NEW THEOLOGY

Albert the Great (1206-80), by his encyclopedic works and the assimilation of ancient learning, opened a new way and placed at the disposal of Christian society the knowledge elaborated by the Greek, Latin, and Arabic world, after clearing away the errors that hindered its use in the schools of the time. He solved single-handed, provisionally at least, the problem of the expurgation of Aristotle proposed by Gregory IX in 1231. Thus he exercised upon his contemporaries and the thinkers of the late medieval world, a profound influence, sufficiently attested by the title early added to his name. Submerged in the vastness of his learning, however, Albert only partially rose above the ideas current with his contemporaries, and did not arrive at a powerful synthesis of his philosophical ideas. The merit of this was reserved to his disciple, Thomas of Aquin (1225-74), who, formed under his direction (1245-52) and rapidly initiated by the universal knowledge of his master in all the great philosophical

and theological problems, created a Christian philosophy and theology which the Church still uses as the foundation of her official teaching.

The approximately seventy-five works, of varying importance, which came from the pen of Thomas Aquinas, were written in less than twenty years (1254-73). In their ensemble they treat of philosophy, theology, and Sacred Scripture. The *Summa theologiae*, the *Summa contra Gentiles*, the *Commentaries on Aristotle*, and the *Disputed Questions*, are the most important works. It is difficult to say which is the more astonishing, the short time in which so vast a work was executed, or the power of thought to which it bears witness. Out of the elements elaborated by his predecessors from ancient times, Thomas Aquinas constructed a philosophy, vast, unified, and stable. Upon this solid foundation, he revised the science of theology and endowed it in its turn with the qualities inherent in his philosophy. In Thomas Aquinas, clarity of expression, extent of erudition, critical sense, methodical spirit, finesse of analysis, and power of synthesis attained their highest development. Through this last quality, the power of synthesis, which was his genius, and through the creation of an incomparable metaphysics, Thomas Aquinas impressed upon his work its coherent force and its marvelous unity.

Even in his lifetime, the influence of Thomas was extensive and profound. Indeed, long before his death, his school was founded, and though it would encounter many obstacles in the course of the centuries, it came more and more to identify itself with the official teaching of the Catholic Church. The Sovereign Pontiffs who gave their patronage to the doctrinal work of Thomas when he taught at the Roman Curia never ceased praising and promoting a sacred science born at the foot of their throne.

The Thomistic school had a rapid development within and even without the Order of Preachers. In the early fourteenth century, St. Thomas had already received the title of *Doctor communis*, which bore witness to the general triumph of his doctrine. Nor was this rapid success realized without difficulty and opposition. Thomas Aquinas personally had been obliged to engage in keen strife against the lingering Augustinianism and antichristian Averroism. After his death the partisans of Augustinianism tried to take their revenge through the action of certain prelates who were more quarrelsome than prudent; witness the condemnation by Stephen Tempier at Paris (March 7, 1277), Robert Kilwardby at Oxford (March 18, 1277), and John Peckham at London (April 30, 1286). But the Order of Preachers withstood these adversaries like a wall of brass. From 1277 on, by its general chapters, it continued to recommend and protect the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas, and the disciples of the great doctor opposed all the attacks by their writings. In 1277, Giles of Lessines, and the young hermit of St. Augustine, Giles of Rome, disciple of Thomas Aquinas, defended the theory of their master on the unity of substantial form. About the year 1280, when the English Friar Minor, William de la Mare, attacked numerous points in the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas in his *Correctorium fratris Thomae*, Richard Clapwell at Oxford, Hugh of Billom and John of Paris in France, refuted him energetically.

DEFENDERS AND DISSENTERS

General works in defense of the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas were undertaken at the beginning of the fourteenth century, such as the work of Robert of Bologna entitled *Apologeticum pro S. Thoma*, and that of Hervé of Nédellec, master of the University of Paris, and later master general of the Order, who began a vast study left unfinished, called *Defensio doctrinae D. Thomae*. Another series of polemical works more specialized in character was also started at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the next century by various Friars Preachers against several celebrated masters, who had either directly or indirectly opposed Thomistic doctrines. Thus it was that Robert of Hereford composed some controversial studies against Henry of Ghent and Giles of Rome; that Hervé of Nédellec entered the lists against the former of these theologians; and that Thomas of Jorz, professor at Oxford and later a

cardinal, defended the Thomistic school against Duns Scotus. In a word, the Order of Preachers engaged in considerable literary activity to propagate and defend the teaching of its great doctor.

Though universally won to the ideas of Thomas Aquinas, the Preachers were too numerous an intellectual group not to have some dissidents. The latter belonged for the most part to the Province of Teutonia, where the endurance of the teachings of Albert the Great and certain mystical tendencies lent a predilection for certain views which savored of Augustinian Neoplatonism and of the influence of pseudo-Dionysius. Such were Ulrich of Strasbourg (d. 1277), Theodore of Freiburg (d. about 1315), John Eckhart of Hochheim (d. 1327). In France, Durandus of St. Pourçain (d. 1334) was one of the most zealous opponents; but in his turn he had an energetic adversary in his confrere, Durandus of Aurillac.

The canonization of St. Thomas Aquinas (1323) by John XXII gave a supreme consecration to the doctrines of the great theologian; for in the eyes of the Church, the doctrine of saints has always enjoyed an exceptional authority. Thenceforth the Thomistic school, by its intrinsic value and the position given it by the Holy See, found itself in the forefront of Catholic theological teaching.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER X Literary Productivity

THE life of study on which the activity of the Preachers was grounded, the professorial work to which a large number were devoted, and their abiding concern for a universal and urgent apostolate resulted in a great literary productivity that rapidly included all fields of learning. Along with the word, and even in a more enduring way, the book was for the Preacher the great instrument of doctrinal propaganda. From the beginning, therefore, the friars resolutely engaged in writing as part of their mission.

We know that St. Dominic not only taught Holy Scripture to his first disciples, but that he also wrote commentaries or glosses on certain books of the New Testament. Under his direction at Bologna in 1220, Paul of Hungary prepared the first manual of moral theology for the use of confessors. Given such an impetus, there could be no stopping, and from day to day this literary activity grew prodigiously. A contemporary chronicler, describing the laborious life of the Preachers about the year 1230, did not fail to emphasize their application to writing: "The Preachers give themselves without rest to study and the reading of the Sacred Books. By their industry in the composition of books and their diligence in understanding the masters, they are warriors clad in solid armor and fortified with bows and arrows; they can go into battle and run to the defense of Holy Mother the Church."

The literary output of the Preachers during the first century of their existence was enormous. Unfortunately most of their works remained in manuscript, and many have been lost. Though a rough estimate is difficult, it seems that what the Preachers produced before the middle of the fourteenth century was not far from equaling the whole of what had been previously written in the Latin Church between the time of the Fathers and the thirteenth century.

What subjects were treated? The Dominican pen touched on practically all knowledge, divine and human. In virtue of the vocation of the Order, however, the theological and philosophical sciences took pre-eminence. The works of the Preachers ranged in length from very extensive treatises to shorter compositions, while, according to the nature of the subject, they pursued the loftiest speculative problems or the most ordinary practical ends. Some works testify to the forcefulness of thought in their authors, others to a simple diligence, for the Order pursued the instruction of all social classes.

Aware of the vastness of their literary achievement, the Preachers attempted an inventory of their works in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Compiled at Paris in the convent of St. Jacques, under the title *Tabula scriptorum*, this is the most remarkable bibliographical project of the epoch, perhaps even of the entire Middle Ages. Although incomplete, it suffices to give an impression of the effort expended by the Order in the domain of books.

The literature of the Preachers was not only remarkable in extent and variety, but much of it was of first rank, because epochal: such works blazed fresh trails, for a long time unparalleled and unsurpassed.

STUDY OF THE BIBLE

The Preachers were the first to undertake new studies on the Bible, the text of which formed the basis of their theological teaching. Under the direction of Hugh of St. Cher, they began at Paris the difficult task of correcting the text of the Vulgate; the work, which was finished in 1236, comprised the text

approved in the Order, in the University, and little by little in the whole Church. The Dominican revision furnished the basis for our actual Vulgate text. Attempts to improve the sacred text were likewise pursued by the Paris Dominicans. About the same time Hugh of St. Cher created the biblical concordances, since then in universal use. These were revised successively by other Preachers. The same Hugh was responsible for the first complete commentary on the whole scriptural text; but the commentaries of St. Thomas Aquinas on certain books of the Bible far surpassed those of his contemporaries in critical value, literal objectivity, and theological knowledge. An interpretation of the four Gospels by means of texts drawn from the Fathers, attributed likewise to St. Thomas, and known as the *Catena aurea*, provided the clergy with a work rich in thought for their personal instruction and preaching, and it continued to be a model of its kind. From all appearances, the Parisian Preachers, while producing other great scriptural works, took in hand the translation of the French Bible. The names of other religious are likewise associated with translations of the Bible into the vernacular in different European countries.

For importance and number, theological works rank first in the Preachers' literary activity. Most of the theologians who wrote, especially those in the great university centers, composed commentaries on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, the classical text for bachelors in the schools of theology. The writings on disputed questions and quodlibet questions are evidences of masterly skill. The theological summas followed a more complete and more coherent Plan than that of Peter Lombard, emphasizing philosophical principles not found in the *Book of Sentences*. Manuals of theology and manuals or summas of penance, for the use of confessors, were numerous. The oldest Dominican commentaries on the *Sentences* were those of Roland of Cremona, Hugh of St. Cher, Richard Fishacre, Robert Kilwardby, and Albert the Great. The series began in the year 1230, if not earlier, and the last cited here were completed before the middle of the century. The *Summa theologica* of St. Thomas (1267-73) stands as the masterpiece of theology. The *Compendium theologicæ veritatis* of Hugh Ripelin of Strasbourg (d. 1268) was a real jewel and the most celebrated manual of the Middle Ages. The *Summa de poenitentia* of St. Raymond of Peñafort, composed in 1235, commanded sustained influence, and was among the works of which multiple copies were made. Finally, the *Summa confessorum* of John of Freiburg in Breisgau was, according to connoisseurs, a most perfect specimen of this type of work.

Established primarily for the defense of the faith, the Preachers aimed at reaching all classes of dissidents within or without the Church, they wrote by far the most powerful treatises in the field of apologetic. The *Summa adversus Catharos et Valdenses* by Moneta of Cremona, in course of composition in 1244, was the most complete and most solid production of the Middle Ages against the two great heretical sects of the period. The *Summa contra Gentiles* of St. Thomas Aquinas, one of the finest creations of this master, constructed a defense of the Christian faith in opposition to Arabic philosophy. Raymond Martin in his *Pugio fidei*, on which he was at work in 1278, took issue with Judaism and showed an extensive knowledge of rabbinical literature. It was the outstanding medieval monument of Orientalism. Lastly, the Florentine Ricoldo of Monte Croce (d. 1320), a missionary in the Orient, composed his *Propugnaculum fidei* against the doctrine of the Koran, quoting directly from Arabic literature.

The most celebrated philosophical works of the thirteenth century are those of Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. The former constructed, on the Aristotelian model, a vast scientific encyclopedia which exerted a profound influence on the last centuries of the Middle Ages. In addition to the special studies and the philosophical articles included in his other works, Thomas Aquinas commented in whole or in part on thirteen treatises of Aristotle, which are the fundamental works of the Stagirite. Robert of Kilwardby, an exponent of ancient Augustinianism, composed the most important introduction to philosophy in that period in *De ortu et divisione philosophiæ*. Theodore of Freiburg at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century left a work, remarkable for its

scientific character, in which for the first time appeared an exact theory about the rainbow. Then there was the most celebrated Greek translator of the whole epoch, William of Moerbeke, who revised the translations of Aristotle, translated other works of the Stagirite previously unavailable, and produced in Latin numerous volumes from the Greek philosophers and other scholars of antiquity.

In the historical field, the accomplishment of the Preachers was considerable. They compiled studies in general, ecclesiastical, and profane history. The works of Vincent of Beauvais, Martin of Troppau, Ptolemy of Lucca, and Bernard Guidonis were particularly significant. Bernard Guidonis, whose historical work is the most remarkable of the period, displayed an erudition in which, for the first time, there was a sense of documentation and a noteworthy spirit of criticism. The anonymous Dominican chronicler of Colmar had a penetrating view of what we today call the history of civilization.

The Preachers composed a notable collection of treatises that may be classified as literature of education, since it was to be at the disposal of all classes of society for their enlightenment: manuals for the education of princes and the government of their states, for the reform of Christian society, for the training of religious, for preachers, for the religious instruction of the people and children.

Over and above the types mentioned, the Preachers in their vast literary heritage treasure some works of a truly unique character, for their like is not found among contemporary productions of that era. In this class are the Letters of Blessed Jordan of Saxony to Blessed Diana of Andalò, the treatise *De musica* of Jerome of Moravia, the *Geography of the Holy Land* by Burkart of Mt. Sion, the *Golden Legend* by Jacopo de Voragine, the *Philobiblion* or treatise on the *Love of Books* by Robert of Holcot, and many others.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER X Literary Productivity

THE life of study on which the activity of the Preachers was grounded, the professorial work to which a large number were devoted, and their abiding concern for a universal and urgent apostolate resulted in a great literary productivity that rapidly included all fields of learning. Along with the word, and even in a more enduring way, the book was for the Preacher the great instrument of doctrinal propaganda. From the beginning, therefore, the friars resolutely engaged in writing as part of their mission.

We know that St. Dominic not only taught Holy Scripture to his first disciples, but that he also wrote commentaries or glosses on certain books of the New Testament. Under his direction at Bologna in 1220, Paul of Hungary prepared the first manual of moral theology for the use of confessors. Given such an impetus, there could be no stopping, and from day to day this literary activity grew prodigiously. A contemporary chronicler, describing the laborious life of the Preachers about the year 1230, did not fail to emphasize their application to writing: "The Preachers give themselves without rest to study and the reading of the Sacred Books. By their industry in the composition of books and their diligence in understanding the masters, they are warriors clad in solid armor and fortified with bows and arrows; they can go into battle and run to the defense of Holy Mother the Church."

The literary output of the Preachers during the first century of their existence was enormous. Unfortunately most of their works remained in manuscript, and many have been lost. Though a rough estimate is difficult, it seems that what the Preachers produced before the middle of the fourteenth century was not far from equaling the whole of what had been previously written in the Latin Church between the time of the Fathers and the thirteenth century.

What subjects were treated? The Dominican pen touched on practically all knowledge, divine and human. In virtue of the vocation of the Order, however, the theological and philosophical sciences took pre-eminence. The works of the Preachers ranged in length from very extensive treatises to shorter compositions, while, according to the nature of the subject, they pursued the loftiest speculative problems or the most ordinary practical ends. Some works testify to the forcefulness of thought in their authors, others to a simple diligence, for the Order pursued the instruction of all social classes.

Aware of the vastness of their literary achievement, the Preachers attempted an inventory of their works in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Compiled at Paris in the convent of St. Jacques, under the title *Tabula scriptorum*, this is the most remarkable bibliographical project of the epoch, perhaps even of the entire Middle Ages. Although incomplete, it suffices to give an impression of the effort expended by the Order in the domain of books.

The literature of the Preachers was not only remarkable in extent and variety, but much of it was of first rank, because epochal: such works blazed fresh trails, for a long time unparalleled and unsurpassed.

STUDY OF THE BIBLE

The Preachers were the first to undertake new studies on the Bible, the text of which formed the basis of their theological teaching. Under the direction of Hugh of St. Cher, they began at Paris the difficult task of correcting the text of the Vulgate; the work, which was finished in 1236, comprised the text

approved in the Order, in the University, and little by little in the whole Church. The Dominican revision furnished the basis for our actual Vulgate text. Attempts to improve the sacred text were likewise pursued by the Paris Dominicans. About the same time Hugh of St. Cher created the biblical concordances, since then in universal use. These were revised successively by other Preachers. The same Hugh was responsible for the first complete commentary on the whole scriptural text; but the commentaries of St. Thomas Aquinas on certain books of the Bible far surpassed those of his contemporaries in critical value, literal objectivity, and theological knowledge. An interpretation of the four Gospels by means of texts drawn from the Fathers, attributed likewise to St. Thomas, and known as the *Catena aurea*, provided the clergy with a work rich in thought for their personal instruction and preaching, and it continued to be a model of its kind. From all appearances, the Parisian Preachers, while producing other great scriptural works, took in hand the translation of the French Bible. The names of other religious are likewise associated with translations of the Bible into the vernacular in different European countries.

For importance and number, theological works rank first in the Preachers' literary activity. Most of the theologians who wrote, especially those in the great university centers, composed commentaries on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, the classical text for bachelors in the schools of theology. The writings on disputed questions and quodlibet questions are evidences of masterly skill. The theological summas followed a more complete and more coherent Plan than that of Peter Lombard, emphasizing philosophical principles not found in the *Book of Sentences*. Manuals of theology and manuals or summas of penance, for the use of confessors, were numerous. The oldest Dominican commentaries on the *Sentences* were those of Roland of Cremona, Hugh of St. Cher, Richard Fishacre, Robert Kilwardby, and Albert the Great. The series began in the year 1230, if not earlier, and the last cited here were completed before the middle of the century. The *Summa theologica* of St. Thomas (1267-73) stands as the masterpiece of theology. The *Compendium theologicae veritatis* of Hugh Ripelin of Strasbourg (d. 1268) was a real jewel and the most celebrated manual of the Middle Ages. The *Summa de poenitentia* of St. Raymond of Peñafort, composed in 1235, commanded sustained influence, and was among the works of which multiple copies were made. Finally, the *Summa confessorum* of John of Freiburg in Breisgau was, according to connoisseurs, a most perfect specimen of this type of work.

Established primarily for the defense of the faith, the Preachers aimed at reaching all classes of dissidents within or without the Church, they wrote by far the most powerful treatises in the field of apologetic. The *Summa adversus Catharos et Valdenses* by Moneta of Cremona, in course of composition in 1244, was the most complete and most solid production of the Middle Ages against the two great heretical sects of the period. The *Summa contra Gentiles* of St. Thomas Aquinas, one of the finest creations of this master, constructed a defense of the Christian faith in opposition to Arabic philosophy. Raymond Martin in his *Pugio fidei*, on which he was at work in 1278, took issue with Judaism and showed an extensive knowledge of rabbinical literature. It was the outstanding medieval monument of Orientalism. Lastly, the Florentine Ricoldo of Monte Croce (d. 1320), a missionary in the Orient, composed his *Propugnaculum fidei* against the doctrine of the Koran, quoting directly from Arabic literature.

The most celebrated philosophical works of the thirteenth century are those of Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. The former constructed, on the Aristotelian model, a vast scientific encyclopedia which exerted a profound influence on the last centuries of the Middle Ages. In addition to the special studies and the philosophical articles included in his other works, Thomas Aquinas commented in whole or in part on thirteen treatises of Aristotle, which are the fundamental works of the Stagirite. Robert of Kilwardby, an exponent of ancient Augustinianism, composed the most important introduction to philosophy in that period in *De ortu et divisione philosophiae*. Theodore of Freiburg at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century left a work, remarkable for its

scientific character, in which for the first time appeared an exact theory about the rainbow. Then there was the most celebrated Greek translator of the whole epoch, William of Moerbeke, who revised the translations of Aristotle, translated other works of the Stagirite previously unavailable, and produced in Latin numerous volumes from the Greek philosophers and other scholars of antiquity.

In the historical field, the accomplishment of the Preachers was considerable. They compiled studies in general, ecclesiastical, and profane history. The works of Vincent of Beauvais, Martin of Troppau, Ptolemy of Lucca, and Bernard Guidonis were particularly significant. Bernard Guidonis, whose historical work is the most remarkable of the period, displayed an erudition in which, for the first time, there was a sense of documentation and a noteworthy spirit of criticism. The anonymous Dominican chronicler of Colmar had a penetrating view of what we today call the history of civilization.

The Preachers composed a notable collection of treatises that may be classified as literature of education, since it was to be at the disposal of all classes of society for their enlightenment: manuals for the education of princes and the government of their states, for the reform of Christian society, for the training of religious, for preachers, for the religious instruction of the people and children.

Over and above the types mentioned, the Preachers in their vast literary heritage treasure some works of a truly unique character, for their like is not found among contemporary productions of that era. In this class are the Letters of Blessed Jordan of Saxony to Blessed Diana of Andalò, the treatise *De musica* of Jerome of Moravia, the *Geography of the Holy Land* by Burkart of Mt. Sion, the *Golden Legend* by Jacopo de Voragine, the *Philobiblion* or treatise on the *Love of Books* by Robert of Holcot, and many others.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XI Apostolic Work

TRUE to the very reason of their foundation, the Friars Preachers made apostolic labor the principal end of their activity. "Apostolic labor" includes preaching, hearing confessions, and in general the spiritual direction of souls. Elements so essential to Christian life were reduced to a rudimentary state in the early thirteenth century. Preaching, an episcopal prerogative, was rarely exercised, and the parochial clergy limited their instruction to the interpretation, in the pulpit on Sunday, of the Apostles' Creed and the Our Father. Meanwhile heresy engaged in a tireless apostolate, and even laymen took upon themselves the office of preacher and offered their services to the parish priests. In commanding confession and Communion at Easter time, the Fourth Lateran Council aimed at strengthening the religious life of the faithful; but most parish rectors were lacking in education and zeal.

The joint action of St. Dominic and the papacy created a militia wholly devoted to the apostolic life, that is, to the religious development and sanctification of souls. In Dominic the medieval world realized its first great type of apostle; in fact, no one before him had consecrated his whole strength and his whole life to the sole and permanent mission of preaching the gospel. This initial personal impulse communicated to the foundation of the Preachers the intensity of apostolic life which characterized the Order in the first century.

By its very name, the Order of Preachers found itself constituted in the Church to exercise the office of preaching. On November 15, 1219, Honorius III declared further that the ministry of the Preachers was useful to the Church and that they were assigned to preaching. In his letter of December 8 of the same year, their ministry was called necessary, and on February 4, 1221, they were no longer simply deputed to preaching but wholly deputed, *totaliter deputati*, and the Pope urged the bishops to entrust to them the confessions of the faithful.

Such was the imperative vocation out of which rose the Order of Preachers for a permanent mission in Christendom. The convents, established in the heart of large cities, were centers of preaching. A primitive name for the convent was *Praedicatio* or the *Sancta Praedicatio*. The urban populations in the midst of which these were located felt their immense force for good. The convents were responsible for the territory in a province or a nation according to districts, which varied in size with the erection of new convents, each of which was assigned a specific field of action. Within each conventual district, secondary houses, not having the rank of convents, might be opened, where for the whole year or part of a year religious resided for the purpose of preaching to the people within a given radius. In this way the entire district of a convent, and, on a large scale, even the whole extent of Christendom became subject to the continuous apostolic action of the Preachers, whose establishments formed a more and more closely woven network.

In a general way all the Preachers were vowed to the apostolate. The members of the professorial corps participated in it as their academic duties permitted. The Order exercised a strict control over the preaching and activity of its members. The Dominican preachers were classed in double rank. The first, and the more numerous, approved by the provincial chapter, included ordinary preachers who exercised their ministry within the conventual district under the direction and responsibility of the prior. The preachers general, less numerous, instituted originally by papal letters and later by the provincial chapters, worked through the whole field of their province and had full liberty of action in their apostolate.

The friars preached the gospel everywhere: in their conventual churches, in those of the secular clergy, in monasteries, in public squares, and in the most varied assemblies. They spoke to all social classes, and Humbert of Romans, master general of the Order, in his circular letter from the chapter of Strasbourg in 1260, accounting for the apostolic activity of the brethren, could say without exaggeration: "We teach the people and their rulers, we teach the wise and the poor in spirit, religious and seculars, clerics and laymen, nobles and peasants, the lowly and the great."

Chroniclers of the period, obituaries of convents, and written fragments of sermons have preserved the names of a considerable number of celebrated or highly gifted preachers. Lecoy de la Marche historian of the French pulpit in the thirteenth century, in considering the quality and intensity of the activity of the Friars Preachers, declared that "in learning and in numbers they were in the lead of their thirteenth-century competitors."

RETURN OF APOSTATES

The apostolate of the Preachers was quickly felt in Christendom. In a letter of May 16, 1227 to Jordan of Saxony, the successor of St. Dominic, Gregory IX said he marveled at the multitude of fish caught in the nets of the new preachers and declared it a miracle. In 1233, in his deposition for the process of the canonization of St. Dominic, the provincial of Lombardy testified that in a short time the friars had won back to the Church more than a hundred thousand persons in northern Italy alone.

The Preachers were universally well received by the bishops, who were conscious of their own powerlessness to deal with the religious needs of their people and to ward off the dangers threatening the Church. Nevertheless the Dominican Friars, being founded to counterbalance the incompetence of the secular clergy, could not but find themselves at times in conflict with those in whose ministry they had assumed a share. Preaching, since it was done gratuitously, was rarely a cause of friction. Hearing confessions was a more delicate matter, because of the direct influence it gave over the people. But it was the grant of burial in Dominican cemeteries, as sought by some of the faithful, which created difficulties, on the score of infringement of parochial rights. Local agreements were reached nearly everywhere for the amicable settlement of these questions. On two occasions, however, the conflict was exceptionally grave: once in Paris, at the instigation of William of St. Amour, in regard to the academic rights of the Order (1252-59); and again in consequence of the bull of Martin IV, *Ad fructus uberes* (1281), when the quarrel was carried on chiefly by the Bishop of Amiens, William of Macon. The Church firmly supported the rights of the Preachers and of the Minors, and, although the privileges of the Mendicants fluctuated somewhat in degree, they remained constant in their essential character.

APOSTOLIC WORK

In the thirteenth century the art of preaching was very different from what it became later. The numerous written specimens of the style of the time give but an imperfect notion of the tone of popular preaching. Though the word was spoken to the laity in the vernacular, the sermons were written only in Latin; the Latin was easier to handle than the changing and unstandardized national idioms; furthermore, the discourse could be used by clerics of all countries in the Western Church. Then too, a few provincial councils, on different occasions, because of the danger of heretical propaganda had forbidden the writing of religious literature in the vernacular. The Order of Preachers had itself been obliged to follow this rule, and in the general chapter of 1242 the friars were forbidden to translate their sermons or Holy Scripture into the national languages of Europe. This prohibition was probably a contributing factor in depriving us of sermons addressed to the laity in the tenor in which they were given. Not until much later, in the last half of the thirteenth century or in the beginning of the following century, were discourses in the vulgar tongue preserved. Five French sermons of Lawrence

of Orleans were added to the *Somme le Roi*, finished in 1277 for Philip the Bold, who was his penitent. The German discourses of the celebrated mystics, Master Eckhart and John Tauler, as well as those of Jordan of Pisa delivered in Italian at Florence, were saved in the transcriptions of their fourteenth-century auditors.

CHARACTER OF THE SERMONS

A large number of sermons still extant were addressed to the clergy, particularly to the students of the University of Paris; but in many cases, the same subjects could be used in preaching to the laity. The preacher simplified them and adapted them to the character of his hearers.

Sermons of the thirteenth century are readily identified by their distinctive traits as different from those of the twelfth. Those of the earlier century, modeled on examples from the Fathers of the Church, had a literary and marked humanist tone, and followed, as far as possible, the rules of rhetoric. But the sermons of the twelfth century frequently employed a form, as in the case of the dialogue, which was only a device for treating a religious subject. Often these discourses were never delivered or were addressed only to monks and to canons. There was almost no preaching, properly so-called, for the world of lay people in the twelfth century. Instead there was but a simple exposition of the Apostles' Creed and the Our Father. What began to merit the name of preaching was possible only with the organization of urban centers and communal life. The Friars became the first great missionaries of preaching among people incomparably more alert and more intelligent than the mass of serfs in the preceding age.

Lecoy de la Marche thinks, with some show of truth, that the first Preachers, moved by an ardent zeal and as yet unskilled in the subtleties of the schools, must have practiced a simpler art than that which soon developed under the influence of philosophical and theological studies. Only then, in fact, did thirteenth-century preaching acquire its own characteristics. Abounding with quotations from Scripture and the Fathers, encumbered with divisions and subdivisions, and woven in and out with allegory, it employed example and anecdote freely. The effect was that of something disjointed, abrupt, without vigor, without soul; evidently there was some warrant for harsh criticism of thirteenth-century preaching. But such judgments proceed partly from a lack of historical sense. A sermon of the period of St. Louis should not be judged by comparison with a sermon of the age of Louis XIV or of our own century. The style of the public discourse has to be adapted to the conditions and needs of a given historical milieu; thus the thirteenth century abandoned the humanist mode of the preceding age and created a form of preaching useful and efficacious for the faithful who were thus truly reached for the first time. Scriptural and patristic texts, divisions and subdivisions, suited an elementary religious instruction for an illiterate congregation; allegories helped in the understanding and assimilation of truths of an elevated nature; anecdotes recalled wandering minds; and examples, in some striking form, fixed the moral of the lesson. The thirteenth-century sermon struck rich veins and drew serious sketches, at the same time revealing a remarkable keenness of vision in regard to the manners, the customs, and ideas of the public and private life of the epoch. Viewed in this light, it is one of the most precious sources of information for the historian. The crude language of the speakers, termed trivial at times, is often but a reflection of a social state, somewhat coarse, no doubt, but sincere and unadorned, still unfettered by the conventional prudery of the modern era.

It has been commonly thought that the Christian pulpit in the second half of the thirteenth century and the century following had attained a period of notable decadence. That view has not been established. Mediocre or poor preachers of the time of St. Louis were no better than those of the time of Philip the Fair. But the great orators-and the term is applicable here for the first time-whom we have already named, who appeared at the juncture of the two centuries, are witness to an undeniable superiority.

Philologists and historians of the European national languages have noted the influence of the sermon on the formation of various idioms in the vernacular. There is no doubt that the effect was far-reaching. All the intellectual culture of the thirteenth century was contained in Latin works. The most ordinary and most effective channel through which the wealth of Latin ideas and expression could be transmitted to the new tongue was the public speech, then current almost only in the sermon. Moreover, it was in reference to some of the great Dominican preachers that these observations were made.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XII

Influence on Ecclesiastical and Civil Society

THE Order of Preachers carried on a social action in Christendom through the principal forms of its apostolate. Through the teaching of sacred science, the dissemination of the written word, and the creation of a sound and strong philosophical and theological system, its influence penetrated the ecclesiastical order. Through preaching, hearing confessions, and the power of example it affected the lay world. Great as was the efficacy of this twofold action, it embraced neither in its totality nor in its diversity the labors which the Preachers voluntarily undertook in the service of Christian society or into which they found themselves drawn by the very force of circumstances.

From the outset, the Order gave a considerable number of the Preachers to the ecclesiastical hierarchy and to the administrative offices of the Church. Two Preachers became popes: Peter of Tarentaise, under the name of Innocent V (1276), and Nicholas Boccasini, a former master general, under the name of Benedict XI (1303). Before the pontificate of John XXII, fourteen had been clothed in the cardinalitial purple, from Hugh of St. Cher, elevated in 1244, to Matteo Orsini, named in 1327. The episcopate especially took its toll. Masters and general chapters resisted with all their energy these continual bleedings, which drew valuable men from the Order. Humbert of Romans, then master general, did not hesitate to dissuade Albert the Great from accepting the see of Ratisbon (1260), declaring he would rather see him buried than elevated to the episcopate. In endeavoring to renew the hierarchy by introducing into it men of learning and virtue, the Holy See gave but slight heed to the objections of the Preachers. These appointments in a continuous stream began about the year 1230 with Gregory IX and went on with such increasing frequency that in the middle of the fourteenth century nearly 450 appointments or transfers of patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops had been effected, involving friars of the Order. If it is recalled that one or perhaps two religious were granted as companions to the Dominican bishops, within one hundred and twenty years, more than a thousand members had been given by the Order for the immediate service of the dioceses of Christendom.

The Roman Curia itself provided liberally for its own needs from the ranks of the Preachers. Not to speak of the Dominicans residing at the papal court and the few exceptional offices to which religious of the Order were attached, the popes often confided to Preachers the distinguished office of vicar of Rome. In the absence of the Sovereign Pontiffs, they were the administrators of the city. But the penitentiaries and papal chaplains, drawn from most of the provinces of the Order, constituted a large class, and since they were well known to the pope, many ended their careers as prelates. Lectors of the Curia, while in the service of clerics attached to the papal administration, did not go out from the Order; but with the institution of Masters of the Sacred Palace, from the time of the transfer of the Holy See to Avignon, a new order of persons was placed directly at the disposal of the heads of the Church.

In addition to those who were in attendance on prelates selected from the Order, other Friars Preachers were called into service either permanently or temporarily by cardinals, bishops, and even dignitaries of lesser rank, to serve as penitentiaries, visitors, or in other capacities.

Commissions of every kind, some of vast import for the Church and Christian society, others more unpretentious and of local character, were entrusted to religious of the Order by the Church. Tasks of the first sort were ordinarily carried out by Preachers already elevated to ecclesiastical dignities. Often, however, they were carried out by religious who, once their mission was accomplished, returned to

their regular life. Affairs of secondary importance were frequently confided to provincials, conventual priors, and religious of ordinary rank.

Often there were papal appointments of great consequence, as in the case of legates and nuncios. The first of such honors conferred on a Preacher was that on Guala of Bergamo, who was regularly the mandator of Gregory IX in his dealings with the communes of Lombardy and with Frederick II. Innocent IV gave Hugh of St. Cher the delicate task of inducing Germany to accept the rule of William of Holland, after the deposition of Frederick II in the General Council of Lyons (1245). Thomas of Lentino and Nicholas of Hanappes, both patriarchs of Jerusalem and legates in the Holy Land, had to defend the Christian interests in Palestine upon the overthrow of Latin domination in Asia; the second of these friars died heroically in the disastrous fall of St. John of Acre (1291). The legations of Cardinals Latino Malabranca (1280) and Nicholas Albertini of Prato (1304), for the pacification of Florence, have remained famous in the history of that Republic.

INFLUENCE ON RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES

Commissions of lesser importance were also frequent. They included the visitation of dioceses and monasteries, the settlement of cases diverse in character, the preaching of crusades, the publication of excommunications or interdicts, collection of taxes, and so on. But no work confided by the Church to the Preachers would be more delicate or more serious than that of judges in matters of heresy. The Order tried in vain to escape this burden. Toward the middle of the thirteenth century it succeeded in having a part of the inquisitorial jurisdiction delegated to the Order of Minors, and in this way its task was notably lightened.

The Preachers also exerted an extensive influence on different religious orders, particularly on foundations that approximated in some degree their own type of institution. Members of the Order cooperated in the establishment of other religious communities: Raymond of Peñafort for the Order of Mercy; St. Peter of Verona for the Servites; Hugh of St. Cher for the Carmelites. Moreover, the forms of activity undertaken by the Preachers served as an example on which the mendicant orders partially modeled their own. The Constitutions and the social organization of the Preachers gave a still wider scope to their influence, because in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries religious institutions in the throes of evolution or adaptation tended, though not uniformly, toward the pattern of Dominican life and frequently included in their legislation even literal extracts from the Constitutions of their forerunners.

In the direction and instruction of numerous convents of women religious, the Preachers were obliged to take a notable part. In spite of a long and tenacious resistance, they were constrained to incorporate into the Order a large group of convents, and frequently had to care for the spiritual welfare of houses which were not even juridically under the administration of the Order. The Preachers of Strasbourg during the thirteenth century attended to eight convents in the city, and in Milan the friars had charge of twelve at the beginning of the fourteenth century, although the houses were not incorporated with the Order.

Beyond the scope of their principal mission, the Preachers covered an almost limitless range in their service to the ecclesiastical world, a service that had its parallel in their work in civil society and among the laity.

Most of the princes of Europe selected their confessors from the Order. The nobility of France was unflinching loyal to them. The long series of royal confessors began with Geoffrey de Beaulieu, who was for twenty years the spiritual director of St. Louis. The Plantagenets in England imitated the kings

of France and it was John of St. Giles who initiated this ministry in 1239 with Henry III. The kings of Castile followed the practice of those of France and England. Dominican confessors were also found at the courts of Portugal and Aragon. It was a Preacher, Guala of Bergamo, whom Gregory IX sent to Frederick II in 1227 when the Pope wished to have the Emperor helped in ordering his conscience, and it was another Preacher, Bernardine of Montepulciano, who assisted Henry VII when he died in 1313 on his Italian expedition. An insidious calumny tried to fasten the death of the Emperor on his confessor.

Often, too, princes took advantage of the ministry of the Preachers for embassies to other princes or to the Sovereign Pontiffs. The communes, especially in Italy, imitated the princes and frequently appealed to the same religious to establish peace between cities and to serve as arbiters between rival factions within a city.

The social organization of the Preachers reacted in its turn, it seems, on the political regime of Europe, by its fundamental principle of election and of representation in deliberative assemblies. The wealth of literature produced by the Order on the education of princes and the government of states, and further still, the diffusion of the *Politics* of Aristotle, unknown previously in the Latin world, as translated by William of Moerbeke and commented on by St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Albert the Great, put into circulation new elements, essential for the development of the national life of Europe.

Life among the people felt a shaping force from the work of the Preachers, through societies that sprang up almost everywhere for the purpose of edification and economic solidarity. Congregations or fraternities of the Blessed Virgin and of the saints which held their meetings in the Dominican convents were instructed or directed by the religious. Groups of penitents and of persons practicing continence, who early responded to the teaching apostolate of the Preachers, formed a clientele which, though not juridically dependent on the Order, was morally so, until the Master General, Munio de Zamora, by his *Rule of Penitence of St. Dominic* (1285) finally constituted a Third Order.

This universal action of the Preachers, in addition to their specific mission of preaching and teaching, was too marked in Christian society not to evoke a testimony from the pen of a master general as observant as Humbert of Romans. In one of his circular letters he described the state of the Order and its activity, remarking the consideration poured out upon its members: "Who could adequately express," he wrote in 1256, "the favor bestowed by the Church on our Order and on each of us who perseveres in his vocation? What kindness is evinced toward us by the majority of prelates! What honor and veneration from kings, princes, and nobles! What charity from other religious! In fine, what devotion everywhere from the faithful!" And in 1260: "The great call us into their councils and seat us in their midst. Prelates confide their business to us. Our Mother the Holy Roman Church favors and protects us. The people nearly everywhere are marvelously devoted to us. We are honored by nobles and peasants and by the whole human race."

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XIII

Foreign Missions

THE spread of the gospel in schismatic, heretical, and infidel nations, as well as the evangelization of the Christian world, was a primordial idea in the foundation of the Preachers. The one was the complement and extension of the other.

The Bishop of Osma had died without realizing his desire to convert the Cumans. He bequeathed his holy ambition to St. Dominic who, unable to accomplish it himself, transmitted it to his sons, when he sent them into Hungary at the time of the general chapter of 1221. In 1219, in the house of Cardinal Ugolino, Dominic won to the Order the young William of Montferrat and with him projected plans for going to the Orient after the brethren were established. It is not surprising, therefore, to find Dominic and his successors devoting special attention to the development of missions beyond the frontiers of Christendom. The papacy, moreover, was thoroughly convinced that the crusades and military orders could play only a negative role, that of defending the outposts of Christendom; apostolic soldiers alone could win souls to the faith and lead them back to the Church. Therefore the Church urged the Preachers toward far distant fields.

During the thirteenth century the organization of foreign mission work was in close dependence on the geographical constitution of the Order. Each of the frontier provinces of Christendom could initiate its work for the neighboring people and nations. Still, in this distribution of apostolic labor, the Province of the Holy Land had a singular importance, because to it were annexed the Asiatic missions, most extensive in area and most numerous in workers. The final overthrow of the continental division of this Province with the fall of St. John of Acre (1291) and the insistent purpose of developing missions in the Orient in the early fourteenth century, led to the formation of a special Congregation of missionaries for Asia, called Friars Pilgrims for Christ (1312). It nurtured the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Asia and by its own activity gave birth to the Congregation of United Brethren of Armenia.

The Dominican provinces girding Christendom pursued foreign mission work almost as soon as they were established. The Province of Poland, founded in 1220 with the delegation of St. Hyacinth and Blessed Ceslaus by St. Dominic, undertook in particular the evangelization of the Ruthenians, Russians, and Lithuanians. In 1222 Hyacinth preached at Kiev and settled his friars there. The invasion of the Tartars in 1241-42 destroyed the work of these missions; many convents of the Province were pillaged and numerous religious suffered martyrdom. After the devastating storm, the work was resumed and sustained.

Established in 1221 by the assignment of Blessed Paul, the Province of Hungary spread the faith among the Cumans according to instructions from St. Dominic. Many chiefs and their subjects were converted, and Brother Theodore became their first bishop in 1227. The Hungarian Preachers likewise labored for the conversion of Bosnia, where one of them, John of Teutonia, became Bishop of Diacovár (1233), and subsequently they extended their apostolate through almost the entire Balkans. Filled with compassion for the pagans of their nation on the middle Volga (Greater Hungary), the Hungarian Preachers made several expeditions to reach them, beginning in 1232, and Brother Julian has preserved some interesting accounts of these difficult attempts.

The Province of Greece, where the first religious were sent in 1221, carried on an apostolate among the Greek schismatics, especially at Constantinople.

The Province of Spain was employed in the conversion of the Moslems of the peninsula, but lost no time in undertaking missions on the shores of Africa. In 1225, one friar Dominic was appointed first bishop of Morocco, and a few years later the Spanish 'Preachers founded a convent in Tunis where they opened a school of Arabic.

SCHISMATICS, MOSLEMS, PAGANS

The Holy Land, mentioned last on account of the extent of its mission territory in Asia, had received its first Dominican colony as early as 1225. Promptly its apostolate radiated beyond the region occupied by the Latins, even though finding itself in frequent contact with the Moslem and heretical churches of the Orient. In an interesting letter written in 1237 by Philip, provincial of the Preachers in the Holy Land, and addressed to Gregory IX, there is a full summary of the results achieved by the Dominican preachers in western Asia. From this period dates the establishment of the Preachers among the Maronites, in Georgia and in Armenia, and the opening of the road toward central Asia. In spite of the upheavals that took place in these regions, the missions were carried on successfully during the course of the thirteenth and the fourteenth century. In 1244, Matthew of Paris wrote that the apostolate of the Preachers and the Minors reached the ends of the earth. In his letters of March 22 of the same year, addressed to the master general of the Order and to the provincial of the Holy Land, Innocent IV granted privileges to the friars in the territory of the Jacobites, Nestorians, Georgians, Greeks, Armenians, Maronites, Mosulites and other Oriental peoples. Clement IV in a letter of 1257 to the master general extended still further the regions to be evangelized: the friars were to go to the Tartars, Ethiopians, Hindus, Nubians, and Saracens of the East and of the South, and to infidels of all nations and countries whatever. We find, in the course of the thirteenth century, through a documentation that has unfortunately too often been sporadic, proof of the presence of the Preachers in most regions of Asia.

The fall of St. John of Acre (1291), though ruining the last stronghold of the Latins and likewise of the Preachers on the Asiatic continent, did not slacken the pace at which the missionaries penetrated among the infidels. On the contrary, Boniface VIII and John XXII signalized the intensification of the missionary activity in the Orient. Faced with the slowness of progress among the nations called Christian, the papacy seemed more than ever to place its hopes in the conversion of Asia. Late in the thirteenth century the Preachers established at Pera, near Constantinople, and at Caffa on the Black Sea, then at Trebizond, contact points for the Asiatic missions. The development of this movement led the Master General, Beranger de Landore, to institute the Congregation of the Friars Pilgrims in the Orient (1312). Under the direction of a vicar, this congregation constituted a true province, and within its boundaries united all the missionaries of Asia. Franco of Perugia, who departed for the Levant in 1298, became the first superior. The Friars Pilgrims worked with great intensity in Armenia, Persia, and Mesopotamia.

So rapid was the progress of the evangelization that in 1318 John XXII thought the time had come for organizing the Catholic hierarchy of those regions on a firm foundation. He instituted an ecclesiastical province having Sultanieh, the capital of Persia, as the archiepiscopal see, with six suffragan bishoprics. The territory included the regions subject to the Tartars of Persia, Ethiopia, and India. It embraced the whole western and central part of Asia situated south of the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea, and the Himalaya Mountains, besides the eastern part of North Africa. Franco of Perugia, vicar of the Friars Pilgrims, was made archbishop of Sultanieh, and six other Friars Preachers were assigned as suffragans. The Preachers successively held the archiepiscopal see, and during the fourteenth century gave numerous bishops to the Orient, until the United Friars of Armenia could themselves supply an almost uninterrupted hierarchy for several of these bishoprics, even after Islamism had penetrated central Asia and ravaged the Christian missions. In that disaster, nearly all the Friars Pilgrims of Persia

perished. Though the Congregation had fifteen establishments there, only three friars survived in that country in 1349. Greatly reduced, the Friars Pilgrims still numbered in 1358 two convents and eight other houses in their Congregation.

UNITED FRIARS OF ARMENIA

The activity of these Friars Pilgrims resulted in a very interesting and practical creation in Upper Armenia: the foundation of a congregation of native religious and missionaries which, even through the most severe trials, would perpetuate itself until the end of the eighteenth century. The apostolate and the holy life of the Preachers, and especially the labor of the Bishop of Maragha, Bartholomew the Little of Bologna, drew a number of convents of Oriental monks within the Dominican sphere of influence. John, abbot of the Oriental monastery of Kerna, was a most zealous mediator and promoter in the return of various convents to Catholic unity. The religious of these monasteries took upon themselves the mission of restoring the Armenian nation to unity. This unity was accomplished in 1330. After the death of Bartholomew (1333), John of Kerna visited the West, and upon his return prevailed upon the Uniates to adopt the Rule of St. Augustine and the Constitutions of the Friars Preachers. The Friars Pilgrims, in cooperation with the United Friars, labored to translate a great number of Latin works into Armenian. In 1356, Innocent VI confirmed the Order of the Uniates and placed it under the jurisdiction of the master general of the Friars Preachers; later, this Order became a Dominican province. To preserve contact with the Latin Church, the Armenians established three convents at Caffa and houses in many Italian cities. They also sent young religious to study in the schools of the Order in the West.

Apart from the United Friars of Armenia, the Dominican missionaries, as well as the personnel of the provinces of Greece and of the Holy Land, were recruited almost entirely from all the other provinces of the Order. Religious could be individually assigned to particular labors on the Oriental missions, but the Order took the initiative, when it was not so requested by the Holy See, in sending out large bands of missionaries, ordinarily about fifty in number, but at times even exceeding that figure.

In the interests of the Church, the Preachers carried on numerous negotiations with princes in the East and in the West. The popes often made the Preachers their nuncios and their legates, and these tireless messengers could be met almost anywhere between the Roman Curia and the Asiatic provinces.

The missionary Preachers wrote accounts of their travels, geographical descriptions, political memoranda for princes or the Sovereign Pontiffs, and discourses on apologetics and religion in the hope of extending and supporting the influence of their ministry. Many of these works were remarkable for their originality and their learning, and have a great source value for history.

CONTENTS

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XIV

Sanctity and the Mystical Life

BASIC to the many works of the Preachers, the problem of the sanctification of the members of the Order endured with a general and permanent finality, rooted in the very nature of the religious life. The personal sanctification of the Preacher was not conceived in an absolute sense or for itself, but relative to the special aim of an apostolic order. Since for every Christian sanctity consists in the exact accomplishment of the duties of his vocation, the Preacher had to sanctify himself by fulfilling as perfectly as possible the obligations of his state. The very work of his interior perfection, in its most personal aspect, was to be directed to the spiritual service of his neighbor and to the salvation of souls. But as we have seen in connection with their apostolic mission, either on their own initiative or by force of circumstances the Preachers were obliged to enlarge and extend the kinds of their activity. As a consequence, the religious had to strive for their spiritual perfection under most varied conditions. Moreover, with the affiliation to the Order of numerous convents of women, whose spiritual direction it had assumed, as well as of a secular clientele that constituted the Order of Penance of St. Dominic, the question of the sanctification of the members of the Order embraced the spirituality of these two new groups privileged to participate in the general life of the Preachers, and seeking to imitate, in their own degree and in their respective positions, the virtues and the holy life of the friars. The Second Order and the Third Order, at least in some localities, developed with a notable intensity the mystical elements of the religious life and in their turn, though only partially, reacted to some extent on the Order of Preachers.

The motivating force communicated to the Order at its foundation strengthened its spiritual vitality as well as the rest of its action. The life of the Founder was that of a heroic saint who strove to realize in himself the perfection he desired to see transmitted to his brethren. The hopes of St. Dominic were not disappointed, whatever the imperfections or shortcomings inevitable in an immense body. In a universal fashion, the voice of authority in that age highly praised the holiness of the Order of Preachers. The Church with its advantage over others in judging, never ceased to express the most complimentary praise. The Church regarded the Preachers as raised up for an example to the Christian world and as practicing in their life what they taught in their sermons. It is not unusual to find thirteenth-century chroniclers and other writers calling the friars "the holy Preachers." Numberless announcements and records have been preserved, which emphasize the exceptional virtues of the religious whose memory they perpetuate. Lastly, official declarations of sanctity made by the Church enable us to judge the tree by its fruit, and the whole Order by its elect members who have been placed on the altars. During one century, before 1320, the Order could count forty canonizations or beatifications; moreover, a few of these declarations named several persons, even a large group, such as the forty-nine martyrs of Sandomir.

SAINTS IN ALL STATES OF LIFE

If the intensity of Dominican holiness is remarkable, so also is its universality. Frequently the saints of religious orders belong to a class of souls dedicated exclusively to the ascetical or mystical life, dwelling apart in a state of humility which hides them from the view of the world. That is not at all true of Dominican sanctity. It has radiated on all the constitutive elements of the institution, on the various offices and missions confided by the Order to its subjects. In the most exalted as well as in the humblest works, in contact with the world or in an obscure cell, Dominican saints have everywhere found a place, thus testifying that the sanctity of the Preachers was profoundly vital and eminently adapted to the structure of their institution.

Dominican saints have risen to high virtue, some in the administrative offices of the Order: among them were masters general like St. Dominic (d. 1221), Jordan of Saxony (d. 1237), St. Raymond of Peñafort (d. 1275), John of Vercelli (d. 1283), and Nicholas Boccasini (d. 1304). Others occupied the chair of Peter, like Innocent V (d. 1276) and Benedict XI (d. 1304). The Dominican episcopate gave Blessed Guala, bishop of Brescia (d. 1244), Peter of Tarentaise, archbishop of Lyons (d. 1275), Albert the Great, bishop of Ratisbon (d. 1280), and Jacopo de Voragine, archbishop of Genoa (d. 1298). The professors and the learned produced St. Thomas Aquinas, doctor of the Church and the prince of Catholic theology (d. 1274); his master, St. Albert the Great, the most famous scholar of the century (d. 1280); St. Raymond of Peñafort, the eminent canonist of his age (d. 1275), and others less illustrious. Preachers, as would be expected, are represented by the largest number. Most of the names already cited are included in this category. But the following should be added: Blessed Reginald of Orleans (d. 1220); John of Salerno (d. 1242); Peter Gonzalez, better known under the name of St. Elmo (d. 1240); St. Hyacinth, apostle of northern Europe (d. 1257); his brother, Blessed Ceslaus (d. 1242); Jordan of Pisa (d. 1311). An Order vowed to the defense of the faith could not but produce martyrs: such were Blessed William Arnaud and his companions (d. 1242), St. Peter of Verona (d. 1252), Blessed Sadoc and his companions (d. 1260). The Second and Third Orders also contributed their lists to the roll of sanctity, and if one were to be drawn up for the seculars affiliated to the Order, it would be necessary to carry it even to the Virgin of Siena, St. Catherine (d. 1380), for she was the very incarnation of the Dominican spirit as it vitalized its lay members.

The lives of the Dominican saints display a great diversity by reason of the varied situations in which they developed. Nevertheless, in Dominican sanctity there are, as it were, common characteristics and family traits. St. Dominic drew the fundamental lineaments in a few words in his Constitutions when he wrote for the direction of his friars: Let them "conduct themselves everywhere as upright and religious men who desire to procure their own and their neighbor's salvation; as evangelical men, following in the footsteps of the Savior, by speaking with God or of God, either among themselves or when in converse with their neighbor." This is the whole plan of the *Summa theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas, viewed from a practical angle, and there is no doubt that Dominican sanctity has its most adequate theoretical expression in the work of the great doctor of the Order. Dominican sanctity goes directly to God through the

Savior and subordinates the other elements of the spiritual life and other practices of Christian piety to these great essential realities, God and Jesus Christ, which should never yield place to secondary or supererogatory devotions, however excellent the latter may be.

This hierarchical sense of religious values in the structure of Dominican sanctity grows out of the fact that it is strongly theological. In strict harmony with the faith of the Church, it testifies to an utter fidelity to the teaching authority as well as to its practical impulses. It is, so to speak, meticulously orthodox. Through its affinity for contemplation and science, it is an intelligent, an enlightened, sanctity; for it is the sanctity of an Order specially vowed to the doctrinal life and the illumination of others, according to the definition of the Dominican vocation given by Thomas Aquinas: *contemplari et contemplata aliis tradere* ("to contemplate and give to others the fruits of contemplation"). Hence its taste for truth and its cultivation of it, which early won for it the name *Ordo veritatis*. Hence likewise, in its direction of others, its sense of moderation and prudence which led Sovereign Pontiffs to say: "Your Order is renowned for prudence."

In the domain of the will the dominant virtue of Dominican saints, as characteristic in the spirituality of the Order, is the virtue of fortitude. The names of "champions" and "athletes," which the Church and its contemporaries were pleased to give to the Preachers, have their warrant in lives dominated by energy and courage. *Fortiter viri fortes* were the words resounding in the ears of St. Dominic's

disciples. Catherine of Siena was merely translating the import of this idea when she formulated this precept for herself and her Order: "Act manfully; manfully endure."

MYSTICS

The ascetic element to which the Dominican Constitutions devoted much space, while moderating the practice, sometimes had a preponderant place in the life of a certain number of pious and holy Dominicans. It is even more particularly under this form that the intensity of the work of sanctification is manifested in the first period of the Order. The mystical life, considered strictly as the habitual or frequent state of pure contemplation and of quietude, to obtain the immediate union of the soul with God, flowed only secondarily from the Dominican spiritual temperament. The Preachers were vowed to too active and too studious a life to be normally free for prolonged repose of the spirit. The Order, however, has seen an exceptional flowering of mystics, especially toward the close of the thirteenth century and particularly in the Germanic countries and in northern and central Italy. The appearance and development of this phenomenon can be accounted for by the incorporation into the Order of numerous convents of women, and by the spiritual direction given by the Preachers to devout souls of both sexes in the world, who placed themselves under their guidance. These clients, eager for spirituality, formed good soil for the doctrinal sowing of an Order vowed to preaching and the direction of souls. Out of this state of affairs there grew an intense mystical life, which has left us most precious literary monuments in the three branches of the Order. For the Third Order they are represented by *The Book of the Emanation of Divine Light* by Mechtilde of Magdeburg and the Dialogue of St. Catherine of Siena; for the Second Order by the accounts of lives of the sisters of numerous convents throughout the valley of the Rhine; and with the Preachers, by the sermons and other writings of Master Eckhart, John Tauler, and Henry Suso, to name only the best known. Eckhart attempted to set forth a theory of mystical life. Many of his expressions, in their pantheistic tinge, have been unfortunate; but for the richness of his language and the depth of his views, Eckhart remains one of the greatest theorists of the mystical life and has exercised a wide and lasting influence on later writers who have treated of these obscure subjects.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XV Liturgy and Art

A DOMINICAN church, always established in a large city, was a center of intense religious life. Frequent preaching, practiced for the first time in the Christian world, was its essential and special attribute. To this direct instruction of the faithful, the prayer of the liturgy and the voice of art contributed their share as in the past, but in new forms.

LITURGY

Established in the beginning as canons regular, the Preachers were bound to the canonical Office. Therefore, they required a liturgy. Their status also as a centralized and apostolic order created a liturgical problem that had to be solved: their liturgy had to be uniform and brief.

The establishment of a special liturgy for the Order of Preachers gave rise to serious difficulties. The chief of these proceeded from the fact that the attempt at unification was not made from the very first hour. Dispersed rapidly in 1217 throughout every country of Christendom, the friars had accommodated themselves to the liturgy of the place where they were established. Consequently there was a great divergence, from the beginning, in the Divine Office of the Preachers. The Order quickly felt a sense of this disharmony. For purposes of study, preaching, and administration, the Preachers made frequent journeys not only from convent to convent, but from one country to another. Each of these moves on the part of an individual friar entailed the difficulty of adaptation to a new ecclesiastical Office. To obviate this inconvenience, it was decided to attempt a unification which, before reaching completion, passed through three stages and took about twenty-five years.

The first attempt was certainly made, we believe, before the year 1235 and probably after 1230. It was carried on, very likely, at Paris where at the same time work was undertaken on the revision of the Latin text of the Bible. This first formation of the Dominican liturgy, whatever its date, has endured as the groundwork of later reforms which seem not to have introduced essential changes.

The development of the Order and the multiplication of the liturgical books led the general chapter of Bologna in 1244, probably seeking to parallel the work of the Church for the reform of the breviary, to take measures to verify the state of its liturgical books, and it directed the definitors of the chapter of the next year to bring with them, for the purpose of establishing a concordance, the rubrics and notations of the breviary, the gradual, and the missal. In view of the work to be accomplished by the next general chapter, the provincial chapter of the Roman Province had in the same year decided upon the correction of its liturgical books; but it was not simply a matter of textual correction. At any rate, the chapter assigned to two religious the composition of a lectionary for the lessons of the seasons and feasts. The Dominican liturgy did not yet have such a book.

THE WORK OF HUMBERT OF ROMANS

The general chapter of Cologne in 1245 probably found itself faced with a problem more complex than it had appeared to the preceding chapter. Four religious taken from the provinces of France, England, Lombardy, and Teutonia were assigned to the convent at Angers to correct, harmonize, and rectify, as economically as possible, the text and chant of the Divine Office. The three general chapters of 1246-48 promulgated a constitution approving the revision made by the four friars. The project of a lectionary confided by the chapters of 1246 and 1247 to the provincial of France, then Humbert of

Romans, was not confirmed by the chapter of 1248, probably because the introduction of this new book was not yet approved by everyone.

The revision accomplished at Angers gave rise to numerous complaints. Many mistakes were found in it, and the general chapter of London (1250) again appointed the four revisers to go to the convent at Metz, for All Saints' Day, in order to revise their work and compose a directory, or little book containing the changes to be introduced into their previous work. The general chapter of the next year, held at Metz, approved of the revision and ordered that a copy of the directory be deposited in the convents of Paris and Bologna that they might correct all the books according to its indications and compose in conformity with it whatever would be written in the future.

The general chapter of Budapest, in 1254, placed the provincial of France, Humbert of Romans, at the head of the Order. The new master, who had already collaborated in the revision of the liturgy while it was carried on in his province by the four friars, had himself made responsible by the chapter for "every ordinance of the ecclesiastical office and whatever is related to it, as well as for the correction of the ecclesiastical books and of the text of the Rule." The undertaking extended to the whole Dominican liturgy, taken in the broadest sense of the word. His spirit of organization inclined Humbert of Romans to establish for the great body of which he was the head a definitive monument, worthy of the reputation which the Order of Friars Preachers had already acquired in the Church and in the world.

Versed as was no other in ecclesiastical matters, Humbert presided with a free hand over the work of the revision, surrounding himself with competent religious of his own choice. Confident in the skill of the Master General, the general chapter of Budapest began the legislation which approved his work. The new liturgy received its final sanction in the two general chapters of 1255 and 1256. In the last of these chapters, held at Paris, Humbert addressed to the Order his annual encyclical announcing the completion of the liturgical reform. The General mentioned the diversity of the demands made upon him and pleaded his excuse for not having been able to please everyone. He asked patience of those whose hopes had not been satisfied. He ordained above all that this unity so long desired by the Order should be henceforth conserved. That they might know everywhere whether they had the complete Office, the General enumerated the fourteen volumes which embraced the whole Dominican liturgy. These were the following: the antiphonary, the lectionary, the psalter, the collectarium, the martyrology, the processional, the gradual, the missal for the main altar, the Book of Gospels and the Book of Epistles for the same altar, the missal for the side altars, the pulpitary, and the breviary for travel. He does not enumerate the Rule of St. Augustine and the Constitutions of the Preachers which had a place in the original codex of the Dominican liturgy. On the petition of the Order, Clement IV (July 7, 1267) gave his official approval to the work of Humbert. That the liturgy might not be an absolutely closed work, Honorius IV (October 1, 1285) granted the Preachers the power of modifying it through enactments of general chapters, though the liturgical books might not be changed or destroyed.

While he was pursuing this reform, Humbert of Romans codified it so that it was standardized, and henceforth there was no room for uncertainty. It took shape in a monumental volume, one of the most beautiful productions of the Parisian art of bookmaking in the thirteenth century. This manuscript which was designed to serve as a model, a type, or *exemplar*, the term then given to books from which other copies were made, was deposited at the College of St. Jacques at Paris, the most important house of the Order. It is now in Rome in the general archives of the Friars Preachers. A few copies were made for other provinces. That of the province of Spain still exists at Salamanca. Finally, Humbert of Romans had a manuscript composed, containing the essential part of the Dominican liturgy, for the use of the master general. That it might be a portable volume it was written on extremely fine parchment. It is now in the British Museum. By means of this copy, in the course of his travels, the master general

could verify the condition of the liturgical books, and in case of need provide an official instrument for the work of correction. To cover the expense of the composition of these general exemplars, a tax of twenty pounds was imposed on each province by the general chapter of 1256.

Successive corrections of the Dominican liturgy seem not to have greatly modified the primitive character as it appeared after its first unification. There is proof for this in the fact that the second and third revisions suppose that their innovations do not require the composition of new liturgical books, but only the correction of the old one. Whence also comes the fact that there are no manuscripts containing the liturgy in its first and second form. But it must be acknowledged that no research studies have been undertaken on the liturgical monuments of the Order scattered through the libraries of Europe.

Since the unification of the liturgy was carried on, it seems, for the first time in Paris or in the province of France, the Parisian liturgy must have exercised a special influence on that of the Order, a fact which would explain the statement of the Dominican Henry of Herford in the fourteenth century to the effect that Humbert of Romans standardized and corrected, at the same time improving, the Divine Office of the Preachers according to the Gallican Office. But only a detailed comparative study can effectively solve this problem.

The primitive Constitutions require that all the hours be said *breviter et succincte*, that the brethren may not lose devotion and that study may suffer no hindrance. Composed according to this directive principle, the liturgy tended to be modeled on the shortest forms and rites, as is characteristic of the liturgy of the Preachers in many points. Moreover, there was no obligation to chant the hours. The conventual prior regulated the matter according to his discretion, as he did the hour for the recitation of Matins and many others, we should note among the special features of the Dominican liturgy, the introduction of the Office of the Blessed Virgin and the institution of the *Salve Regina* chant and procession after Compline.

ART

The artistic expressions of Dominican activity deserve honorable mention in the history of art, even in the medieval period. Interests of this nature were not only foreign to the thought of the founders and the first generation of Preachers, but for a long time the Order resisted the interior artistic impulse that was unconsciously germinating in its bosom. Art has an accompaniment of the sumptuous and striking. But the Preachers aimed at a rigid practice of poverty and humility. Their mission was to propagate the Christian spirit, not to dazzle men. The Preachers brought into existence a body which was to be the strongest and most influential of the epoch, and they proposed to themselves an incessant labor for the instruction of the Christian people. In so doing, they posited some principles and facts that would react on their primitive ideal of poverty and humility, and would modify it or, better, adapt it to the evolution of the contemporary social environment and the exigencies of a great and powerful institution. It was in buildings that art early appeared among the Preachers. The evolution proceeded and developed at the end of the thirteenth century with the advent of painting. Moreover, the artistic activity of an educated and propagandist Order like that of the Preachers would radiate even from its very dwellings and touch more or less deeply the life and forms of art then being rapidly fashioned in Christian Europe.

THE CHURCHES

In several cities in which the Order was established, churches already constructed were given to the Order, but generally the Preachers had to undertake the building of their own edifices: churches and

convents. The primitive Constitutions enjoin ordinary and humble structures and, for more security, state the height beyond which they should not go. They also forbid (and this prohibition was to have great influence on the appearance of Dominican churches until the second half of the thirteenth century) the use of arches, except over the choir and sacristy. The Basilica of Santa Sabina in Rome, given to the Order in 1219, kept its antique roof of great beams, and gave warrant perhaps for this measure which was inspired by a solicitude to maintain poverty.

Everywhere the Preachers adopted the French ogival style and did not hesitate to introduce it into the large cities of Italy where it did not yet exist. Depending on the circumstances of the place, their cloisters and their churches had a great variety of dimensions. In many places the edifices were reconstructed or enlarged and grew into monumental churches that contemporary writers call *opera sumptuosa*. This style had its origin with the convent of Salamanca in 1229. Gregory IX himself gave the impulse in this direction and his successors followed him. By a letter of April 9, 1228, he gave the title of convents to all the houses of the Order, so that they might have their place among the honorable structures reared by the Christian people. The initial stimulus was thus given to the *opera sumptuosa*. Nevertheless many of the religious viewed with suspicion the trend toward the erection of grand buildings, which the enemies of the Order soon called palaces and royal houses. In general chapters the legislative authority resisted this trend. Again, toward the end of the thirteenth century, we are told that a master general, Stephen of Besançon, held in horror these sumptuous buildings. All the opposition was in vain. The Preachers were the victims of their success. Communes, kings and princes, even simple bourgeois vied with one another in erecting churches and monasteries, worthy of the men from whom they had received incomparable benefits, men who counted their sons and their brothers in the ranks of the Preachers, and whose glory added to that of their province or their city.

This outside patronage found a support from many within the Order, especially conventual priors who were more concerned with the material development of their house than with its moral growth and who heaped up with equal ardor the stone of their buildings along with mediocre or useless vocations. But at times even men of study, said Humbert of Romans' let themselves be caught by the contagion of a passion to build, and expended on wood and stones devotion they should have reserved for books which serve for the welfare of souls. Whatever may have been the case, a remarkable flowering of Dominican churches and cloisters grew up in Christendom, and the movement gained in intensity especially toward the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the following century. Taking into account the lapse in observance of the two Constitutions on the plainness of buildings and the prohibition of vaults for churches, the Order suppressed them in the general chapter from 1297-1300.

The individualist spirit of the Preachers expressed itself in the great diversity of their structures. Humbert of Romans, the fifth master general, observed it with some regret and seemed to envy the splendid uniformity which made brethren of one and the same family the establishments of Cluny and Cîteaux. From the end of the thirteenth century, however, the beautiful Dominican churches kept a greater unity of style.

In the plan of their churches, the Preachers were guided by the needs of their ministry and the desire to give an example of poverty to the faithful. Thus it is that the Dominican churches had the appearance of oblong halls, finished in simple framework, which, even with one or more naves, formed a single auditorium for the reach of a preacher's voice. The construction itself was simplified as much as possible. The walls were flat and plain without useless architectural adornments. There was no sculpture, or its use was reduced to a minimum. The windows of the naves and choir ordinarily were very high, and in some churches almost equal to the vertical dimensions of the walls. This device, along with an almost exclusive use of lines in the construction of the edifice, led the architect to create a style remarkable for simplicity and elegance. Moreover, general chapters of the Order endeavored to

rule out all luxury in decoration, furniture, or devotional objects; but there again, although more slowly, the evolution followed that of architecture. It was only with the fourteenth century that separate steeples or bell towers made their appearance, especially in Italy. In the thirteenth century the churches had only one little tower rising above the highest point of the edifice, with a single, modest bell.

Some of the first large Dominican churches had characteristic lines by their division into two naves, separated by seven or twelve columns, a symbolic number. The church of St. Jacques in Paris seems to have been the first of this kind, a type which may still be seen in the [beautiful church of the Jacobins at Toulouse](#). This innovation of French origin, found also in other Dominican churches, as in Barcelona and Augsburg, was owing to the desire of establishing a church for the laity and another for the religious and clerics. In Paris and Toulouse the Preachers were numerous; but hardly numerous enough, it seems, to justify such a procedure. But these churches and those of the Order in general were frequented by the masters and students of the Universities, and the Preachers wished to reserve a choice place for these guests who were their academic colleagues and their first benefactors in Paris. Thus a Dominican church with two naves might be called a church of the university type.

In the beginning, the Order confided the direction and superintendence of conventual structures to three religious. Very soon their work was assumed by a single friar who was named *operarius*, *praefectus*, or *praepositus operum*, and was, at times, himself the architect of the church. The names of a number of these prefects and architects are known.

PAINTING

During a great part of the thirteenth century the Order prohibited all decoration or interior ornamentation of churches: sculptured tombs, trophies or banners, statues, pictures, and mural paintings. The magnificent tomb of St. Dominic at Bologna was an exception, justified by the veneration of sons for their father. Likewise, in its successive embellishments, this monument portrays the stages by which art made the conquest of the Dominican churches. The tomb of St. Peter of Verona at the church of St. Eustorgius in Milan is of the fourteenth century, a period in which the Preachers had renounced their ancient scruples about the sumptuous, and the cause of art had long since won its way.

The introduction of painting into the churches and other conventual edifices began with pictures, that of the Blessed Virgin, the Founder of the Order, and other saints, after the canonization of St. Dominic (1234). The earliest mural paintings of the Dominican churches have disappeared. Santa Maria Novella of Florence, which holds an artistic primacy among Dominican churches and convents, probably possessed frescoes in its original state before the construction of the actual church begun in 1278. Nowhere can the history of the introduction of painting into the Dominican churches and cloisters be studied with greater surety than at Santa Maria Novella, because nowhere did it have a like distinction or bear an impress so strongly Dominican. This is especially true of the famous frescoes of the ancient chapter room, the work of [Andrea di Bonaiuto of Florence](#) (1366-67). The chapter room of the convent of Treviso, with its series of illustrious Preachers, painted by Thomas of Modena (1352), represents the expression of a thought wholly Dominican and bears witness to the expansion that mural decoration had reached in the Order in the middle of the fourteenth century.

The names of a number of Dominican artists of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries have survived as have some of their works. But time, as well as the malice and the stupidity of men, has destroyed much. The activity of Dominican artists was not limited, moreover, to the service of the Order alone. They worked on projects of religious and secular art, either in the construction of churches and public edifices, or in sculpture or other adornments.

Lastly, the Preachers exercised a general influence on art by their literary productions, many of which became practical guides for painters and sculptors at the end of the Middle Ages and a constant source of inspiration for their artistic counselors: such were the encyclopedia of Vincent of Beauvais, the *Golden Legend* of Jacopo de Voragine, the *Speculum humanae Salvationis* of Ludolph the Carthusian, written during his Dominican career. The Preachers, moreover, were often the inspiration of artists in the conception of their works, as, for example, in the Campo Santo of Pisa and the cycle of symbolic paintings representing the doctrinal triumph of St. Thomas Aquinas.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XVI
The Plight of Preaching in the Twelfth Century
by Reginald Ladner, O.P.
THE CATHOLIC POSITION

THE preacher by right of office is the bishop. This he was in the time of the apostles and still is today. In the twelfth century such was likewise the case; except a few heretics, no one contested this prerogative. Moreover, the heretics directed their objections less against the right than against its exclusiveness.

Preaching is the most important of the official duties of the successors of the apostles. The bishop should have no other concern. His whole life should be given to the study of the holy books, prayer, and the preaching of the gospel.(1) Study, further, has value and purpose only in reference to the end it serves, preaching.(2) Ecclesiastical prescriptions, even the ceremonial of consecration, recommend this duty to the bishop in express and decisive terms. With all his strength and with all his zeal he must devote himself to preaching.(3) If the ordinand does not wish to bind himself to this obligation by oath and to discharge this duty, he must be refused the anointing.(4)

That laymen in the twelfth century had a high regard for and a correct understanding of the episcopal office is shown by an episode of the time. The time was the autumn of the year 1160. Paris was to have a new shepherd. The electoral chapter was considering two candidates, similar in birth, virtue, and knowledge. Both seemed equally fitted for the weighty responsibilities of the bishopric of Paris. Unable to agree on a candidate, the electors sought counsel from King Louis VII. "Choose," he said, "the one who has the most zeal for souls, the best preacher." Maurice de Sully, accordingly, was chosen instead of Peter Comestor, the other candidate. During his episcopate he justified the hopes placed in him.(5)

The bishop shared the task of preaching and teaching with the other prelates and ordinaries, that is, with abbots and superiors and, as Peter Cantor rightly adds, with country pastors.(6) All had the same duties toward their subjects as the bishops, since they had been entrusted with the care of souls.(7)

The bishop usually preached in his cathedral. An ancient tradition required the bishops to explain the gospel every Sunday and feast day.(8) Zealous pastors were still observing this tradition in the twelfth century as the record of homilies left by them shows.(9) Most of the bishops, however, limited their preaching to what was imposed on them by the diocesan statutes.(10) In cloisters and religious houses preaching was fostered to a greater degree, and the collections of sermons that have come down to us are largely the product of this practice.(11)

For a long time there had been good regulations for preaching in the country parishes; (12) but many of these regulations had fallen into desuetude. Regular preaching on Sunday, a practice that was already observed in certain places and at certain times, was not imposed as an obligation on every parish priest until the Council of Trent.(13) Toward the end of the twelfth century, provincial councils merely reminded priests to have the people recite the Our Father, the Apostles' Creed, and the Hail Mary, and to explain these prayers to them.(14)

AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED

No one but those just indicated had a right to preach. The pastor was forbidden, for example, to permit any priests who were not qualified and who did not possess a formal authorization from the bishop to preach in his church or even within the limits of his parish.(15) Under pain of grave penalties, the faithful were likewise forbidden to listen to such preachers. The priests were to remind them frequently of this prohibition.(16)

The regular authorization of the preacher was strictly adhered to. It was accepted as a criterion of orthodoxy. Whoever preached without deputation or authorization was immediately classed as a heretic.(17)

THE CLERGY

"During the entire Middle Ages," wrote Bourgain, "the pulpit never exerted a greater influence than in the twelfth century."(18) This amazing assertion is unsound and superficial. If among the great preachers of the twelfth century only a St. Bernard, a St. Norbert, and others of like caliber were counted, there might indeed be some warrant for the conclusion. But can we conclude on the evidence of a few exceptions that preaching answered the needs of an age and supplied all its demands? In face of the incredible progress made by heresies of all kinds everywhere, and in view of a bourgeoisie disposed and inclined toward innovations in the domain of religion, we may rightly wonder whether the clergy fulfilled, or were even able to fulfill, their work of direction and education.

Readings and sermons of the period have aroused the same conjecture. Written and delivered within the cloister, the sermons could have been of little value for the instruction and edification of the faithful. At least it is difficult to imagine how refined subtleties and prolix allegories could make an impression on uncultured minds.(19) Only a very limited number of the secular clergy gave their attention to the composition of sermons.(20) The majority of the bishops were too absorbed in other occupations to have the time for such work. They had their sermons written by others or were content to repeat a patristic homily.(21) Cases are known of exemplary bishops who found nothing blameworthy in this practice and even hesitated to compose their own sermons.(22) There might have been some hope of profit from these sermons if those who delivered them had taken the trouble to translate the Latin model into the vernacular. But frequently they did not and the words were not understood by the listeners.(23) Yet, a preacher had only to show that he understood the needs of the Christian people in order to be received with genuine gratitude. The extraordinary success of Foulques de Neuilly, and of some others, is proof of this fact.

DEARTH OF PREACHING

Very little preaching was done, in the opinion of contemporary writers. Minds of clear vision, conscious of their responsibilities, never tired of calling attention to this failure.(24) Souls were hungering for the word of God, but there was no one to speak it to them.(25) The cry of Bernard calling for able shepherds echoed throughout the whole century. "Give me at least a few learned and exemplary shepherds!(26) No longer are there any but 'dumb dogs.'"(27)

Alain of Lille put his finger on the cause of this *pessima taciturnitas*, as Peter Cantor called it.(28) How could they preach? It would be only to pronounce their own condemnation. They could no longer take the risk for fear of pointing to their own turpitude.(29)

A more glance at the acts of some three hundred councils of the twelfth century shows that this statement is not an exaggeration. All imaginable vices are listed, certainly not for the pleasure of

enumerating them. Anyone will readily comprehend why, in such a situation, the *ministerium praedicationis* suffered and was bound to suffer.

In the Third Lateran Council (1179) the reform of the clergy was one of the principal questions for discussion.⁽³⁰⁾ Prelates' love of pomp and their luxurious robes had become proverbial. Strict and minute prescriptions were directed against this abuse. Many bishops preferred hunting to the visitation of their dioceses. Others found time for a visitation in the midst of their numerous cares as feudal lords, but it was with such display that the poor pastors were obliged to meet the expense by alienating some of the goods of the Church.⁽³¹⁾ Rapacity, avarice, and immorality seem to have been the chief vices. At times they were carried even to the point of cynicism. According to a contemporary, Bishop Raoul of Liege (1168-91) one day had some benefices sold at auction; as intermediary in the transaction he used a butcher who sold these benefices with his meat.⁽³²⁾ This is but one example among many others which may be cited and which the chroniclers relate in detail.⁽³³⁾ Further, there remained for the prelates no means other than simony for the maintenance of their extravagant way of life. Simony persisted as a most stubborn evil against which all the councils contended, apparently without effect. This circumstance explains the fact, at first surprising, that few of these councils enacted statutes on the subject of preaching.⁽³⁴⁾ The councils had to attend to more urgent affairs and to effect basic reforms before there could be any thought about a reorganization of the pastoral ministry. It was well understood that a preacher who did not live according to his teaching could but aggravate the evil.⁽³⁵⁾ The heretics knew how to profit by this condition. One of their most effective arguments was based on the contradiction between the example and the teaching of the churchmen.⁽³⁶⁾ It is significant that our Lord's admonition occurs so frequently in contemporary literature: "All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do: but according to their works do ye not. For they say, and do not."⁽³⁷⁾

LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

If the scandalous conduct of so many prelates was a dangerous stumbling block for the people, their example was still more directly harmful when it was accompanied with an uncertainty in the matter of doctrine. The faithful indeed were being neglected on all sides. Neither the teaching nor the example of their spiritual superiors could bring them support or encouragement.

We are not speaking here of those prelates, especially numerous in southern France, who abetted heresy.⁽³⁸⁾ We are speaking rather of those prelates, much more numerous, who lacked the knowledge necessary to fulfill their duty toward their subordinates. The maxim, *oportet praelatum esse doctorem*, continually repeated in one form or another, indicates that in this domain there was much to be desired.⁽³⁹⁾ If, at a time when requirements for the instruction of clerics were very moderate, bishops had to be deposed for crass ignorance, the import of the fact can be appreciated.⁽⁴⁰⁾

Innocent III counted lack of knowledge among the deficiencies which could and should lead to the resignation of a bishop.⁽⁴¹⁾ We cannot estimate how often this charge recurs in the numerous depositions that this Pope pronounced.⁽⁴²⁾ He always expressed himself with reserve and tact in the bulls which refer to this question. But the expression, *propter impedimentum cordis*, which was used rather often, may well be a paraphrase signifying that the prelate in question was not able to fulfill his office as teacher of the faithful. This meaning is frequently evident in the light of the context and of circumstances known in other ways.⁽⁴³⁾

Moreover, a number of these prelates, forced into the clerical state for purely selfish motives, showed little eagerness to assume the burden of the duties of their state. Few of them could merit the tribute paid to Sylvester de la Guerche, bishop of Rennes, by a contemporary. He was a warrior, rough and

unlettered, and was not even a cleric. But he had concern for his diocese and for the salvation of the souls of the faithful. He sought the services of able and zealous priests who could provide for his people what he himself was not able to give.(44) According to earlier decrees, the bishops could provide a substitute preacher when they were hindered by sickness or absence.(45) But they could not plead ignorance as an excuse from preaching. The Fourth Lateran Council had declared that in the future ignorance would not be tolerated.(46) But, since it was necessary to provide for the support of these helpers, many prelates preferred the more economical solution of letting preaching lapse entirely.(47)

INERTIA OF THE CLERGY

As heresy continued its steady progress in southern France, Innocent III judged at first that he could oppose it effectively with the help of the bishops. He appealed to the clerical forces to redouble their efforts and their zeal.(48) But soon he realized that the prelates themselves were largely responsible for the lamentable situation and the inroads of error.(49) In a letter to his legates, he complained of the deplorable state of the Church in many places through the fault of these pastors.(50) Instead of doing their duty, instead of mounting guard and sending a call to arms against the forces of darkness, they showed their inability and negligence, and stood blind and dumb in the face of danger, absorbed in their profane ventures.

Unfortunately conditions were still more intolerable among the lower clergy. These conditions affected a greater number of individuals and appeared in a coarser form than did the same vices and weaknesses in the prelates.(51) Certain parishes were abandoned to wretched, illiterate, and uncultured creatures,(52) sometimes because better persons could not be found, but more often because these parishes preferred the services of those who would accept the lowest salary. Thus they got what they paid for.(53)

It would be unfair not to acknowledge and recognize the activity and success of certain good and admirable prelates. The way they tried to remedy the situation will be considered later. In normal times, perhaps the efforts of such men would have compensated for the inadequacy and subversive influence of the others. But the exceptional circumstances demanded exceptional measures and created needs which could not be met by a great part of the clergy.

THE HERETICS

While the pastors lawfully appointed by the Church were concerned with their own interests, and while cowardly hirelings abandoned their flocks and left them to die of hunger,(54) others who were not appointed advanced to take their place. Since those who alone possessed the right to preach did not exercise the right, others would, but in an altogether different fashion.(55)

The numerous heresies, under various names, which were taking root again and springing up almost everywhere, especially in northern Italy and in southern France, showed common traits. But what particularly impressed their contemporaries was the ardor of the heretics in spreading their message.(56)

The most dangerous of these, the Cathari, whose teaching was essentially heretical,(57) displayed amazing zeal for preaching. Those who had received the *consolamentum* consecrated themselves to the work immediately. They labored unceasingly, openly, and secretly, to win others by their discourses. They had an uncommon knowledge of the New Testament and used its maxims skillfully in favor of their theses. According to the occasions and the circumstances, they gave a positive explanation of

their doctrine of dualism or they violently attacked the Catholic Church, reproaching her with the scandalous lives of many of her prelates. Their doctrinal activity was accompanied and very effectively supported by a life of poverty in imitation of the apostles. Wherever they went, this example made a profound impression. Their clothing was of the plainest, their diet frugal, their fasts strict and frequent. They traveled on foot as our Lord and the apostles did, and preached through city and country. Ordinary folk could not help comparing this edifying example with that displayed in their prelates' life of luxury. Nor was it difficult to guess what turn their sympathy would take, for ordinary people will not stop for protracted investigation; they are quickly carried away by what they see. All flocked round the new preachers, who were evidently living what they taught.

THE WALDENSES

We cannot overlook the success of the Waldenses,⁽⁵⁸⁾ which was the more deplorable since they had at first begun to work within the bosom of the Church with a pure faith and a right intention to renew Christian life. Soon, however, they were separated from her. They were different from the Cathari since their activities were promoted by utterly illiterate men, and by example rather than by any subtle form of teaching. For zeal in spreading their ideas, however, no one could outstrip them. No sooner did Waldo attract to the ranks of his followers a person desirous of imitating Christ and the apostles in perfect poverty than he sent the new disciple, even though a woman, to preach in the neighboring villages. On the streets and in the public squares his followers would address everyone they met. They read and explained the Bible in the vulgar tongue. When their preaching and their activity took a disturbing turn, the Bishop of Lyons forbade them to preach. This prohibition was imprudent, and if we bear in mind certain promises of the Pope, even an injustice. They replied in the word of the Scriptures: "We ought to obey God rather than men."⁽⁵⁹⁾ They felt that the bishops should have been satisfied that some preaching was being done.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Thus they turned their back on the Church and went their own way. Their influence and popularity increased, and they showed themselves more and more determined and bold in their views and ventures. Lastly, they shook off all ecclesiastical control and declared that only those who were living in real imitation of the apostles, in perfect poverty, had the right to preach. Whoever, whether man or woman, fulfilled this condition had, in virtue of his baptism, a mission to teach and preach everywhere.⁽⁶¹⁾ Like the Cathari, therefore, the Waldenses were champions of preaching by laymen.

LAY MONKS

The heretics were not the only ones interested in this problem. Certain orthodox groups also advocated preaching by laymen. Monks had to some extent taken sides in the contest.⁽⁶²⁾ The term "layman," as understood at the time, was used in contrast to "scholar" and "Cleric."⁽⁶³⁾ As opposed to "scholar," the word "layman" signified the great mass of the common people; as opposed to "cleric," it included monks who had not received holy orders.

In the beginning there were few priest-monks in the cloisters. But from the end of the eleventh century, influenced by a new ideal which included apostolic labor, the character of the lay order changed. The number of monks who were ordained to the priesthood continued to increase. But from the ranks of the secular clergy and even in the cloisters voices were heard tending to exclude the monk from exercising any kind of pastoral activity, especially that of preaching.⁽⁶⁴⁾ Dead to the world, the monk should not return to it, even under the cover of the apostolate.⁽⁶⁵⁾ The formula of St. Jerome: "The duty of the monk is not to teach, but to weep," as well as the saying of a Sovereign Pontiff, "Whatever a monk's knowledge, he should not presume to preach," was often heard.⁽⁶⁶⁾

THE DUTY OF MONKS TO PREACH

An attempt was made to prove that Jerome meant by the word "monk" the solitary or the religious who did not have holy orders.(67) Thus it was necessary to distinguish between the duty of fraternal exhortation, incumbent on every man of sufficient intelligence, and the right of public preaching, the prerogative belonging only to bishops, abbots, and priests in their cloister or their church.(68) The latter class alone were in possession of the indispensable mission; they had received it with their ordination.(69) Thus the priest-monks who had received the complete priesthood and not what might be called semi-priesthood had full power to preach. Their case was not to be distinguished from that of the canons regular, whose rights they would share fully. With lay brothers, however, it was different.(70)

There were those, however, who tried to save preaching even for the lay monks. Their argument put the emphasis rather on the mission, not considering ordination.(71) Thus they explained the fact that in all ages there had been lay preachers and monastic preachers who had not received major orders.(72) Such a mission evidently would be unusual or, if the result of a supernatural call, confirmed by signs and miracles.(73) Such preachers would be expected to have at least a minimum of culture, know Holy Scripture, give obedience to the Church, and lead an apostolic and perfect life.(74) Nevertheless, even with all these conditions fulfilled, the preaching of lay monks was in practice out of the ordinary and could be considered only an exception.(75)

While the preaching of these lay monks was relatively easy to control and scarcely in danger of gaining greater extension, since it was the custom to call the ablest among them to the priesthood, the preaching of laymen could much more easily elude the vigilance of the bishops; it became increasingly more difficult, therefore, to check their deviations. At this period, collectors of alms constituted a real public calamity.(76) Armed with authentic or, more often, with bogus relics, certain laymen or clerics of questionable standing, whose ordination it was difficult to attest, passed through cities and villages, carrying off charitable offerings made to the profit of churches and hospitals which might or might not exist. At the sound of a bell the people were called to the church or to the public square, and cunning words enticed alms from them in honor of some saint or in favor of some enterprise.(77) If the solicitor were a priest or pretended to be one, it was customary for him to close the collection by celebrating Mass on the reliquary.(78) The almost unbelievable ignorance of some of these preachers and their evil conduct provoked great scandals among the people.(79) To put an end to this abuse, a whole series of councils directed severe canons against it.(80) In the interest of charity, the bishops were not opposed to the act of begging in itself; but, as far as possible, it was to be carried on only by canons, chaplains, or other priests of good repute.(81) In the future, moreover, every mendicant was to carry a letter from his bishop inscribed with his name as the rightful holder of it. Further, his right to preach during his rounds had to be attested by a special document;(82) otherwise he could only present his request, after which the cleric of the place would do the preaching.(83) The latter sometimes had to be responsible for forwarding the collection to its destination, probably because often these mendicants begged on their own initiative and for their personal profit.

HIRED PREACHERS

In addition to the *quaestuarii*, for whom preaching was only a means of money-making, there was another group that carried on the work of lay preaching. Their motives, too, were not disinterested. These men made a business of preaching and rented out their services, turning over to their manager a certain part of the money they received.(84) Some of them were shrewd business men. In fact, organizations were formed which, for a stipulated sum, contracted for the entire preaching of a parish, indeed even of an ecclesiastical province notably in France and in Normandy.(85) Bishops and priests who made use of this system must have thought that the commission thus given would exempt them from all other responsibility in the matter and that it would be enough for them to supplement or to

correct the lack of knowledge or of virtue in their hired agents. The councils threatened with the most severe penalties those easy-going and negligent pastors who relieved themselves so conveniently of their most important duty.[\(86\)](#)

Hence we should not be surprised that the majority of the prelates were opposed to lay preaching. Perhaps they hoped to redeem their own neglect in the matter of preaching the word of God by showing greater zeal in condemning lay meddling. At least, they could not be taxed with negligence in fulfilling this easy duty. Among the laymen who engaged in preaching, there were always some who were suspect; they were called *pseudo-praedicatores*.[\(87\)](#)

At certain times, indeed, the Church showed herself more lenient than at others. But her very concessions she regarded as merely temporary and provisional. Any other view would have contradicted the very existence of the hierarchy willed by God. Experience always taught that, sooner or later, preaching by laymen led to heresy or to some other aberration.

NEGLECTED REGIONS

In times of religious ferment, people have a special need of enlightenment. The necessity was quite pronounced in that age when, in certain large circles, a reaction against wealth and avarice in the Church aroused an enthusiasm for an ideal of primitive Christianity, a poor and apostolic life. Was not the movement to all outward appearances good? The intentions of these reformers were upright, no doubt, but the means they employed led into dangerous paths. The conditions called for solicitude about explaining the Gospel to these reformers and about ensuring their sound training. But this task was declined by a clergy engrossed in worldly interests, particularly in regions like southern France where, from the middle of the twelfth century, the practice and the office of preaching had been slipping into the hands of laymen. The magnitude of the terrible danger menacing the Church was first understood perhaps by Innocent III. With sure insight, he gauged the strength of the remarkable forces confronting him and adopted a policy that would not simply check this popular movement but would direct it into the proper channels. By the same stroke he launched a revolution that has nothing comparable in the history of the pastoral ministry, especially in that of preaching.

As the thirteenth century opened, such was the plight of Christian preaching. The description just given, merely sketching it, is limited to general traits drawn principally from the statutes of the ecumenical or provincial councils, and the allegations and complaints of contemporary ecclesiastical writers. Details that might be added from chronicles would not notably affect the tone of the general sketch. A more extended investigation would enlarge the picture by reports of statistical findings and by special attention to conditions in various regions and districts. As to the latter, a few notations have sufficed for our purpose. The crisis in preaching, was particularly severe in France and Italy, chiefly in Languedoc and Lombardy, in western Germany, and in Flanders; in those regions where civilization was most advanced, the situation was the gravest.

One last detail of a more general nature must be added to the picture as a final touch: the problem was extremely serious in the cities. The early thirteenth century saw the close of an evolution from the feudal to the communal regime.[\(88\)](#) Economic, social, and political life, which until then had revolved within the orbit of the lord's château, now found its axis in the towns, which grew in importance daily and expanded round the artisan and trade in a mighty upswing. The towns became centers of prosperity and culture, and tended little by little to free themselves from a condition of dependence as well as from the influence of their former masters, ecclesiastical or civil.[\(89\)](#)

But the Church all the while stood rooted in the old order and in the feudal regime. Many of the communes were not the seat of a bishopric, and the few cities that had a bishop did not always have in him a preacher. The spiritual or pastoral life radiating from the monasteries of monks or even of canons did not, as a general rule, touch the cities, for the monasteries stood in isolated places. No one, so to speak, concerned himself about the souls in the rising towns; or, to be more exact, the clergy in such places were not ready to meet the people on the level of their new needs; neither in number nor in education had they kept pace with the progress of the communes.⁽⁹⁰⁾ Nor did the bishops understand the import of all the upheavals then occurring and reaching consummation under their very eyes. The mobile life of a people engaged in commerce and the pursuits of artisans created unprecedented problems in the ministry of souls and urgently demanded a solution.⁽⁹¹⁾ Indispensable agents were lacking, and even the most elementary approach seemed closed. With a great number of bishops the effect of the situation must have been overwhelming.

NOTES

1 "Let the bishop take upon himself no business cares and let his time be given only to reading, prayer, and the preaching of the word of God" (*Decretum Gratiani*, c. 6, Dist. LXXXVIII). "The work of the pontiff is twofold: to learn of God by reading and meditating often on Holy Scripture; to teach the people" (c. 3, Dist. XXXVI).

2 "Therefore let priests know Holy Scripture and the canons that all their work may consist of preaching and teaching" (*Decretum Gratiani*, c. 1, Dist. XXXVIII).

3 Lecoy, *La chaire française au moyen âge*, p. 20.

4 "But if he shall have determined otherwise, and thus shall not gladly pledge himself so to do and to teach, let him by no means be consecrated" (*Decretum Gratiani*, c. 6, Dist. XXXVIII).

5 Bourbon, no. 485; cf. Lecoy, p. 45.

6 Preaching is "the duty of prelates" (in this term the rural priest is also included). *PL*, CCV, 172.

7 "But the task of preaching or of public teaching is incumbent only on those to whom it is assigned, that is, bishops and priests in their churches and abbots in their monasteries, to whom the care of souls has been committed" (Martène, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, V, 1622).

8 Martigny, *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes*, pp. 660 ff.; Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, IV, 43.

9 For example, Maurice de Sully, bishop of Paris (d. 1196): *Expositio evangeliorum sive sermones de singulis dominicis diebus et de festivitibus per totum anni circulum*. Cf. Lecoy, p. 520.

10 Cf. the following councils: Rouen (1214), can. 7, Mansi, XXII, 918; Paris (1213), can. 3, Mansi, XXII, 840; Mainz (1233), can. 19, Hefele-Leclereq, V, 1548. The Council of Paris, assigned by Mansi to 1212, occurred at the earliest in 1213. Cf. *Arch. d'hist. doct., et litt.*, IX (1934), 90 ff.

11 For example, the sermons of Adam Scotus (d. 1192), *PL*, CXC VIII; most of the sermons of St. Bernard (d. 1153), *PL*, CLXXXIII.

12 For the prescriptions under the Carolingians, cf. the account in Albert, *Die Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland bis Luther*, II, 49 ff.; Council of Aachen (836), Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 94 f.

13 Council of Trent, Sess. V, chap. 2; Mansi, XXXIII, 30 f.

14 "Let the priests always exhort the people to say the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Hail Mary" (*Odonis Episcopi Parisiensis Synodicae Constitutiones*; Mansi, XXII, 681; cf. Mansi, XXII, 683, 735). The Our Father, the Apostles' Creed, and the Hail Mary formed the outline for religious instruction in the Middle Ages until the Council of Trent.

15 "Let no one be permitted to preach unless he is either a qualified person or one sent by the bishop or archbishop." *Odonis Ep. Paris. Synod. Constitutiones* (Mansi, XXII, 681). "Let him not be admitted unless our letters give his name and expressly state that we have given him license to preach" (Mansi, XXII, 729); cf. St. Bernard, *ad Tolosanens* (*PL*, CLXXXII, 437).

16 "Priests are strictly forbidden to permit them to preach . . . even outside the church and let the priests warn their parishioners on Sundays that they may not listen to such preachers under pain of excommunication." *Odonis Ep. Paris. Synod. Constitutiones* (Mansi, XXII, 683).

17 Cf. Lucius III (1184), *Decretum contra haereticos* (Mansi, XXII, 477).

18 Bourgain, *La chaire française au XII^e siècle*, p. 370.

19 "Almost all the extant sermons of the twelfth century show a learned, studied character, savoring of the cloister and the school. Usually they were written for clerics and monks" (Lecoy, p. 11).

20 Of the preachers at the close of the twelfth century, who have left evidence of their work, a fifth belonged to the secular clergy.

21 Bartholomew of Vendôme (d. 1206), archbishop of Tours, had his sermons composed by Stephen of Tournai. *PL*, CCXI, 342; cf. Warichez, *Étienne de Tournai et son temps*, p. 81. Adam Scotus, O. Praem. (d. 1192), recounts the reproaches of malcontents against a preacher satisfied to reproduce the work of another: "Do not Augustine, Gregory, and other doctors say these same things? Pilfering words here and there in the books of the doctors, he committed them to memory and recited them to us for a sermon, as if we ourselves could not just as well see those very things that he himself saw and collected." To which, by way of reply: "As if we should know how to say or ought to say anything that our learned and holy predecessors have not said or left in their books for our instruction" (*PL*, CXCVIII, 184). Cf. Albert, *Die Geschichte des Predigt*, II, 179.

22 "I heard that Pope Innocent.... a man of vast learning, preaching once on the feast of the Magdalen, had someone near holding the homily of Gregory for that feast, and he read word for word in the vernacular what was there written in Latin, asking the one who held the book about the sequence when he could not remember it. After the sermon when he was asked why he had done so, since he himself was equal to saying many other things, he answered that he had done this for the correction and instruction of those who disdained the words of others" (Humbert, *De vita regulari*, II, 397).

23 "That bishops should strive to preach the sermons and homilies of the holy Fathers in the language of the people, so that all will understand them" (from the Council of Reims). Ivo of Chartres (d. 1117); *PL*, CLXI, 385. "Since the people understand nothing at all of what is said unless it is spoken in the vulgar tongue" (Adam Scotus; *PL*, CXCVIII, 184; cf. Bourgain, p. 195).

24 "And today those to whom the word of God has been committed are silent on what is good, dumb dogs, unable, nay unwilling to bark." Peter de Blois (d. 1200); *PL*, CCVII, 1108. "Woe to us wretches! Many of us are ramblers, few of us preachers." Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141); *PL*, CLXXVII, 974. Cf. Peter Cantor, (d. 1197), *Contra negligentiam praelatorum*, *PL*, CCV, 176 ff.; Alain of Lille (d. 1202), *Quod praelatorum tantum debeat esse praedicatio*, *PL*, CCX, 182 ff.

25 "Because of this I shall send a famine upon the land, not a famine of bread, nor yet of water, but of hearing the word of God. Because the little ones have asked for bread, and there was none to break it unto them" (cf. Laim. 4:4). Peter Cantor, *PL*, CCV, 178. "For there is hunger in the land, and the little ones seek bread, but scarcely one can be found to break it for them." Innocent III; *PL*, CCXV, 274.

26 "Who will give me men, learned and holy men, to be pastors in the churches of God, if not in all, at least in many, at all events in some?" (*PL*, CLXXXII, 450.)

27 Cf. Isa. 56: 10. "His watchmen all blind . . . dumb dogs, not able to bark, bide the talent committed to them in the napkin like the unprofitable servant, since the word of the Lord has been bound in their mouth" (Innocent III; *PL*, CCXIV, 904).

28 *PL*, CCV, 189.

29 Bourgain, p. 280.

30 Cf. Mansi XXII, 219, 273; Schroeder, *Councils*, pp. 216 f.

31 Mansi, XXII, 219, 273, 820, 940 f.

32 *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 1869, XIV, 402.

33 For example, Vitry, pp. 270 ff., 290 ff, Cf. Schmieder, *L'Église et la civilisation au moyen âge*, II, 633 ff.; Pierron, pp. 99-106.

34 Only at the outset of the thirteenth century did synods and councils begin to give more attention to preaching. Cf. Mansi, XXII, 681, 683, 730, 735, 785, 840 917. But previous to that time remonstrances were not wanting; cf. Hauck IV, 42 f.

35 "His life, moreover, is despised, and as a result his preaching is contemned" (Peter Cantor; *PL*, CCV, 172; cf. Alain of Lille; *PL*, CCX, 182).

36 Bourbon, no. 251. "The heretics everywhere publicly dogmatize and seduce the unwary whom they attract to themselves, so much the more easily as they perniciously draw arguments against the Church from the life of the Archbishop himself and other prelates, and accuse the whole Church for the crimes of a few." Innocent III; *PL*, CCXV, 355.

37 Matt. 23:3. Cf. Alger of Liège (d. 1132), *De misericordia et justitia* (in Martène, *Anecdota*, V, 1044); Foncaude (d. 1192), *PL*, CCIV, 807; Peter de Blois (d. 1200), *PL*, CCVII, 1159.

38 Guiraud, *L'Inquisition*, pp. 336 ff.; cf. Innocent III, *PL*, CCXV, 357.

39 Cf. Peter Cantor; *PL*, CCV, 172. "The bishop ought, moreover, to be a doctor." *Dictum Gratiani*, ad Dist. LXXXVI. "It is not enough for a prelate to be a man of good life and upright character unless he

also have the knowledge of doctrine." *Ibid.*, C. 2, Dist. XXXVI. "O vile ignorance, abominable stupidity, which imposes silence on a prelate, renders our dog, that is, our pastor, mute" (Alain of Lille: *PL*, CCX, 184). Cf. especially Vitry, pp. 270 ff. Cf. the corresponding prescriptions of the councils; e.g., Third Lateran Council (1179), can. 3; Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1089; Schroeder, *Councils*, pp. 216 f.

40 Thus Honorius III found that he was obliged to depose the Bishop of Carinola who because of his great ignorance had stirred up the indignation of the clergy and the people, C. 15, X, *de aetate et qualitate et ordine praeficiendorum*, 1, 14). "What he should know who is to be ordained bishop: It should be asked . . . if he has to give extempore sermons, whether he has a ready knowledge of . . . the sacred canons and the holy Gospel as well as the book of the Holy Apostle, and all Sacred Scripture, and whether he lives according, to the commandments of God and is disposed to teach the people entrusted to his care" (C. 6, Dist. XXXVIII). "Let no one presume to advance the illiterate . . . to the clerical order" (C. 1, Dist. XXXVI). "Nevertheless, moderate knowledge is sufficient" (*loc. cit.*, *glossa*).

41 "These are the causes on account of which a bishop may ask leave to resign his pastoral office: consciousness of crime, weakness of body, defect of learning, Malevolence of the people, deformity of person" (*PL*, CCXV, 802).

42 The biographer of Innocent III tells us: "He dispatched prudent visitators through various provinces, through whom he made diligent inquiry about the condition and life not only of the churches but also of the prelates; and those whom he found guilty he at once removed from their prelacy. . . . Who can say how many prelates he deposed?" (There follows, "to name a few out of many," a list of more than twenty bishops.) *PL*, CCXIV, 172.

43 *PL*, CCXIV, 374, 458.

44 Though unlearned, he zealously gathered about him those who were educated. Spiritual discipline flourished in him, so that divine knowledge poured forth resplendently upon him what flesh and blood had not communicated. Thus he found company in his own way with the learned, if there were any such" (Baudry, *Vita B. Roberti*; *PL*, CLXII, 1048). Cf. Walter, *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*, pp. 100 f.

45 Council of Mainz (813), can. 25; Hefele-Leclercq, III, 1141. Valence (855), Oan. 16; *op. cit.* IV, 208. Avignon (1209); Mansi, XXII, 785.

46 "It often happens that bishops, on account of their manifold duties or bodily infirmities, or because of hostile invasions or other reasons, to say nothing of lack of learning, which must be absolutely condemned in them and is not to be tolerated in the future, are themselves unable to minister the word of God to the people . . ." (can. 10; Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1340; Schroeder, *Councils*, pp. 251 f.).

47 "When they (preachers) are in need, let them be supplied with the necessities. lest for want of these they may be compelled to abandon their work at the very beginning" (can. 10; Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.*; Schroeder, *loc. cit.* Cf. Innocent III; *PL*, CCXV, 274).

48 *PL*, CCXIV, 71, 82.

49 "Therefore grieving with holy sadness as much over the failure of the Church as over the loss of souls, believed to have fallen into the snare of damnation through the negligence of their shepherd, and

desiring to apply a salutary remedy . . ." (Innocent III, *PL*, CCXIV, 458. Cf. *PL*, CCXV, 273, 884). Cf. Council of Avignon (1209), can. 1; Mansi, XXII, 785.

50 *PL*, CCXIV, 903.

51 *Ibid.*, CCXV, 273, 355, 358.

52 Cf. Mansi, XXII, 224, 540, 582 ff.

53 Innocent III (*epist.*, III, 24; *PL*, CCXIV, 905). Raoul Ardent mentions priests who did not even know how to read (*PL*, CLV, 2035). Council of Oxford (1222), can. 23: "Archdeacons in their visitations will take care . . . that priests know how to say correctly at least the words of the Canon" (Mansi, XXII, 1169). Cf. Fourth Lateran Council (1215), can. 27, 30; Hefele-Leclereq, V, 1356-58; c. 32: "For we have learned as a fact that in certain localities parish priests do not obtain for sustenance more than a quarter of a quarter, that is, one sixteenth of the tithes. Whence it happens that in those places a priest is hardly ever found who has an ordinary knowledge of letters" (*ibid.*, V, 1359 Q. "Since many parochial churches, because of the poverty of the priests, are lacking in due service, we decree that ... it is important that the priest should be so competently provided for that he may be able to celebrate fittingly the divine mysteries" (Council of Paris [1213]; Mansi, XXII, 846).

54 "The pastor has turned into a hireling . . . when, feeding not his people but himself . . ." (Innocent III; *PL*, CCXV, 359).

55 "Since the dogs of the flock of the Lord do not bark, the (heretics) themselves bark, not that they may ward off the attacks of the wolf, but rather that they may cause the flock to stray away" (Innocent III; *PL*, CCXV, 819).

56 Alain of Lille thus begins his treatise *De fide catholica contra haereticos*: "These are called Waldenses from the name of the heresiarch, Waldo, who, led by his own spirit, not having been sent by God, founded a new sect, so that without the authority of a prelate, without divine inspiration, without knowledge, without learning, he presumed to preach" (*PL*, CCX, 377). Cf. Foncaude, *Adversus Waldensium sectam*, chaps. 4, 5, 8; *PL*, CCIV, 793 f.; Mansi, XXII, 477.

57 Guiraud, *L'Inquisition*, pp. 143 ff.

58 *Ibid.*, pp. 235 ff.

59 Foncaude, *Adversus Waldensium sectam*, *PL*, CCIV, 817.

60 "The apostle rejoices, whatever way Christ is preached, whether through the wicked or through the good, with a right intention or a wrong one. Why then, should not the bishops also rejoice when Christ is preached by us? But they contradict us" (*ibid.*, *PL*; CCIV, 807).

61 Guiraud, *L'Inquisition*, p. 238.

62 Endres, *Honorius augustodunensis*, pp. 147ff.; Rupert, *Altercatio monachi et clerici* (*PL*, CLXX 537ff.); *Epistola ad Everardum* (*PL*, CLXX, 541 ff.).

63 Marténe, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, V 1648.

64 "Concerning the monk of Preuilly called Peter the Hermit, it is commanded that he be at once recalled from preaching among the Albigenses, nor should he or any other dare to usurp the office of preaching without license from the general chapter. But if anyone shall have presumed to usurp it, let him be regarded as a fugitive." Canivez, *Statuta Cap. Gen. O.C.*, Vol. I (1212), Louvain, 1933; *Vita apostolica*, PL, CLXX, 611.

65 "While you profess to be a monk, you confess that you are dead. For he is not a monk who is not dead to the world; moreover, how is he dead whose voice is heard abroad?" Rupert, *Alterc.*; PL, CLXX, 537. "That the brethren may not leave their solitude for preaching" (Etienne de Muret, *Regula*, chap. 48; PL, CCIV, 1155).

66 Eusebius Hieronymus, *Liber contra Vigilantium*; PL, XXIII, 351. Rupert, *Alterc.*; PL, CLXX, 538. Rupert, *Epist.*; PL, CLXX, 543. St. Bernard, *Sermo 64 in Cantic.*; PL, CLXXXIII, 1085. Martène, *Anecd. V, Dialogus*, 1618.

67 "He used this name 'monk' according to the etymology of the word, for a solitary." Martène, *Anecd. V, Dialogus*, 1621. "For he said this about a monk who is 'a monk only and not also a cleric or priest'" (Rupert, *Epist.*; PL, CLXX, 543).

68 "Every man with an intellect, that talent which the wicked servant buried in the soil, if he is not a solitary, if he lives with men, has a duty of teaching, because he owes it to his brother when he sees him wandering from the truth or the path of morals to recall him by showing him the right way. . . . But they do not have the office of teaching publicly unless they are sent. That office belongs to the bishop, to priests in their churches, and to abbots in their monasteries, for to them the care of souls has been confided" (Martène, *Anecd. V, Dialogus*, 1621 f.).

69 "The apostles 'send' archbishops; the archbishops, bishops; the bishops, priests; that is, when they ordain them" (Rupert, *Alterc.*; PL, CLXX, 542.)

70 "If, then, this (to baptize, to preach, etc.) is not permitted to monks who are ordained, they are, therefore, called not *pleni presbyteri*, but *semipresbyteri*" (*Vita apostolica*; PL, CLXX, 637). ". . . the bishops send priests, evidently when they ordain them. From this mission, however, the monk is exempt, since he has not taken on the duties of sacred orders" (Rupert, *Alterc.*; PL, CLXX, 542).

71 Alain of Lille, *Contra haereticos* (PL, CCX, 379); Foncaude (PL, CCIV, 815 f.).

72 Foncaude (PL, CCIV, 809 ff.).

73 *Ibid.*, 816.

74 *Ibid.*

75 "And from all this it is absolutely certain that they who have not sacred orders must not be readily heard among the people of God" (*ibid.*).

76 Cf Mansi, XXII, 846, 901- 681, 683, 729, 735, 821, 1123.

77 Preachers should not be permitted . . . to ring bells in the village nor to speak in churches, nor to display relics; but they may recommend their business, and the priests may speak for them." Odonis *Episc. Parisiens. Synod. Constitutiones* (1212), can. 9; Mansi, XXII, 681. A prescription of the Council

of Paris (1213?) gives a warning against unknown priests: "We strictly forbid that unknown priests whose ordination is not established should be admitted for the divine celebration" (can. 9); Mansi XXII, 821.

78 Mansi XXII, 681, 735, 846.

79 Cf. Mansi, XXII 683.

80 *Odonis Episcopi Parisiensis Synodicae Constitutiones* (can. 9, 41; Mansi, XXII, 681, 683). Council of Paris (1213?) (can. 8, Mansi, XXII, 821, 846). Council of Rouen (1214) (can. 9; Mansi, XXII, 901). *Constitutiones Richardi Episc. Sarum.* (1217) (can. 50; Mansi, XXII, 1123). Cf. Mansi, XXII, 729, 735.

81 *No quaestuaris* or *conductitius* may be admitted to preach in behalf of any hospital or any other house, on account of the great scandals caused by pseudo-preachers of this type; nevertheless, faithful canonical messengers or chaplains of a cathedral church of approved testimony, or good parish priests, with the authority of the archbishop or bishop of the place, or of those whose responsibility it is, may be permitted to collect alms in behalf of hospitals for the use of the poor and other works of piety, or for the repair of churches; but not such a one as will celebrate Mass over his coffers and folding tables in contempt of the Sacrament of the Lord" (Council of Paris [1213?], can. 9, Mansi, XXII, 846).

82 "We forbid that any preacher be allowed to seek alms of the faithful without letters signed by us containing his name and explicitly stating that we give him license to preach. He may be permitted to present the case and the need for which he has come, even if he does not have license to preach, on condition that he be provided with letters from us, as we have said. We require, moreover, that the priests of the church in which the appeal is made receive the money collected and keep it safe under the custody of two worthy men until, conformable to our command, it be delivered to that place for which it was collected and gathered." *Constitutiones Richardi Episcopi Sarum.* (1217), can. 50 (Mansi, XXII, 1123).

83 Mansi, XXII, 735.

84 "Conductitius praedicator"; cf. Du Cange, II, 523; Mansi, XXII, 821, 901; St. Bernard, sermon 66 (*PL*, CLXXXIII, 1101).

85 "We also strictly charge that no one may be a 'hired' preacher, nor may the office of preaching be entrusted to such, nor may he be allowed to preach. . . . Nor may the preaching in any province or parish be given over to him or to others as to a firm. Transgressors of this constitution ought to be punished by a penalty of the kind mentioned above." Council of Rouen (1214), can. 9; Mansi, XXII, 901. Council of Paris (1213?), can. 8; Mansi, XXII, 821. Cf. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XVI, 165. In Languedoc the act was addressed to the heretical organizations: "A good many prelates do not fear to commit their churches to the promoters of the heretics." Innocent III (May 27, 1204); *PL*, CCXV, 357.

86 Council of Rouen (1214), can. 9 (Mansi, XXII, 901).

87 Mansi, XXII, 846. "What is the penalty for a false preacher? To know this, we must know who may be called a false preacher. And you ought to know that any layman, even a religious, is considered false because the office of preaching is forbidden to them all. . . . Laymen ought to hear and to obey the clergy, not teach or command."

88 Schnuerer, *L'Église et la civilisation au moyen âge*, II, 641 ff.

89 Michel, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, 1897, I, 136 ff. Hefele, *Die Bettelorden und das religiöse Volksleben Ober-und Mittelitaliens im 13. Jahrhundert*, p. 7.

90 Hauck, IV, 22 ff.; 30 ff.

91 Greven, *Die Anfänge der Beginen*, p. 205.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XVII

Efforts of the Church to Revive Preaching

by Reginald Ladner, O.P.

IN face of such an evolution, the papacy could not stand idle. The crisis here described was not exclusively the fruit of the waning twelfth century; its growth had begun in a much earlier period. So, too, had the efforts of popes and councils to keep ahead of developments. All their attempts cannot be enumerated or considered in detail; for a complete understanding, their endeavors and their plans would each require an extended account. Our treatment seeks merely to give a general view with emphasis in each case on a typical feature.

The great Gregorian reform scored a certain success and achieved some lasting results. Monks recovered their primitive ideal with the rigor of an earlier age; in many places clerics gave up all personal property and began to live in common under a rule. Born of such efforts, the institutions of the Cistercians and of the canons regular flourished as their enduring reflection. But the most characteristic feature in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries was the stir of a remarkable spirit, an earnest desire to work for souls. To plumb the deep-rooted springs of this interest would lead beyond the limits of this investigation. However, the fact is that there was then developing on original lines, along with Gregory VII's reform, the practice of imitating Christ in the primitive way of the apostolic life.

Among the canons regular this idea appeared in its new aspect with particular vigor. They discovered, and rightly, in the union of a contemplative life and an active ministry for souls, the perfect imitation of Christ and the apostles.⁽¹⁾ A number of city chapters were reformed under the impulse of the new aspiration. Regenerated by a powerful ideal, these ordinary clerics would have solved in great measure the crisis in the pastoral ministry if their number had been greater; for they were already at hand in the cities, and their regular life had no other purpose than the efficacious support of their apostolate. Unfortunately, when the eleventh century closed, the reform had failed to reach the greater part of the clergy in the cathedrals and the collegiate churches.⁽²⁾

Among the monks, naturally more conservative, at first only a few individuals claimed the right to preach and to devote themselves to the ministry of souls.⁽³⁾ Had not St. Bernard himself, the greatest preacher of the twelfth century, expressly forbidden his monks to preach? In general, the orientation of monks toward the priesthood and sacerdotal functions did not meet with favor.⁽⁴⁾ Even with them, however, the stir of these aspirations could not be controlled. Their spokesmen went so far as to wish to make preaching and the ministry of souls the prerogative of monks.⁽⁵⁾ In fine, they arrived at the same conclusion as the canons regular: whoever would follow Christ in imitation of the apostles must lead an apostolic life in poverty and austerity.

The very foundation of Prémontré, that is, as primitively conceived by its founder, was perhaps more capable of the desired synthesis of monastic asceticism and apostolic activity. The Premonstratensians, unlike the canons regular, could have built a centralized institution that would render possible an energetic and organized apostolate. Moreover, their asceticism and their rigorous poverty, resembling that of the Cistercians, was in contrast to the spendthrift and worldly manners prevalent in certain religious circles and especially among the clergy. If the Order, for all its capacity, did not accomplish the renewal called for in the pastoral ministry, this failure was on account of the dominance of the Cistercian influence, reactionary as it was toward the apostolate. There were other causes, among which the love for solitude was not the least. As far as we can judge now, the Premonstratensians

chose country places for their cloisters,(6) And yet, as we have noted, the center of the cultural and religious life, with its own peculiar exigencies, was then in the cities.

PAPAL EFFORTS

Evidently the Church could not be satisfied with ensuring greater perfection of life only for the monks and clerics, although their reform was destined to redound to the welfare of the whole Church. The needs of the faithful required a particular solicitude. It was not given to the popes of the twelfth century to effect a fundamental reorganization of the pastoral ministry and preaching. Yet they did not neglect to take advantage of opportunities as these occurred, and to give their support and their approval to a number of remarkable preachers and apostles. Toward the end of the century, when a certain lull ensued in political affairs, they endeavored to appoint and send individual preachers or even whole groups of missionaries to strengthen the faith in threatened areas, to convert heretics, and to preach the gospel in new territories.

In these original experiments sponsored by the popes, we can distinguish three classes of workers: apostolic preachers, missionary bands, and converted heretics, authorized by the Church to preach.

APOSTOLIC PREACHERS

The apostolic preachers, called also itinerant preachers, showed a marked predilection for poverty. The first in the twelfth century was Robert of Arbrissel (d. 1117), a man of powerful personality, fortified with sound knowledge and endowed with an extraordinary gift of eloquence.(7) These traits were combined with a most severe asceticism, grounded in solid spirituality. As a young archdeacon of Rennes, he had manifested his zeal against simony and other vices of the clergy and thus earned for himself the hostility of his confreres. After the death of his bishop he retired into solitude in the forest of Caron, where his renown and his sermons drew to him a number of disciples. With Robert at their head they soon formed a community of canons regular.(8)

ROBERT OF ARBRISSEL

Early in 1096, when Pope Urban II was at Angers, he heard Robert spoken of, and asked that he come to preach before a vast audience. Urban at once recognized the worth and distinction of the man and resolved that his power should not be lost in desert places. The Pope appointed him apostolic preacher with a world-wide mission to announce the word of God.(9) From then on Robert led an itinerant life, devoting himself whole-heartedly and without respite to prayer and to preaching.(10) To be freer for the work, he relinquished the direction of his community.(11) His word and example led great numbers to renounce the world; these he settled in several communities, especially in his foundation of Fontevault.(12) Henceforth they were to live by the labor of their hands, without assured revenues, in imitation of Christ. Tirelessly and with irresistible power he went on preaching. His must have been a magnetic influence.(13) Fresh and captivating, his words made the allegories of his contemporaries seem lifeless.(14) It was not Robert's way to stir and thunderously move his hearers, only to abandon them afterward to the insecurity of unfortified souls. When he had drawn them from their sins, he communicated a doctrine breathing only of the Gospel.(15) He endeavored especially to imbue them with a true spirit of poverty. Not monks alone in their renouncement of personal property were called to live in this spirit, but even the rich of this world.(16) Robert wished that his disciples should be known merely as "the poor of Christ."(17) The titles of abbot and lord he had himself refused, keeping only that of master.(18) Poor, without possessions, without a country, he desired to be a father to those whom an unhappy destiny had reduced to such a state. He would be all to them.(19) Robert's

appearance gave his teaching a more gripping force. Barefoot, dressed in coarse garments, he traversed the countryside. As a sign of penance, a flowing beard framed his face emaciated from fasting.(20)

Although Fontevrault played only a minor part in his life, and its establishment was largely owing to events of the moment, later history has preserved the name of Robert of Arbrissel rather in virtue of his title as founder of this new congregation. Preaching, the lifelong work to which he remained faithful even to his last breath, was pursued by no society of itinerant preachers. The fire of enthusiasm which he had enkindled died with him.

From among his companions figures arose, it is true; their activity, in the domain of preaching, was of short duration. Bernard of Thiron (d. 1117), a former abbot, became founder of a monastery and again passed from the apostolic scene.(21) Like Robert, he must have received the mission of preaching from the Pope. In this connection we learn that the activity of an itinerant preacher was not limited to the sermon: it embraced also all the sacerdotal functions (confession, imposition of penances, baptism). The faithful had to provide for his support by their alms.(22) Mendicant preaching was already introduced.

Out of Robert's entourage there came still another preacher, Vitalis of Savigny (d. 1122). A remarkably well-educated man,(23) he frequently conferred with the other two preachers on ecclesiastical or pastoral questions.(24) His was perhaps the most ardent of all the companies. The preachers worked on a sort of relay system to which the term "perpetual preaching" might almost be applied.(25) Their circuits carried them as far as England. Though constrained like Robert to found a convent, Vitalis did not abandon his apostolate.

Men of holy life, these preachers were cultured and sincere, understanding full well the needs of their time. In their person the ideal of the poor and apostolic preacher was even then realized. Not any of them, however, thought of perpetuating his work in an institution. The difficulties were still too great; the time was not yet ripe.(26)

ST. NORBERT

The earnest tones of the itinerant preachers were still resounding in France, when in Germany, at the Council of Fritzlar (1118), a canon, Norbert of Xanten (d. 1134), was denounced for preaching without authorization.(27) Since he was not a monk, he was reprovved also for dressing like one, and for leading a vagabond life. Thus condemned, all activity was henceforth forbidden him. Norbert then went to France where he found Pope Gelasius II and asked for authority to preach. It was granted.(28) He was on the road at once and, furrowing the North of France, he preached everywhere, going barefoot, in a coarse habit. He took the imitation of Christ and His apostles literally. But even ahead of poverty he ranked preaching, for it makes the true apostle.(29)

The esteem of Callistus II for itinerant preachers seems not to have equaled that of his predecessors. He wished that Norbert should no longer travel about alone, independent of any regular community. Then it was that Norbert founded Prémontré.(30) But, under the circumstances in which the foundation was made, it required of him at least a partial renouncement of his ideal of apostolic preacher. The Cistercians, to whom he was allied, tried even to win him entirely to their way of life.(31) Evidently that would have meant the end of a preaching program. Norbert himself did not abandon preaching,(32) but his sons could exercise it only within the limits of the parishes which they administered.(33) Far from favoring an intensive ministry of souls, since their work was largely confined to country parishes, this situation occasioned long conflicts between the bishops and the clergy of the Premonstratensian parishes, who were exempt from episcopal jurisdiction.(34) After the

death of the founder, the Order tended more and more toward the ascetic and monastic ideal of the Cistercians.

The priest Lambert of Liège, called le Bègue or the Stammerer (d. 1177), developed an entirely new type of preaching.(35) Bernard of Thiron had already made some attempts at an apostolate among workmen;(36) but Lambert devoted himself directly to this ministry in quite an original manner. Son of a workman himself, he was always proud of his station and cherished the views of life current therein. As a priest he labored almost exclusively among his own class, which was acquiring more and more importance.(37) He restored and furnished a little dilapidated church which he had rented; then he employed even greater care to have divine services carried on with dignity; he endeavored above all to permeate the entire life of the workmen with religious inspiration. In view of this, he went so far as to translate into the vulgar tongue a part of Holy Scripture.(38) People were eager to hear his sermons; they besieged his little church. This is the more readily understandable since the local clergy, impoverished in zeal, had by an unworthy life forfeited the last semblance of authority. The jealousy of his fellow priests, exasperated by the sight of their empty churches and scant offerings, soon made it impossible for him to continue where he was. His active participation in the reform movement, patronized by the popes, heightened still more the hostility of the clergy.(39) They took his church from him because he refused to pay the higher rent demanded under pretext of his greater affluence. He was assigned a little benefice in the country. His activity in the city went on, nevertheless, with greater intensity.(40) This complication and the growing opposition of the clergy then decided his destiny. To strike at him more easily, they accused him of heresy. Lambert appealed to the Pope, who had no difficulty in penetrating the machinations of the accusers. He cleared Lambert and even gave him permission to preach anywhere.(41) Having escaped from prison, Lambert had been able to present himself before the Curia to make his defense in person. But, exhausted by sickness and the severity of his confinement, he died on his return journey.(42) A fruitful apostolate, a spiritual ministry timed to the needs of the day and calculated to arrest among urban groups the progress of Catharist and Waldensian errors, thus came to a premature and tragic close.

FOULQUES DE NEUILLY

Foulques de Neuilly (d. 1202) met less opposition. Jacques de Vitry gives a whole chapter in his *Historia Occidentalis* (43) to this "Curé of Ars" of the twelfth century. He finds in this country priest, only fairly talented and moderately educated, but animated by a fiery zeal, a restorer and a prophet whom God raised up for the condemnation of slothful priests and bishops. The parish church of Neuilly, scene of Foulques' first labors, was soon too small to hold the faithful who flocked to hear him preach. In the country round there was not a corner to which his word and his appeal had not penetrated. His efforts almost succeeded in moving, Paris, where the morality was far from exemplary. The people revered him as a saint who performed miracles. The same good will was accorded to the disciples who aided him when he no longer found it possible by himself to satisfy all the demands for preaching. But the attitude of one of their number, who bartered the poverty of the apostolic preacher for the prebendal income of a canon and a chancellor, brought them and their work into disrepute. It soon spent itself, leaving no promise for the future.(44)

The appearance of the preachers whose figures have been here sketched, lasted no longer than a shooting star in a night sky. For a moment the world lent them its ear. Their irreproachable conduct and their poverty, in sharp contrast to the rapacity and the corrupt manners of the age, won the immediate confidence of the faithful. But they vanished almost as quickly as they arose and, even if the ministry of one or the other survived for a little while, it was not long enough for a world hungering for a holy life and daily crying for the bread of truth. However, the activity of isolated

apostles, mighty and fruitful, was far from being even remotely sufficient. It was like a drop of water falling on a burning rock.

THE MISSIONS

It was the work of Innocent III to mobilize more numerous troops to carry out his designs. His predecessors had left it to him to solve the problem of the crusades. Shortly after his enthronement, he sought to engage therein the services of Foulques de Neuilly, known to him through his preaching. Wishing to give the preaching of the proposed crusade a broader foundation and to further ensure its success, he charged him to recruit among the monks and canons men who were able to assist him in his office.[\(45\)](#) In the following year (1099) Foulques went to the general chapter of Cîteaux, but he met a refusal. Such an activity, he was told, was not in line with the work of the Order. Moreover, the Order had already received from the Pope particular missions connected with the work of the crusade. As a matter of fact, Innocent III had already confided the preaching of the crusade to a certain number of Cistercian abbots.[\(46\)](#) But that did not satisfy him. His high regard for the Cistercians manifested itself in a ceaseless effort to direct their energies toward apostolic work. He cherished the hope that their rigorous and exemplary life, sustained by solid instruction, would yield particularly effective preachers.[\(47\)](#)

Soon it was to the bishops that the Pope turned in the hope of arousing them to unusual sacrifices. In the year 1205 Innocent III communicated to the French episcopate an urgent appeal for preachers the appeal had come from the Roman Emperor of the East, Baldwin I.[\(48\)](#) It was a call to them to choose from the ranks of their clergy men of approved knowledge and morals, full of zeal for souls, who could be sent to Constantinople as missionaries.[\(49\)](#) About the same time he tried to obtain from the University of Paris, on behalf of the Emperor, masters who would undertake a reform of studies.[\(50\)](#)

Meanwhile the plight of the Church in southern France gave cause for deeper concern. Innocent III had made it the object of closest study from the beginning of his pontificate, and he resolved to check the ruin with all the forces at his command.[\(51\)](#) After delegating the two Cistercians, Rainier and Guy,[\(52\)](#) without delay he sent Peter of Castelnau (who became a Cistercian later on),[\(53\)](#) giving him full powers in the threatened territory. In July, 1200, still another legate was appointed for this region, John Cardinal of St. Prisca.[\(54\)](#) But nowhere did they meet with success. Three years later, Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, both Cistercians, were still working in the name of the Pope and fighting heresy. With the appointment of Arnold, the abbot general of Cîteaux, as papal legate, the Cistercians were given a monopoly, as it were, of the missions among the Albigenses, and in the Pope's mind this was destined to be the "mission of honor" of the Order.[\(55\)](#) But persistent failure had a demoralizing effect on the workers. More than once they asked the Pope to let them resign.[\(56\)](#) Innocent never weakened; vigorously he exhorted them to persevere. With the arrival of Diego and of Dominic the mission took new life. Its development is given special study elsewhere in this history.

Another task which Innocent III assigned to the Cistercians was better suited to their abilities. It was a question of combining colonization and missionary activities in East Prussia. In a letter to the Archbishop of Gnesen the Pope recommended some Cistercian monks who had carried on a promising apostolate.[\(57\)](#) These religious were decried by some of their own brethren who contended for observance and maintained that the purpose of the Order was incompatible with the ministry of souls; the Pope took occasion to write about it in 1212 to the general chapter of the abbots.[\(58\)](#) He ordered them to raise no obstacle to the apostolic work of the Archbishop of Gnesen, but, on the contrary, to give him brothers for his field of labor and in every way possible to support the project in East Prussia.[\(59\)](#) He likewise recommended to the benevolence of the abbots the Cistercian missionaries in Pomerania and Poland. At the same time he arranged that others should be sent to preach in Tuscany,

and was not unmindful of the Cistercian workers in Languedoc, whom he incorporated at length into the local hierarchy. Honorius III continued Innocent's policy to align the religious orders in the service of preaching. Soon, however, he ceased to apply to the bishops.(60) There arose two new Orders, the Preachers and the Minors. Original in nature and propagated through an amazingly rapid expansion, they would realize beyond all expectation the missionary designs of the papacy.

THE HUMILIATI

Of all the attempts of Innocent to restore the ministry of souls and regain the territories lost to heresy, by far the most interesting was the incorporation of converted heretics into the organism of the teaching Church. Between 1160 and 1170 there appeared in northern Italy the lay religious movement of the Humiliati, which was scarcely distinguishable from that of the Waldenses. Some of its agents sought an approval of their way of living from Alexander III on the occasion of the Third Council of the Lateran. The Pope acceded to their request, but at the same time expressly forbade them to hold assemblies and to preach in public; but this was precisely what they wished to have the right to do. This prohibition was not observed, and on that account they incurred (1184) excommunication by Lucius III,(61) Innocent III's policy seemed to embrace a vast strategy for recalling to the right path and reuniting to the Church the various heretical groups, notably the popular movements veering toward heresy.(62) The first fruit of his efforts was the reconciliation of the Humiliati. It came about in 1201, owing to the broad spirit of understanding evidenced by the Pope in tolerating their most cherished customs. In the matter of lay preaching, his concessions went still further. He accorded precisely what Lucius III had refused. the right of assembling and the right of preaching.(63) For the First Order (on the model of canons regular with rules or customs peculiar to the Humiliati), the authorization came almost as a matter of course. It was not of great importance perhaps for the Second Order of monastic and cloistered life. But it was quite otherwise for the third group, by far the most numerous, composed of laymen living in the world. With this step, the position of the Church toward lay preaching was profoundly modified. True, there was an essential difference between the sermon on faith and the discourse for edification, the type to which laymen were restricted,(64) but never before had such preaching activity been authorized for laymen. No longer was there any need of a "mission" from a bishop, but only of a permission, which must not be refused to the preachers of the Humiliati.

An army of zealous laymen, aiming first at putting the teaching of the Gospel into practice in their own lives, an ideal militia for Catholic action, thus put itself at the command of the hierarchy. They were ready not only to oppose the heretics on their own ground, but also to supply a haven to revive morality in the world called Christian. The hopes of the Pope were realized only in part.

This experiment entailed another consequence. Since it had been possible to reconcile the Humiliati, why not the French Waldenses? The difficulties to be overcome in the second case were, however, more considerable. The Waldenses did not form an organic community centered in one region, as did the Humiliati. It was not easy to reach the preaching Waldenses who had neither hearth nor home, nor their adherents who soon spread through nearly the whole of Europe. On the other hand, the kind of preaching life inaugurated by Diego and Dominic in the mission to the Albigenses under the authority of Pope Innocent had, on one important point, minimized the distance separating the Waldenses from the Church.(65) Did not the Catholic Preachers in their mendicant life show an evangelical spirit particularly esteemed by the Poor Men of Lyons?

In 1207, the dispute at Pamiers between Diego and the Waldenses occasioned the return to the Church of Durandus of Huesca with several companions. The attitude of Diego and Dominic smoothed the path of their return, perhaps, by the guarantee that they might pursue within the Church their customary mode of living.(66) In fact, the delegation which they sent to Rome (1208) obtained this

authorization. Since numbers of them were clerics and educated men, they were authorized to resume their preaching activity after they had abjured their errors and promised obedience to the Church.(67) A type of preaching was permitted in accord with their rank as bishops, priests, or laymen. They founded schools of doctrine which they directed themselves.(68) Their organization thus provided for teaching and preaching as their essential function. It was an exceedingly bold gesture on the part of the Pope to authorize an association of almost independent preachers. Difficulties of the heretics, and outwardly their lives differed little from those this caused frequent misunderstanding, Prelates saw their own prerogatives and particularly their privilege of preaching the faith infringed by these new independent preachers, whose zeal became for certain bishops an unwelcome reproach. Their mistrust led them to see in these troublesome competitors only disguised sectarians, and they seized every occasion, even the least misstep of the "Poor Catholics," to denounce them immediately to the Pope and to condemn the entire work *en masse*.(69)

BERNARD PRIM

While the bishops showed little enthusiasm for the experiments of the Pope and evinced no disposition to support this method for winning over heretics, Innocent III scored still another success. Bernard Prim of Milan, a layman, was preaching without authorization against the Waldenses in southern France.(70) His name was listed among the miscreants. Accusation was also brought against him for some words that savored of heresy. Bernard, however, never had any thought of separating himself from the Church and promised to submit to her orders even in the least things. Later, on June 18, 1210, his company was approved by the Pope, and a rule of life was granted with a right to preach and to conduct schools like those of the Poor Catholics. Nothing further is known of their activity.

Innocent III was certainly the last one to believe that everything essential was now guaranteed for the future. Neither the problem of heresies nor that of preaching and the pastoral ministry had been solved, even in part. The dearth of capable preachers and -rectors was as universal as the need felt for them, and that throughout the whole Church. The Fourth Lateran Council, therefore, could not pass over the question in silence; it had to take a stand. It could not do otherwise than strive to remedy the crisis by lawful means, through the intermediary of the only organ competent and responsible, the hierarchy.(71) The idea of providing auxiliaries to the bishop in his office of preaching was an old one and thoroughly comprehensible. Would it not suffice to organize on a permanent basis a practice which had been applied up to that time only in exceptional cases? Quite recently the experiments of the Bishop of Toulouse had demonstrated the benefits to be derived from such an organization. A certain length of time would have to elapse before the new prescription could have any effect. Negligence in regard to the decree of the Third Lateran Council on masters for schools was being paid for dearly. Where could preachers be found when nothing had been done to train them?(72) Could the Church afford to wait still longer without risking grave dangers? Was the Pope of a mind to wait?

How much hope did Innocent III place in canon 10? We do not know; no more than we know what passed at that hour between him and St. Dominic. However it was, Honorius III carried the work of his predecessor to completion when he confirmed the Order of Preachers. And certainly, he did not act without reason or without previous recognition of the value and the necessity of such an institution. We cannot help feeling that Innocent III, in a methodical way, tried to discover a new form of preaching adapted to his time; and St. Dominic's foundation emerged as the crowning success of those attempts. At the same time, it appeared as the product of the ideas then widely diffused and dominant, as the ripe fruit of reflection and experience. A final review of all that has been considered in this chapter will make us more aware of this truth.

THE LAST CARD

With the appearance of the first itinerant preachers, ideas and tendencies were set in motion which forecast change. Evangelical Poverty, imitation of the apostles, preaching and a free pastoral ministry, that is, independent of the bishop, all of these were new and characteristic practices that had come to stay. The earliest attempts to realize this ideal were not without excesses and extremes which condemned them to remain merely isolated ventures. A want of a certain talent for organization likewise rendered impossible a priori the continuance of the agglomerations of wandering preachers. Lambert of Liège and Foulques de Neuilly recognized the need of an intensive ministry among souls in the cities; they showed the way by their example and pointed out the means, but always and everywhere there was a dearth of workers, in the face of which the most zealous men could accomplish nothing. The Church found only a few free lances who put themselves spontaneously at her service; for the rest, she had to appeal to the good will of apostolic monks.

The monks, as such, could not overnight habituate themselves to work among souls. Their ascetic and contemplative lives, their learning which was often profound, and their knowledge of Scripture should have been the very best equipment for a fruitful apostolate. But it was neither their vocation nor their office. Pope Innocent III was wrong in almost forcing them to it. For the battle with the heretics there was need especially of a mobile and trained body, one clothed in the armor of poverty and able to fight them on their own ground. Innocent III purposely created such an instrument in companies like the Humiliati and the Poor Catholics. But it fell short of the need. Only the Humiliati had any length of existence. Their efficiency, too, was limited in geographical extent and in social range. The Poor Catholics and the company of Bernard Prim never succeeded in clearing themselves from the suspicion of heresy, and clashed against the exasperated resistance of the bishops. The lay element weighed heavily in their ranks, and with good reason the hierarchy stood on guard against their preaching.

As to the secular clergy, they were not in a position to fulfill this task alone or to meet every need. Unfavorable as the situation was, would even an application of canon 10 of the Fourth Lateran Council have achieved important results? The weapon to be forged for every exigency and immediate service had to possess all the qualities which had proved their worth in earlier tests.

Nor could the need have been filled simply by ascetic missionaries, living in imitation of the apostles, contemplatives, supported by a profound knowledge of Holy Scripture, and intent on consecrating themselves wholly and exclusively to preaching and the salvation of souls. What had to be formed was a mobile company, under the government of a single head, who could utilize it at his will wherever there was call for it. If the demands of the towns were to be satisfied, then urban centers should be expected to yield recruits. But above all, it was essential, if the lay preaching movement was to be kept from extending further and increasing the number of dissidents, that this company of auxiliaries should rise out of the very bosom of the Church and from the ranks of the hierarchy.

In confiding to an Order the work of preaching, which had been guarded by the bishops from the first centuries as their personal office, and in making the preachers dependent on the papacy alone, the popes were truly playing their last card. Never would they have been equal to the move had they not been convinced that the good of the Church required it, and that the spirit and organization of the Order of Preachers corresponded fully to the need.

NOTES

1 Anselm of Havelberg, *Epist. Apolog. pro Canonicis regul.*, CLXXXVIII, 1124.

2 Hauck, IV, 367. But that was not the only reason. There were bishops who looked with suspicion on all that was monastic, and who, on that account, forbade the Canons regular to engage in the apostolate. Cf. Ivo of Chartres, *PL*, CLXII, 88 ff., 216 f.

3 *Vita apostolica*, *PL*, CLXX, 609 ff. Rudbertus, *Quaestio utrum monachis liceat praedicare* (Endres, pp. 145 ff.) Honorius of Autun, *Quod monachis liceat praedicare* (*ibid.*, pp. 147 ff.).

4 "And we know that the duty of the monk is not to preach but to weep; . . . therefore it is surely clear and certain that it is not proper for a monk to preach publicly, nor is it fitting for a novice, or permissible for one not sent." St. Bernard, *Sermo 64 in Cantic.*, *PL*, CLXXXIII, 1085; cf. *PL*, CLXXXII, 570. "Why does the desire of the clericature so upset modern monks that worthy or unworthy they all wish to be ordained priests?" (Martène, *Anecd. V, Dialogus*, 1626.) "The monk who is worthy to be ordained does not become a priest unless compelled" (*ibid.*).

5 "And because the word 'monk' stands for one in a state of perfection, and the word 'cleric' indicates an office which those not perfect ought not to have, therefore the clericature properly belongs to monks" (Martène, *Anecdota*, V, 1644; *Vita apostolica*, *PL*, CLXX, 642).

6 Schnuerer, *Franz von Assisi*, p. 12.

7 Baudry; *PL*, CLXII, 1043 ff. Andrew, *Vita B. Roberti*; *PL*, CLXII, 1057 ff. Cf. Walter, *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*, I, 9 ff.

8 "Moreover those assembled were called regulars, because they strove to live regularly according to the custom of the primitive Church. The 'swarm,' therefore, fleeing the allurements of the world, became a congregation of canons. Robert was at their head, teaching them with honied speech like the most prudent bee" (Baudry; *PL*, CLXII 1050).

9 Robert "therefore spoke appealingly to the people and greatly pleased the Lord Pope, who recognized that the Holy Spirit opened the preacher's mouth. At length the Pope spoke the word of authority and enjoined upon him the office of preaching, thus commending the ministry to one somewhat inclined to resist such an obedience. Afterward he decided to sow the word of God himself, and wherever he went, he exhorted others to zeal of this kind" (Baudry; *PL*, CLXII, 1051; cf. Walter, I, 117 f.).

10 "Truly whatever might occur, the Lord Robert never let himself be diverted either from preaching or from prayer, but, wholly dedicated to a life of strenuous activity, he made his rounds which took him through regions near and far" (Baudry, *B. Roberti*; *PL*, CLXII 1054).

11 *Ibid.*, 1051.

12 *Ibid.*

13 For the Lord had given him so great a grace of holy preaching that when he addressed a general sermon to the people, each one felt that he heard what was needful to himself (Andrew, *op. cit.*, *PL*, CLXH, 1068).

14 Walter, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 124 ff.

16 *Ibid.*, pp. 126 f.

17 "Swayed by his words, the crowd of those renouncing their sins increased until those whom he willed to be known by no other name than "the poor of Christ" were almost innumerable" (Baudry; *PL*, CLXII, 1053).

18 "They called the prelate their 'master' only, for he was not accustomed to being addressed as lord or abbot" (*ibid.*, 1052).

19 "Robert, poor in all things for Christ, an exile from his country and his own people . . . traveling without any money, built many mansions for the poor out of love for Christ" (*ibid.*, 1056). "Truly he evangelized the poor, called to the poor, assembled the poor" (*ibid.*, 1055).

20 "For a long time, he did not ride a mount, nor did he taste wine or delicate foods. He went about barefoot, garbed in a rough tunic and cloak. . . . He carried on his fasts, frequently spent the night in prayer, and chastised his body by protracted abstinence" (*ibid.*, 1052; Walter, *op. cit.*, p. 128).

21 *Vita beati Bernardi fundatoris congregationis de Tironio in Gallia auctore Gaotrido Grosso; PL*, CLXXII, 1363 ff. Cf. Walter. II, 1 ff.

22 "The Pope enjoined this office upon him: that he should preach to the people, hear confessions, give penances, baptize, make the rounds of the territory, and fulfill carefully all that should be attended to by a public preacher. And after he had bestowed the task of the apostolate upon him, unwilling that support should fail a vicar of the apostles whom he destined to preach without money, he recommended that he should accept food for the body from those whom he would refresh with the word of salvation" (*ibid.*, 1403). Since this commission did not represent an isolated instance, no one should, without special reason, question it, as Walter does (II, 4 f., 52 f.).

The opponents of the itinerant preachers reproached them for living on alms and for carelessness in the matter of dress, unworthy of a priest. Nor was there any greater regard for traveling monks in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Cf. Walter, I, 99; II, 52; Mansi, XXII, 828, 848, 908.

23 Walter, II, 66 ff.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 83.

25 *Ibid.*, pp. 86 f.

26 All the itinerant preachers encountered more or less opposition from the bishops or secular clergy. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 89; *PL*, CLXXII, 1398 ff.

27 Hauck, IV, 369 ff. *Vita Norberti* (A), *Mon. Ger.* XII, 663-703.

28 "He also obtained from him the free right of preaching, which the Pope confirmed by the authority of his letters." *Mon. Ger. hist., Scriptorum*, XII, 675.

29 Hauck, IV, 371.

30 Walter, II, 127; Hauck, IV, 372 f.

31 *Vita Norberti* (A), *Mon. Ger. hist., Scriptorum*, XII, 683.

32 Walter, II, 128.

33 Hauck, IV, 379.

34 *Ibid.*, p. 380.

35 Greven, pp. 158 ff.

36 "Whence the workers freely gathered round him, carpenters as well as black, smiths, sculptors and goldsmiths, painters and stonecutters, vinedressers and farmers" (Vitalis, Bk. VIII, chap. 27).

37 Creven, p. 165.

38 *Ibid.*, p. 169.

39 At the Diocesan Synod of Liège (March 13, 1166) he made an energetic appeal for an application of the prescriptions of the councils and the popes. As the assembled clergy did not wish to bear references to these matters, he abandoned the meeting with a few partisans as a sign of protest.

40 Greven, p. 175. They desired also (very unjustly) to accuse him of ignorance: "Who is that country-bred fellow who presumes, unschooled, to usurp the authority and office of preaching?" *Vita beatae Odiliae viduae Leodiensis, Analecta Bollandiana*, XIII (1894), 206. Cf. Greven, p. 181.

41 It was Callistus III (1168-79), antipope of Alexander III, but recognized at Liège. Greven, pp. 163, 181.

42 *Ibid.*, p. 184.

43 Vitry, chap. 8 (pp. 280 ff.).

44 "But his disciples whom he sent to preach, like the apostles of Christ, were received by all with the greatest honor and reverence. One of them, however, . . . Master Pierre de Roissy, brought stain on his glory. For he who had been zealous on the road of perfection and a preacher of poverty, was by reason of his preaching loaded with gifts and favors, and made canon and chancellor of the Church of Chartres; and he who should have produced light out of smoke, produced smoke out of light. On this account he not only rendered his teaching contemptible but brought much disfavor upon the other disciples of the aforesaid Foulques" (*ibid.*, p. 287).

45 "By our apostolic authority we grant you a plenary faculty that with the counsel and consent of our most beloved son, Peter, Cardinal Deacon of Santa Maria in Via Lata and Legate of the Apostolic See, whom we have appointed especially for the discharge of this ministry, you may freely take as your auxiliaries, from the black as well as from the white monks, or canons regular, some whom you consider suitable for preaching, notwithstanding anyone's resistance or appeal" (Innocent III [November 5, 1198]; *PL*, CCXIV, 375).

46 Cf. Innocent III, letter to all the abbots of the Cistercian Order, assembled in general chapter (*PL*, CCXIV, 336).

47 "We rejoice and we give thanks to the Giver of all good gifts, considering that in your Order there are a great number of men filled with an enlightened zeal for God, powerful in work and word, and

ready to give to whoever asks it a reason for the faith and the hope in which we abide; men in whom, we believe, charity grows strong to prepare them to give their lives for their brethren, if the needs of the Church demand it; who are so much the more fitted to confound the fabricators of false dogmas as they are above the least reproach from a jealous adversary; they enjoy a good reputation even among people at large, because in them holiness of life is in harmony with sound thought, and their life vivifies their teaching so that their word is living, efficacious, and more piercing than a two-edged sword; their teaching penetrates their life so that men can read in their deeds what their sermons explain" (Innocent III, *epist.*, VII, 76, *Abbati Cisterciensi, et monachis Fontisfrigidi*; *PL*, CCXV, 359).

48 Innocent III, *Universis archiepiscopis, et aliis in Francia* (May 25, 1205); *PL*, CCXV, 636.

49 "He begged that we should send to Constantinople approved and religious men, from the Cistercians, Cluniacs, canons regular, and other religious orders for the purpose of establishing the truth of the Catholic faith and strengthening it in perpetuity" (*ibid.*, 637).

50 Innocent III, *Magistris et scholaribus Parisiensibus (ut in Graeciam accedant pro studio reformando unde exordium habuit)*; *ibid.* This letter is not dated but it is doubtless from the same period as the preceding.

51 Innocent III (elected Pope January 7, 1198) wrote about April 1, 1198, to the Archbishop of Auch, concerning the heretics in southern France. Potthast, no. 69. Cf. Hurter, *Histoire du pape Innocent III et de son siècle*, II, 305, 341 f.

52 Potthast, no. 95 (April 21, 1198).

53 Guiraud, *L'Inquisition*, p. 376.

54 Potthast, no. 1092 (July 12, 1200).

55 *Ibid.*, no. 2225 (May 29, 1204).

56 *Ibid.*, no. 2391 (January 26, 1205); Cernai, no. 20.

57 Innocent III, *Gnesnensi archiepiscopo* (September 4, 1210); *PL*, CCXVI, 315. Cf. Winter, *Die Cistercienser des nordöstlichen Deutschlands*, I, 218 ff.

58 Innocent III, *Universis abbatibus in generali Cisterciensi capitulo constitutis* (August 10, 1212); *PL*, CCXVI, 668.

59 Through our apostolic letters we command that you do nothing to hinder in any way those brethren whom the aforesaid Archbishop has deemed worthy to be recommended to you in his letters; neither should the other brethren of your Order be allowed to prevail on them to any degree to prevent their preaching the gospel" (*ibid.*, 669).

60 Cf. Potthast, no. 6249 (May 12, 1220); Theiner, *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, 1859. I, 27.

61 "At that time there were certain citizens in the states of Lombardy who elected to live a kind of religious life in their homes with their families. Refraining from lies, oaths, and lawsuits, they were content with a simple garb, and united for the defense of the Catholic faith. Going to the Pope they

besought him to confirm their way of life. The Pope yielded to their request that they might pursue their aim in humility and honor, but he expressly forbade their holding meetings, and strictly prohibited their presuming to preach in public. They rendered themselves disobedient, however, by despising the apostolic command and for this reason drew upon themselves the penalty of excommunication." (Chron. Laud.) *Monumenta Germaniae historica., Scriptorum, XXVI*, 449 ff.; Mansi, XXII, 477.

62 Cf. Grundmann, pp. 72 ff.

63 Tiraboschi, *Vetera Humiliatorum monumenta*, II, 128 ff., 135 ff., 139 ff.

64 "It will also be your custom every Sunday to assemble in a suitable place to hear the word of God. One or several of the brethren proved in the faith and practiced in religion, who may be influential by word and example, may with the permission of the bishop of the diocese propose an exhortation to those who have assembled to bear the word of God, advising and encouraging them in upright manners and deeds of piety, provided they do not speak concerning articles of faith and the sacraments. Moreover, we forbid that any bishop, contrary to the form prescribed, should hinder the brethren from engaging in this kind of exhortation, since, according to the apostle, the spirit ought not to be extinguished" (*ibid.*, II, 133).

65 Grundmann, p. 92.

66 *Ibid.*, p. 105.

67 From this time they also had the name "Poor Catholics"; cf. Pierron, pp. 51 ff.

68 *Ibid.*, pp. 57 ff.

69 *Ibid.*, pp. 32 ff., 109 ff.

70 Cf. Innocent III, epist. XIII, 94; *PL*, CCXVI, 291, 648, 668. Cf. Grundmann, pp. 118 ff.

71 Canon 10; Hefele-Leclerq, V, 1340; Schroeder, *Councils*, pp. 251 f.

72 Canon 18; Hefele-Leclerq, V, 1101; Schroeder, *Councils*, p. 229.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XVIII

The Ordo Praedicatorum

THE TERM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

WHEN Foulques and Dominic set out for Rome and the Lateran Council, they intended to ask the Pope to confirm the Toulouse society for preaching.(1) Often in their more intimate conversations on its subject, they had sketched projects for the future.(2) Therefore we should not be surprised to find that even before the journey to Rome they had made plans for the work and the name of the new Order. The expression used by Jordan, "which was to be called and would be an Order of Preachers," need not be thought of as a projection of later events to an earlier period, even though a year or two passed.(3) before the title *Ordo Praedicatorum* was officially conferred.

The term *ordo praedicatorum* and other terms like it were current in the twelfth century and had a precise meaning. It would be a mistake to identify this term with the title given to the Order of St. Dominic or to interpret the expression in the light of its present connotation. On the other hand, there exists a certain continuity of derivation. To discover what was then meant by *ordo praedicatorum*, we must recall the steps in the development of this idea.

Since the day Christ gave His apostles the command: "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations" (Matt. 28:19), preaching has been the most eminent office of the Church. One of the first decisions of the apostolic college concerned this duty and its organization (Acts 6:2 f.). That the twelve might be free to consecrate themselves wholly to preaching, they entrusted to deacons the care of the poor. The vocation of Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, was in a special sense to preach the gospel; that was his conviction.(4)

When St. Augustine speaks of preachers, *praedicatores veritatis*, he seems to be referring particularly to successors of the apostles.(5) For him, moreover, the preacher was the bishop.(6) Like the vocation of the apostles, that of the bishops was to feed the flock of Christ, to teach and direct the faithful.(7) Augustine vigorously defended the teaching mission of the bishop. It was not by chance that St. Paul associated "pastors" and "doctors" together (Ephes. 4:11). It was his purpose to convince others that the one office was inseparable from the other. The bishop was at once pastor and doctor.(8) The work of a doctor was to communicate to the faithful the revelation preserved in Holy Scripture, to explain the Sacred Books. The office of doctor was one with that of the preacher of the word (*veritatis*), the herald of the gospel of Christ.(9)

St. Jerome had treated the same thought. To fulfill a mission as the head of a Church, it was not enough to be holy. The shepherd had to be capable of edifying the flock entrusted to him by his knowledge and his word: he should be a "doctor." (10)

"He who neglects the preaching office assigned to him," says a work written for a bishop, "will perish with all those whom his inexcusable silence has caused to perish." However exemplary his life may be otherwise, that will hardly avail him; because he has not achieved his first and principal duty to announce the word of God to the faithful.(11) He must not excuse himself by reason of his inexperience or his want of oratorical gifts. The people really desire of their shepherds only the truth in an intelligible form. (12)

THE WORDS OF ST. GREGORY

Gregory the Great (d. 604) manifested a predilection for speaking of the messengers of the word of God and particularly under the formula, *ordo praedicatorum*. In all his works and notably in the commentary on the First Book of Kings,(13) he reverts to it frequently. Everywhere in the Sacred Books he found symbols and references to the preaching office. The great splendor of his writings, his authority and influence in the Middle Ages, warrant a more developed exposition of his views.

The doctrinal office of the Church, he says when interpreting St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (4:11), is entrusted to four classes of workers. In the beginning there were in the Church only apostles and prophets. They were soon aided by evangelists and doctors (who are not distinguished from pastors). The latter by their preaching and teaching communicate the rich treasure of Holy Scripture to the faithful, while the evangelists are entrusted with the missions and devote themselves to the instruction of the infidels and catechumens.(14) The doctors preach, and the preachers teach: this theme occurs repeatedly in all its varying contexts.(15) The one and the other are the same identical office; the same duties are proper to each; they require the same virtues. The two terms, "preacher" and "doctor," are synonymous.(16) Preaching was not to be confused with exhortation, which, without any special commission, any cleric and even any one of the faithful might have occasion to give to his neighbor.(17) Preaching in the true sense of the word meant an office, the object of a commission, a delegated duty. This office embraced all that pertained to the ministry of souls. The preacher or pastor was to instruct his people in truth and good morals, direct and defend them;(18) is if he found himself at the head of his Church it was precisely for that work.(19) Here we note how Gregory envisaged the "preachers-doctors" as the bishops exclusively. In other passages he explicitly reaffirmed this idea.(20)

Thus in the anointing of Saul he saw the consecration of bishops, wherein the ceremonies make the consecrated one appear as preacher and doctor.(21) To the unlearned, the bishop preached by the example of his life; to the learned, he opened the mysteries of Scripture by his knowledge.(22) Interpretation of these texts constituted one of the principal duties of the preacher, and it was in this function especially that he merited the title of doctor. If we recall that in patristic times preaching to the faithful consisted almost exclusively of explanation of Holy Scripture, we will understand the right and force of identifying the preacher and the doctor. The body of those who served the gospel by preaching and teaching was known, without distinction, either as the *ordo praedicatorum*(23) or as the *ordo doctorum*.(24) To the priests and prophets who constituted the order in the Old Testament,(25) Gregory related the "new order of preachers" and the "new order of doctors," interpreters of the Sacred Books and messengers of the new covenant.(26)

In the rich and multiple organism which the Church constitutes, soon and naturally the states, the groups, or the individuals devoting themselves to the same office were grouped under the accolade of the same *ordo*: for example, *ordo patrum*, *ordo prophetarum*, *ordo episcoporum*, *ordo continentium* (order of virgins), *ordo conjugatorum*, *ordo laïcorum*, and so on. The term designated a class, a category of men. We find mention of orders of this kind in widely different authors. But it seems that Gregory the Great was the first to group under the term *ordo praedicatorum* all those who devoted themselves to the office of preaching.(27)

SANCTUS PRAEDICATOR

Gregory assigned a special place in the Church to preachers who in an eminent degree realized the character of messengers and teachers of the gospel: the *sancti praedicatores*.(28) To give themselves body and soul to their office, they lived dead to the world and its vices, often renouncing every possession.(29) What an impression such a life would make on the clergy and laity of the eleventh and twelfth centuries may be imagined and particularly upon those who aimed at realizing more closely the primitive ideal of the apostles, and for whom a rich prelate was a scandal.

The right and duty of preaching belonged in the beginning only to the bishops, the very successors of the apostles. It is beyond doubt that simple priests and deacons could in certain circumstances -- not taking account of exceptional cases supernaturally inspired -- preach and explain the Sacred Books. The first Christian ages furnished more than one example of this practice, but it was always by delegation of a bishop and in place of him. However, the practice was not allowed to go on without a stir of objection. The preaching of the priest Augustine instead of and in place of his bishop caused quite a little scandal in North Africa.(30) Jerome inveighed, apparently without great success, against the custom of certain Churches where ,it was forbidden a priest to preach in the presence of the bishop.(31) At Rome in particular the privilege of the bishop(32) was watched over almost jealously. In the eighth century it still appeared necessary to appeal to the authority of Jerome to permit preaching by priests.(33)

THE PREACHER A TEACHER

From what has just been said, it is possible to picture the situation for the patristic period: the preacher was essentially the bishop. He alone preached by right of office. To announce the gospel was the most ancient and the first of the duties proper to him. That is why the *ordo praedicatorum* was confined to the hierarchical body constituted by the bishops. Except in place of the bishop and by his commission, no one could preach. The term *praedicatio* in the fullest sense of the word meant teaching Christian doctrine through whatever organs were designated for the work.(34) As ambassadors of Christ, the Word made flesh and Truth made manifest, as messengers of the gospel, they were called "preachers of the truth" and "preachers of the word." As an interpreter of Holy Scripture, the preacher earned the title of doctor. The "holy preacher" was the preacher who lived what he preached, who taught by word and example. According to the teaching of the Fathers, it was a duty always to listen to the words of the bishop, even though his life could not be proposed as a model. The preacher's authority and influence was more far-reaching when, not content merely to speak as an ambassador of Christ and in His name, he also truly imitated Christ in his life.

To the portrait of the preacher traced for us by the Fathers, especially by Gregory the Great, the following centuries did not add any essential traits. The same features were perpetually emphasized. Indeed, writers were often satisfied with simply reproducing the word-for-word sketch of earlier texts. A closer scrutiny, however, will reveal that, under the vesture of unchanging formulas, the concept of preaching was all the while in process of evolution. An examination and analysis of this development is the next step.

In the manner of Gregory the Great, Rabanus Maurus (d. 856) found in the Sacred Books foreshadowings and symbols of the order of preachers. The stewards of Solomon providing for the royal table represented the whole order of holy preachers, engaged in hard and unwearying labor to provide through tongue and pen whatever was needful for their neighbor.(35) It is interesting to note with what insistence Rabanus counted writers among those who fulfilled the work of the preachers. Perhaps he had in mind the monastic scribes of Fulda. Holy doctors and preachers, well versed in the Scriptures, will be armed for a successful attack against the wickedness and perfidy of the enemies of Christ.(36) To apostolic orthodoxy they will unite the strength of an exemplary life,(37) and through love of their neighbor they will strive by word and example to save sinners from perdition.(38) For men they hold the place of God; all owe them humble obedience.(39)

Peter Damian (d. 1072) desired that priests should be numbered in the *ordo praedicatorum*. In addition to the twelve apostles, did not Christ send the seventy disciples to preach? The seventy men whom Moses summoned at the command of the Lord, the twelve fountains and the seventy palm trees, were

they not allegories of the *ordo praedicatorum* formed by the bishops and the other ranks of the clergy?(40)

Peter leaping from the boat and walking on the sea to meet Jesus (Matt. 14:29) was for Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109) a typical figure of the order of preachers, hastening in the lead of the faithful toward the kingdom of heaven.(41) Gottfried, the abbot of Admont (d. 1165), as well as others,(42) recognized in the messengers sent by the king to the guests of the marriage feast (Matt. 22:3 f.) the likeness of the doctors and heralds of the truth. By their example and by their word they stirred the people to higher aspirations.(43) The preacher was the guardian of the vineyard; he was the leader and intermediary willed by God.(44)

BY WORD AND EXAMPLE

In this text and in a general way in the works of the last authors cited, there occur frequent references to the "holy preachers" or to the "holy doctors" who work or ought to work "by word and example." These expressions reflect, in part at least, the Gregorian reform then in course of development; for that movement considered chiefly an improvement in the morals of the clergy. These allusions may also have signified something deeper. All the writers quoted belonged to the cloister. Out of that environment in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries many voices rose to claim for the monks, the true imitators of the apostles, a share in the ministry of souls and in preaching. It would not be surprising if some of the texts reflected the influence of such ideas.

The glosses of Scripture show to what an extent the idea of *ordo praedicatorum* and of *ordo doctorum* was current in the twelfth century.(45) The sons of St. Dominic soon selected a large number of these texts and applied them to their Order. Most of them were drawn from the works of the Fathers, or at least inspired by them.

A passage from the *glossa ordinaria*, repeating an idea of Peter Damian, envisaged an expansion in the class of preachers. The case of the seventy disciples showed that the class of preachers was not constituted exclusively by the immediate successors of the apostles.(46) Apropos of St. Luke, 14:17, the gloss remarks that the servant sent to invite the guests signifies the *ordo praedicatorum* which will come at the end of time.(47) Cited also were a certain number of other texts taken from well-known authors. Other glosses contributed nothing essentially new.

In a letter which deserves particular attention because of its pronouncements on several problems of preaching, Innocent III refers to the *ordo praedicatorum*. Recalling that the most profound mysteries and the most sublime truths are hidden in Holy Scripture, and that eminent and instructed souls do not succeed in fully explaining them, the Pope counseled the laity to be on their guard against the temptation to wish to understand all and interpret all themselves. Therefore it would be still less permissible for men whose instruction is inadequate to take it upon themselves to preach and explain the Sacred Books to others. To each his place and his duty; beyond these limits, none ought to go. Since the duty of teaching and governing others was confided to a select number and since the *ordo doctorum* discharged one of the most important functions of the Church, it could not depend on the will of an individual to set himself up as a preacher.(48) Thus we find reiterated the traditional doctrine that the preacher of Holy Scripture, that is, the preacher in the strict sense of the word, is called "doctor." Moreover, it is especially in the bishops and generally in prelates that the office is invested. The point of view of the age of the Fathers still endured.

We may note, however, that among the preachers were numbered more and more persons who were not bishops. Of course it is understood that they had received the commission to preach from authorized superiors.

TOWARD A PREACHING SOCIETY

While the world of preachers was on the verge of a great expansion, at the same time it was being contracted within certain bounds. It had been given a limited determination by Rabanus Maurus, and the idea of *ordo praedicatorum*, or, to be more precise, that of *ordo* became more clearly defined, and little by little almost imperceptibly began to be associated with the idea of a group, that is, a community, properly so called, of preachers. A beginning of this idea is traceable in the writings of the commentators on the Apocalypse.

The list of writers who employed and identified the terms *ordo praedicatorum* and *ordo doctorum* could be extended.⁽⁴⁹⁾ Those we have mentioned are sufficient for our purpose. The group now about to claim all our interest includes the apocalyptic writers to whom we have just referred.

The turmoil of continual wars, the progress of Islamism, the growth of error everywhere, and more than anything else perhaps, the corrupt morals of the clergy, all contributed their share in the twelfth century to develop apocalyptic ideas and uneasy forecasts about the end of the world. Witness to this are the numerous commentaries on the Apocalypse, always a book of particular interest in periods of unrest.

Richard of St. Victor (d. 1173), referring to the seven angels of the Apocalypse (Apoc., chap. 8), gives a description of the *ordo praedicatorum*. Taken in chronological order, the angels constitute the *ordo praedicatorum* of all ages, from the time of Christ to the end of the world.⁽⁵⁰⁾ "First angel, first order of preachers," and so on.⁽⁵¹⁾ Each of the angels is characterized by a particular office according to the period in which he appears. With the appearance of the sixth and the seventh angel, the *ordo praedicatorum* is also called *ordo doctorum*.⁽⁵²⁾ Indeed, in these ages which immediately precede the coming of Antichrist, preachers and sacred masters are one in preaching and defending the faith.⁽⁵³⁾ "Holy preachers" and prelates, in a word, the members of the hierarchy, hold a privileged place in the Church. By the grace of God the mysteries of Holy Scripture are first made known to them. It is their duty by their own preaching or that of others to transmit to the faithful what they should have learned and contemplated.⁽⁵⁴⁾

Similar ideas occur in the work of Anselm of Laon (d. 1117).⁽⁵⁵⁾ Other commentators on the Apocalypse also agree in identifying the seven angels with the preachers;⁽⁵⁶⁾ Martin of Leon (d. 1203), canon regular of Spain, notes the likeness particularly in preachers who practice the apostolic life.⁽⁵⁷⁾ With Joachim of Flora (d. 1202) the explanation of the allegory of the Apocalypse attains a new height. His *Expositio* is illuminating, particularly on the meaning and evolution of the idea of *ordo praedicatorum*.⁽⁵⁸⁾

Of the three great ages of the world which embrace the whole span of religious history, the second is that of the revelation of the Son of God. it is characterized by the *ordo praedicatorum* or *ordo clericorum*, because by this intermediary Christ continues to communicate Himself to the world.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Nothing more is said about the preachers and their duty. They simply represent the teaching Church.

Joachim divides the second age into seven periods. The time in which he writes (between 1180 and 1202) corresponds to the decades of transition from the fifth to the sixth.⁽⁶⁰⁾ With the sixth period, a new order is to appear in the Church.⁽⁶¹⁾ It will manifest itself in the figure of a preacher of invincible

faith, a "preacher of truth" will be who, surrounded by his disciples, the "order of preachers, remarkable for the power of his word.(62) Descending from the heights of contemplation, he will teach men to scorn the things of earth and to cherish the treasures of heaven.(63) All the false prophets and heretics will unite against the preacher of truth and attempt to silence him.(64) They will not succeed. The renown of the new order will grow in radiance and brilliance; even to the end of time it will preach and defend the faith with success.(65) Elsewhere Joachim calls this order the order of the just and of the perfect, because its members will imitate the life of Jesus and His apostles.(66) At times he also speaks of the rise of two orders in the near future, both of which will receive the mission to preach.(67) His thoughts on this point are not very clear or particularly coherent. But that does not affect the matter in question. For him also the preacher is the doctor par excellence.(68) He holds in his hand the two-edged sword of truth, the possession of all who assume the office of preacher,(69) this duty likewise makes him a "lector" in Holy Scripture.(70)

THE PREDICTIONS OF JOACHIM

Certain of Joachim's ideas or descriptions had a striking harmony with more than one feature of the Order of St. Dominic, as it subsequently appeared, and earned for the Calabrian abbot the reputation of a prophet who had predicted the institution of the Order.(71)

Joachim was certainly a good observer of the conditions and trends of his time. He could foresee in a certain measure the orientation which events would take. The earnest interest he had in the destinies of the Church moved him to seek sure ways and means to cope with dangers and weaknesses. Thus many events that he desired and vividly described were purely personal fabrications, expressive of his ideas and his hopes. Like other apocalyptic writers, Joachim was in a way the interpreter of his age. The ideas cherished by him were likewise, and often in the same degree, a preoccupation with his contemporaries. For example, when he spoke of an order of preachers that would soon arise and replace the "order of bishops,"(72) he was but giving expression to an idea already current, that preaching could be separated from the episcopal dignity and exercised in an autonomous way.

It is of no great importance for us to know whether Joachim of Flora was effectively inspired by prophecy. But we are interested in whether he prepared the way for future developments. The prodigious influence of his writing indicates that he exercised a tremendous power.(73) How far did this power affect the motivation of particular events? What did it contribute to the formation of Innocent III's policy in regard to preaching? We should not a priori reject the possibility of an influence that would render intelligible certain daring moves on the part of the pope, especially the singular and unusual work confided to the Order of Cîteaux in his apostolic program. For want of a decisive document, we shall for the moment simply put the question.(74)

One thing, however, is certain: Joachim gave a final determination to the new concept of *ordo praedicatorum*, one which does not embrace the full traditional notion. He forecast a new "order of preachers," a religious community on the model of older orders, the essential office of which would be preaching and the defense of the faith. Thus the idea of transferring to an independent community the office and the title until then reserved exclusively to the bishops lost some of its startling newness. It is evident that precisely at the right moment Joachim rendered an important service to the foundation of the future Order of Preachers.

In almost all the texts examined and discussed in this chapter, one truth is brought forcibly and strikingly to light: it is the exact equivalence of the two concepts, "preacher" and "doctor." For the Fathers as well as for the authors of the twelfth century, it is a truth so manifest that not any of them feels the need of giving it special consideration. They are content to use the terms almost

interchangeably, That does not mean that they regarded the terms as absolutely identical. The very texts indicate that a "doctor" stands for a preacher of Holy Scripture, a preacher of the faith, a preacher to whom the Church has confided the mission of instructing the faithful in the truths of belief, In this connection, even before the time of the Preachers, certain Premonstratensians were called "preachers and doctors," because the instruction and direction of a certain number of souls had been confided to them.[\(75\)](#)

The term "doctor," therefore, should not be translated by "professor." This latter personage, in the restricted present-day role, did not appear on the scene until later; he took one of the last places in the teaching Church. When theology, and scholastic theology in particular, was still in its infancy, the bishop was at once preacher, doctor, and professor;[\(76\)](#) of these titles that of preacher was the first and most eminent. The first duty of the bishop was to instruct in the truth of faith the flock committed to him; he acquitted himself Of this duty by preaching. When he devoted himself to the education of his clergy and introduced them into the mysteries of Holy Scripture, he was a professor, in the modern sense of the term. But ever and always when he announced the faith as a witness of revealed truth and of tradition, he acted as a doctor, in virtue of the office expressly founded to communicate doctrine to the faithful.

DOMINICAN PREACHING

The preaching entrusted to the sons of Dominic as the essential office of their Order was the preaching of the faith. In this office they were to be auxiliaries of the bishop, who now could no longer compass the work of his charge alone. It was an age when the preaching of the faith involved critical encounters; truth had to be sustained on the battleground of heresies. No wonder an appeal was made to the University of Paris for preachers of the faith qualified for the struggle against the Albigenses.[\(77\)](#) They were, indeed, professors of theology, but in all probability they would have refused this title and preferred that of "preachers." Nor would they grant that there could be any essential difference between preaching the gospel to a congregation of the faithful and explaining the Holy Books to their hearers in the school, Peter Cantor (d. 1197), one of the most celebrated "professors" of the time in the schools of Paris, had no loftier ambition than to preach and to train others for preaching.[\(78\)](#) It was a general and absorbing aim. Through the twelfth century and far into the thirteenth, all the great masters of theology were great preachers. The scholarly life was enveloped in the life of preaching to which it was ordained. Called by the bishops to share or assume the professorial duty incumbent on the episcopate, the masters were at the same time introduced to participation in the fullness of the doctoral mission; they became doctors and, in consequence, preachers.

The sons of Dominic, therefore, were faithful to this program when they at once extended the scope of their activity to the whole field of theology. Under penalty of endangering their ideal, such action was imperative. They would have only partially fulfilled their office if, when theology became dissociated from preaching and constituted an independent discipline, they retained but one half of their doctrinal mission. Certainly St. Dominic had no intention of founding an order of professors, in the strict sense of the word. His desire was to create a society of able preachers, masters of doctrine, well instructed in the faith and in the Sacred Books. Otherwise why would he have attached so much importance to study? Why did he wish to have a "doctor" in every convent?[\(79\)](#)

We shall not pursue the matter further. This aspect of the subject has been treated in a special study.[\(80\)](#)

Another traditional name for preachers was also transmitted to the Friars Preachers: "Preachers of the word of truth," or simply, "preachers of truth." Even with St. Augustine the expression conveyed the idea of a doctrinal mission for the proclamation of truth. The title *ordo veritatis* was for the Dominicans a symbolic device. The papal documents which employ it are on that account very significant.

Frequently we have come across expressions such as "holy preachers" and "holy doctors." The nearer we come to the thirteenth century, the more freighted with meaning is the call to the preacher to teach "by word and by example." Undoubtedly one of the reasons was that many of the prelates were far too indifferent about the personal example they should have given. Therein, to be sure, lay one of the impelling forces which favored the dissociation of the preaching Office from the dignity of the episcopate and the state of prelate. Preaching was to be reserved to him who lived what he spoke. One step more and an exemplary life would be considered the sole qualification for a legitimate exercise of the sacred word. Evidently such requirements could not be pushed too far without a trespass on what was orthodox; yet such ideas prepared the way for the separation that actually occurred.

In the thirteenth century the expression *ordo praedicatorum* had, as already noted, a twofold meaning. It signified first of all, in the classical and traditional sense, the whole body of bishops and prelates along with their delegates in the office of teaching the faithful. But in the commentaries on the Apocalypse it was shown to have another significance, one of later discovery and one less clearly defined. It concerned a future reality, the image of which was not yet clear. The new *ordo praedicatorum*, that was yet to be, would be different from the ancient *ordo*. It would bear the same name and fulfill the same function, but the preachers would constitute a separate community, in the form of a religious order. Again and again there was insistence on the fact that preachers should imitate the life of Christ and His apostles.

THE RISE OF AN ORDER

The foregoing study should have made it clear that the Order of Preachers was prepared for in many different ways. When the Order of St. Dominic was dedicated by the papacy to the ministry of preaching and was given a name designating the doctrinal office of the Church and the most important duty of the bishop, it appeared like an unprecedented move. Yet this aspect should not be over stressed. The foundation was not unexpected. To all who had eyes to see, it was evident that sooner or later the bishops, whatever their good will, would be unequal to the task of fulfilling alone the office of preacher and doctor. In fact, from day to day there arose occasions for confiding this duty to those who were not prelates. And writers were at work disseminating and propagating the new ideas. From the beginning of the thirteenth century the thought that preaching could be exercised apart from the episcopal office and the care of souls began to be more generally entertained.

In the light of this fundamental and basic preparation, the importance of earlier elements, as marshaled and organized by St. Dominic in view of his purpose, should not appear secondary. At the right moment the indispensable man placed himself at the service of the papacy to construct out of all the good forces ready at hand a pastoral institution perfectly adapted to the new needs of Christendom in the thirteenth century.

1 "Moreover, Brother Dominic and the Bishop came to the Council together and with equal ardor then besought the Lord Pope, Innocent, to confirm for Brother Dominic and his brethren the Order which was to be called and would be an Order of Preachers" (Jordan, no. 40).

2 "The institution of the Order had only been considered; for the Order of Preachers had not yet been established" (*Ibid.*, no. 37).

3 "The title *Fratres ordinis praedicatorum* appeared in a legal document for the first time on February 11, 1218, in a letter of Honorius III. Laurent, no. 84. 156

4 "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel (I Cor. 1: 17). I am appointed a preacher and an apostle, a doctor of the Gentiles" (I Tim. 2:7).

5 "Bringing up clouds from the ends of the earth. What clouds? Preachers of the word of His truth. . . . But it is not enough to have raised up clouds from Jerusalem or from Israel to be sent by Him to preach His gospel unto all the earth; concerning these clouds it is written: 'Their sound hath gone forth into all the earth and their words unto the ends of the world.' This is little, but since the Lord said: 'This gospel shall be preached . . .' (Matt. 24:14), clouds rise from the ends of the earth. For, the gospel increasing, whence will there be preachers of the gospel on the borders of the world unless He there call clouds from the ends of the earth?" (*Enarrat. in Ps. 134:7; PL, XXXVII, 1749*). "For apostolic preachers have been sent ... the clouds are the preachers of the word of truth.... The preachers, therefore through whom the gospel of God is preached, are the clouds of God" (*Enarrat. in Ps. 35:6 PL, XXXVI, 346; cf. 837*).

6 "The leaders whom He appointed to preach to His people (*Sermo 17, PL, XXXVIII, 125. Cf. Sermo 18, PL, XXXVIII, 131; Sermo 353; PL, XXXIX, 1560*).

7 "To them He entrusted his sheep, that they might be fed, that is, instructed and governed" (*In Joan. Evang. tract. 123, 5; PL, XXXV, 1969*).

8 "But when he had said 'pastors,' be added 'doctors' that pastors might understand that teaching was part of their office ... but in such a degree that one and the same office was included in the two titles: and other some pastors and doctors" (*epist. 149, 2; Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, 44, 358*).

9 Cf. *Sermo 71; PL, XXXVIII 456 ff.* "Therefore, he ought to be a scholar and a doctor of Holy Scripture... to teach ... to edify ... to impart" (*PL, XXXIV, 91*).

10 "It is necessary, therefore, that the bishop . . . be . . . a doctor . . . for it is of no profit to possess virtue unless he is able also to instruct the people entrusted to him" (*PL, XXIII, 258; XXVI, 569*). "That one and the same leader of the Church be both pastor and doctor" (*PL, XXVI, 500*).

11 Julianus Pomerius (d. 498), *De vita contemplativa*. "He ought to live holily, to give example, and to teach by reason of the duty of his office . . . even if he live holily . . . since he perishes with all who on account of his silence will perish." "For he is a leader of the Church of God not only that he may lead others to live well by the example of his own life, but likewise by preaching faithfully" (*PL, LIX, 434; cf. 432*).

12 "Nor will the Pontiff excuse himself through lack of skill, alleging that he is not able to teach because he is not sufficiently eloquent in speech . . . and his hearers can profit sufficiently if they also hear preached simply to them what they see done spiritually by their teachers" (*PL, LIX, 438*).

13 The *In primum Regum expositiones* are indeed from St. Gregory though he did not himself write them out. The actual writing was the work of assistant, the Abbot Claudius, whose fidelity St. Gregory expressly praised. Cf. Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius theologiae catholicae* (1903), I, 561.

14 "Holy Church for the instruction of the faithful has four orders of rulers whom Paul . . . enumerates (Ephes. 4:11; 1 Cor. 12:28). Pastors and doctors are named as one order of rulers, because he who teaches truly feeds the flock of God. . . . In the beginning Holy Church had apostles and prophets. . . . As in former times, so now there are evangelists and doctors. . . . Truly apostles and prophets have endured from then until now" (Ezech. 40 : 42); *PL*, LXXVI, 1046. The office of evangelist and that of deacon are almost inclusive.

15 "Not undeservedly are holy doctors called pillars because, while they preach truth, they endeavor to live in accord with their preaching. . . . Four bases secure the pillars of the tabernacle, because the preachers of the Church . . . uphold the four books of the Evangelists" (Job 38:6; *PL*, LXXVI, 457). "Samuel ministered to the Lord in the presence of Heli, as the new order of doctors preached the faith of the Redeemer. . . . To minister unto the Lord, therefore, is to proceed to the work of preaching" (*PL*, LXXIX, 40, 45, 79).

16 *PL*, LXXIX, 102, 155 f., 158, 267.

17 *PL*, LXXVI, 186, 1097.

18 *PL*, LXXIX, 45, 48.

19 "Preachers are placed at the head of holy Church for this purpose (the pastoral ministry). . . . But in thought and obedience the ministers are often inferior to those over whom they have been placed by their prelacy" (*Ibid.*, 74, 277 ff.).

20 "The ruler is called to stand in the midst of the people, and thereby the figure of prelates is shown to Holy Church. Moreover, we hold that the rulers of the Church are the holy preachers" (*Ibid.*, 104, 808).

21 *Ibid.*, 278, 447.

22 "The life of the preacher is proposed as an example of salvation to the faithful, and through his teaching the secrets of Holy Scripture are revealed to the wise" (*Ibid.*, 142).

23 *Ibid.*, LXXVI, 882, 1267; LXXIX, 148-50, 155-57, 271.

24 *Ibid.*, LXXIX, 42, 150, 153, 164,

25 They are frequently considered together in the formula, *ordo doctorum veterum, veteres doctores* (*PL*, LXXIX, 102 f.)

26 *Novus praedicatorum ordo* (*ibid.*, 104, 145, 150, 153). *Novus doctorum ordo* (*Ibid.*, 145).

27 One of the corresponding texts attributed to St. Augustine by Frachet (p. 16) is not authentic.

28 Cf. *PL*, LXXIX, 100, 153 f., 158.

29 "Wherefore in order to love their neighbor perfectly, holy preachers have striven to love nothing in this world, to seek nothing and to possess nothing with undue attachment" (*PL*, LXXVI, 1094).

30 Possidius, *Vita S. Augustini episcopi*, chap. 5: Valerius, bishop of Hippo, whose native language was Greek and who was, therefore, not well versed in Latin, "empowered the same priest (Augustine) to preach and very frequently to comment on the Gospel in the church in his presence, contrary indeed to the use and custom of the African Church, whence also some bishops objected" (*PL*, XXXII, 37). Similar instances are recorded elsewhere.

31 "In certain Churches there is the very bad custom of silencing priests so they may not speak in the presence of the bishops, as if the latter were envious or not disposed to listen" (Epist. 52, *ad Nepotianum*; *PL*, XXII, 534).

32 Cf. Hefele-Leclerq, II, 1112.

33 "For they say that priests and deacons have been forbidden to preach in churches . . . Let them declare in what canon priests have been forbidden to preach . . . For our Lord Jesus Christ subjected men of the second rank to His apostles for the office of preaching. . . . Wherefore are homilies read in the church by every order of clerics? What is a homily but a preaching?" He ends by citing the letter of Jerome to Nepotianus (Alcuin, *epist.* 163; *PL*, C, 427).

34 In this sense, the letters of the Fathers of the Church are also sermons. It was not rare for bishops to send a written instruction to those who could not assist at their preaching in the church. Cf. Martigny, p. 662.

35 "Lest anything be wanting to those who dwell in the house of the king, the whole order of holy preachers labors (by writing and speaking) that the table of the Lord may be filled with an abundance of books and all of the faithful may have suitable food" (cf. III Kings 4:27; *PL*, CIX, 132). "The order of holy preachers . . . composes divine documents by writing and teaching" (*PL*, CIX, 1036),

36 "For David the leader wages war against enemies when the order of holy preachers opposes the shield of faith against the powerful of the world" (*PL*, CIX, 873). "Holy preachers deliver sacred sermons" (*PL*, CX, 510). Because the order of preachers shows the faithful, who are members of Christ, the deceit and depravity of heart of those men (heretics and schismatics) . . . the holy doctors manifesting their iniquity" (*PL*, CIX, 651).

37 "What do the twelve young lions signify but the order of preachers that follows the apostolic teaching? . . . The ways of good works . . . they strive to fortify by their teaching and example" (cf. III Kings 10:20; *PL*, CIX, 197, 1035; CXI, 1079).

38 "Thus that Ethiopian eunuch who, impelled by the fear and love of God, was eager to understand the prophet, signifies the holy preachers of the nations who, the Gospel says, make themselves chaste for the kingdom of heaven, who through divine charity strive both by word and example to rescue the oppressed from the pit of perdition" (*PL*, CXI, 1079).

39 "It is in accord with this sound plan of Holy Church that the multitude of the faithful is ranged under the rule of holy preachers, that through humility and obedience the people may be made subject to the power of her chosen teachers" (cf. Esther 8:2; *PL*, CIX, 661). "She will raise up unto the ages a useful governor over the earth. For the power of holy doctors is ordained by the dispensation of God; and He has given them a ministry of honor when He has by their office set them as leaders of the

human race" (cf. *Ecclus.* 10:2; *PL*, CIX, 826). The interlinear (Anselm of Laon) interprets the word rector as the *ordo praedicatorum* (*Biblia Sacra cum glossa ordinaria . . . et postillis Nicolai de Lyra* (Antwerp, 1617, III, 2016).

40 Peter Damian, *Contra intemperantes clericos* (*op.* XVIII); *PL*, CXLV, 389.

41 "Peter stands for the order of preachers; the waters in truth . . . signify the people. Over the people he walks to Christ who leads to the kingdom of heaven by ruling the multitude of the faithful. . . . For Peter descends from the boat as often as any holy doctor from the bosom of mother Church, whence he came forth" (St. Anselm; *PL*, CLVIII, 600).

42 "But who is designated by this servant unless the order of preachers?" (Gregory the Great; *PL*, LXXVI, 1267).

43 "Again through the servants sent we understand the doctors and preachers who by word and example call the guests to the marriage. . . . And because preaching is exercised not by silence but by speech, it seems suitable to apply to the very preachers of truth that which follows in the text: 'Call the guests.' 'Call,' I say, that is, 'be more diligent in preaching, arouse the souls of your hearers to better things' " (*PL*, CLXXIV, 612).

44 "In the aforesaid husbandmen of the Lord we can also find the certain good preachers appointed in the vineyard of the Lord, through whom the Lord will order his own workers to be called" (*PL*, CLXXIV, 135). "But a certain good prelate is not unhappily symbolized by the gate of the city, for through him the way for the Lord is prepared in the soul. For while the holy preachers through their instructions enlighten and inflame the faithful soul in the love of God, they themselves are indeed gates of the city" (*Ibid.*, 535). In *Ecclus.*, chap. 1. "In the second verse he includes three ranks through whom and in whom Holy Church is established. . . . In the height of heaven, the life of the continent; in the breadth of the earth, the life of the married; in the depth of the abyss, the, order of prelates may rightly be understood" (*Ibid.*, 1112). The "prelates" and "doctors of the truth" constitute the third order. The "holy doctors" discover in their persevering toil over the Holy Books "how they must be at the head of each of the other orders," that is, of the continent and the married (*Ibid.*).

45 Cf. *Biblia sacra cum glossa ordinaria . . . et postillis Nicolai de Lyra* (1617), II, 701, 1630, III, 2171; IV, 1903; V, 90. *PL*, CXIII, 1221. The ordinary gloss, attributed by mistake to Walafrid Strabo, is a composition of the twelfth century. The interlinear gloss has been definitely assigned to Anselm of Laon (d. 1117); several indications lead to the supposition that this author, or at least his school, is also responsible for the *glossa ordinaria*.

46 "For not only the twelve apostles preached the faith of Christ, but also the Other seventy" (*PL*, CXIII, 234, 437).

47 "The hour of the supper, the end of the world. . . . In this time the servant is sent, that is the order of preachers" (*PL*, CXIV, 308). Cf. *Biblia Sacra cum glossa Ordinaria*, V, 887.

48 Innocent III, "to all the faithful of Christ in the city of Metz as well as in the limits of the diocese" (probably of July, 1199; cf. Grundmarm, p. 98); *PL*, CCXIV, 696 f.

49 E.g., St. Bernard (*PL*, CLXXXIII, 506); Anastasius IV (*PL*, CLXXXVIII, 1085); Martène, *Anecdota*, V, 1643); Peter Lombard, *Collect. in epist. ad Philipp.*, I, 12-18 (*PL*, CXCII, 227); *in epist. ad Eph.*, IV, 11 (*PL*, CXCII, 200); Alain of Lille (*PL*, CCX, 379).

50 "The seven angels standing before the throne of God are the army of preachers of all times, because seven is the number of days, the grace of the Holy Spirit working, preaching the word of God" (*PL*, CXCVI, 776).

51 *Ibid.*, 778.

52 "And the sixth angel sounded the trumpet, that is, the sixth order of doctors of the time of Anti-Christ preached." "Thus the sixth angel is the sixth order of preachers" (*Ibid.*, 786, 794).

53 "Likewise, aptly is it said to be before the eyes of the Lord (cf. Apoc. 9:13), because the Father is well pleased in the Son, referring to the sixth angel who sounded the trumpet, that is, to those who, amid the peril of persecution, will spread the holy truth of doctrine. For all writers and teachers of sacred knowledge will preach in those days, and preachers whose special work it is to strengthen others, will struggle to fortify the elect against the cruelty of that hour" (*Ibid.*, 786).

54 "For under the opening of the seals he declares that those secret things veiled by figures in Holy Scripture are revealed by holy doctors. For those things which are hidden in Scripture are first opened through divine grace to the holy doctors, who afterward through their own word or that of others preach openly to the people. . . . For truly every gift is best, and every good perfect, which comes own from the Father of lights: first, of course, it is revealed to a few elders, namely, to the prelates and doctors, because then it is preached by them to many, indeed, to all the faithful of the Church" (*Ibid.*, 886).

55 Anselm of Laon, *Enarrationes in Apocal.*; *PL*, CLXII, 1529 ff.

56 Bruno, bishop of Segni (d. 1123). "For the seven angels are doctors; in truth, the seven trumpets are seven sermons." "For the first angel playing on the trumpet stands for the first doctors beginning to preach" (*PL*, CLXV, 646f.). Rupert of Deutz (d. 1135). "For who are those seven angels but all the preachers of the gospel, the messengers of truth?" (*PL*, CLXIX, 1106.)

57 Martin of Leon (d. 1203). "And the seven angels are all preachers imitating the apostles." "And if openly one says: 'I saw and I heard . . . the voice of one eagle,' that is, the preaching of one rank of preachers." "And the sixth angel . . . the rank, to wit, of the sixth grade of preachers" (*PL*, CCIX, 846, 349, 353).

58 *Expositio magni prophetae Abbatis Joachim in Apocalipsim*, 1527.

59 "And again as the order of the married, distinguished in the first age, seems in the pattern of the similitude to pertain to the Father, and the order of preachers of the second age relates to the Son, so the order of monks of the great last times is for the Holy Spirit" (*op. cit.*).

60 "Therefore, as far as I can determine, the time of the sixth angel (the sounding on the trumpet, Apoc. 9:13) has at least been ushered in; but the time of the fifth has not yet reached its consummation. Therefore the time of the sixth angel has already begun in sequence and ought to reach fulfillment with all swiftness and instancy" (*op. cit.*).

61 "The sixth age of the Church, in which it would conceive ... a spiritual offspring beyond all others this is the very order shown by Jesus. This order, of course, must indeed be inaugurated within the limit of a favorable period, that is, in the sixth age if it has not risen previously in other epochs,

because this point is not yet clear to me, for beginnings are always obscure and lowly" (*Expositio*, fol. 83 va.).

62 "One thing I hold certain: the sign of this angel touches personally a certain great preacher; however, it may be capable of reference spiritually to many religious men who are to come in that age, especially since Christ chose not a few disciples to preach the word of the gospel" (*Expositio*, fol. 137 rb.). "Moreover whether that preacher appears alone or in a company, he is to have great power of illumination in preaching the word of God" (*Ibid.*, fol. 198 va.). "Whoever that preacher of the truth will be, he is described as strong, because he will be robust in faith. He will come down from heaven because he will go forth from the contemplative life to the active" (*Ibid.*, fol. 137 rab.).

63 "Therefore, although the reprobates are not worthy, nevertheless, either for their sake that they may not have an excuse, or for the sake of the elect that they may know how to redeem the time, because the days are evil, a preacher of truth must be sent by the Lord in the sixth age to teach men how to despise earthly goods and to love the heavenly" (*Ibid.*, fol. 137 ra.).

64 "And all these (i.e., false prophets) labor to blot out the name of Christ from the earth and impose silence on the sixth angel, that is, on the preachers of truth to whom it is given to announce to others the gospel of Christ in those times" (*Ibid.*, fol. 135 rb.).

65 "For an order will arise which seems new and is not; clothed in black and girded; their number grows and their fame is spread abroad, and they preach the faith which they will defend unto the consummation of the world in the spirit of Elias" (*Ibid.*, fol. 176 ra.).

66 "We think, nevertheless, that what has been seen sitting above the white cloud and like unto the Son of man signifies a certain order of just men to whom it has been granted to imitate perfectly the life of the Son of man" (*Ibid.*, fol. 174 va.), "Wherefore there ought to be understood in that which was like the Son of man, a certain future order of perfect men following the life of Christ and the example of His apostles" (*Ibid.*, fol. 175 vb.).

67 "But there is nothing contrary to faith or rational consideration in the idea that certain spiritual Eliases, men like Moses and Elias appearing with Christ on the mountain, would be sent by the Lord to preach the word to men quickly, even as the twelve apostles were prefigured in the similitude of the twelve patriarchs; or that two orders of just men should be thus designated in figure" (*ibid.*, fol. 147 rb.).

68 "It is the portion of doctors faithfully to drink in the rain of the teaching of Christ and to pour it into the hearts of the faithful by the distillation of their words" (*Ibid.*, fol. 106 va.).

69 "For what is meant by 'cherubim,' which is interpreted as fullness of knowledge, but the doctor of the Church, and what by the flaming and revolving sword but the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God, which has been given into the band of the doctor so that no one may enter the inner paradise but through him?" (*Ibid.*, fol. 70 rb.).

70 "The Gospel of Matthew is for that reason suitable for priests, that is, for the teachers of deacons, because it is the duty of doctors to explain the Sacred Scriptures" (*Ibid.*, fol. 107 rb.).

71 Frachet, P. 13.

72 Cf. Denifle, Protocoll der commission zu Anagni; *Archiv.*, I, 111.

73 The Fourth Lateran Council gave attention in the first place to Joachim's *Libellus* against Peter Lombard and, directly after the profession of faith, devoted its first canon to that writing. The terms employed by Innocent manifest his firmness in condemning the error of the Cistercian and yet his great regard for Joachim's religious work and his attitude toward the Pope: "especially since the same Joachim has requested that all his writings be submitted to us that they might be approved or even corrected according to the judgment of the Apostolic See" (can. 2; Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1329). Joachim already had intimate dealings with the predecessors of Innocent, and some of his spiritual compositions, notably his commentary on the Apocalypse, had been written on the order of Lucius III and carried on with the encouragement of his successors. Cf. Schott, "Joachim, der Abt von Floris," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXII (1901), 356-58.

74 Although the ideas of Joachim about the future order were neither very clear nor very coherent, it is evident that for him the order of Cîteaux was to be the, source of this renewal. In the copious studies produced since the beginning of the century on Joachim of Flora, it does not seem that the accord between the ideas of the Calabrian. and the Order of Preachers has been made the object of special consideration. On this point a judicious treatment may be found in the few pages of Fournier, *Études sur Joachim de Flore et ses doctrines* (1909), pp. 43-49.

75 "For the Norbertines glory that they are preachers and doctors." Martène, *Anecdota*, V, 1620.

76 "There is still a remnant of this in the prescription which requires of the future bishop an academic title. *Codex Iris Can.*, can. 331, §1, 5°.

77 Cf. Laurent, no. 76. Honorius III wrote to the master and students of the University of Paris that some should come to Toulouse to teach and preach to the people.

78 Cf. Congar, "Note sur la Gnose on l'enseignement religieux des savants et des simples selon saint Thomas," *Bulletin Thomiste*, I, 5-7. Peter Cantor expressed his idea on the subject in his *Verbum abbreviatum*: "Training in Sacred Scripture consists in three exercises: reading, disputing, preaching. . . . Moreover, reading is the basis and foundation of the other two; because through it the other abilities are prepared. Disputation is like a wall in this training and building, because nothing is fully understood or faithfully preached unless first broken by the tooth of disputation. Indeed, preaching, to which the first are subservient, is like a roof protecting the faithful from the heat, from the whirlwind of vice. Therefore, only after the reading and consideration of Holy Scripture, and the examination of controverted points through disputation should preaching be engaged in, and not before; for thus the round is completed" (chap. 1; *PL*, CCV, 25).

79 A reading of Jordan's *Libellus* as well as the process of canonization with this point in view, will give an amazing insight into the number of times there is a question of study and the place it occupied in the life of St. Dominic.

80 Mandonnet, in *Revue Hist. Eccl.*, XI (1914), 34-49; cf. *infra*, chap. 19.

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XIX

The Academic Crisis at the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century and the Foundation of the Order of Preachers

THE foundation of the Order of Friars Preachers was intimately connected with the general needs that stirred Christendom in the early thirteenth century. The Church, while causing religious life to rise to a new plane of service, decided to use it for the solution of problems then urgent. Neither the monks, vowed to their personal sanctification by labor on the soil and choral office in monasteries where they made a vow of stability, nor the canons regular, whose institution was closely patterned on the monastic regime, could be counted on for a ministry which demanded above all an educated ecclesiastical militia ready to enter into the social life of the time. The Preachers, with a new vocation and a new organization, were equipped for the needs of a new age. They were the first religious Order vowed to an intense active life for the religious, intellectual, and moral service of Christian society.

The fundamental purpose of the institution of the Preachers was the apostolate of the word. Their very name, *Praedicatores*, which bore Witness to the teaching mission of the Church, evidenced the character of their work so definitely that other proofs would be superfluous. Preaching, representing the loftiest and yet the most Ordinary form of Christian teaching, implied special obligations of study for those who expressly assumed it as a duty. The new Preachers, by their very vocation, were vowed to study.⁽¹⁾ In the language of the Church, at that time, "preacher" and "doctor" were equivalent terms. The *Ordo praedicatorum* and the *Ordo doctorum*, which designated the teaching members of the Church, were one and the same.⁽²⁾

The Friars Preachers, however, could have organized their academic life exclusively in view of the needs of the Order, that is, for the doctrinal training of their own members. That they did not do. Many considerations inclined them to adopt a broader method in preference to the unfruitful and exclusive one. Probably they did not even consider the alternative procedure. Whereas the need for evangelizing the people imposed upon them the role of preachers, at the same time the requirements of the clergy, without instruction and without schools adequate in number or standards, imposed upon them the office of professors of sacred science. In fact, the Church was facing a grave academic crisis at the opening of the thirteenth century; and the papacy proposed to solve it by means of the Preachers, while she counted on their service also to provide instruction for the people. The two problems were so closely related that it was natural and economical to grapple with them at one stroke through the instrumentality of the same agents. That there existed in the Church at the close of the twelfth century a serious academic crisis and that the papacy finally attempted to remedy it by means of the Order of Preachers, forms the twofold consideration of the present chapter.

THE ACADEMIC CRISIS AND THE FIRST ATTEMPTS AT SOLUTION

Ordinarily the twelfth century is credited with having made considerable progress in the domain of thought and scholarship. At first glance, the view seems to be justified. But a distinction must be made. The twelfth century presents a large group of famous men, in contrast to the paucity of writers and thinkers in the preceding period. Both in number and quality the men who figure in the literary and intellectual advance give evidence of enormous progress. A closer view, however, concentrates attention on a select group and reveals that the vast majority of ordinary churchmen, those who should have benefitted by such culture, had no share in the diffusion of knowledge and instruction.

All this simply reflected the rate of progress made in the academic world. Schools had been the ceaseless trial of the Church from the earliest Christian centuries in Europe. The combined efforts of ecclesiastic and civil authorities fell far short of success in creating the masters and institutions requisite for the training of the clergy. Although there was progress in the twelfth century, the general situation did not improve; from one point of view, it grew worse. Great centers of learning, unknown to earlier ages, were organized, particularly in France. These attracted and retained the most celebrated masters and thus weakened the strength of the teaching personnel throughout the vast expanse of Christendom. The academic population which had taste or means for study naturally followed this movement of concentration.

DIFFICULT SITUATION

The great scholastic centers, favored with the choicest among the masters, certainly raised the cultural level of those who could attend them as students and professors. But most parts of Christendom lay outside this sphere of influence, and academic organization for the profit of the vast numbers of the clergy was rendered difficult and often impossible. The twelfth century saw the growth of this two-sided phenomenon: a specialized cultural progress in the clerical minority who were in contact with certain great and flourishing schools; an ignorance, hardly conceivable, in the great clerical majority, deprived, as ecclesiastics were, of opportunities for learning in the very regions where the duties of their ministry detained them, that is, in the various dioceses throughout Europe. Clerics who studied devoted themselves to the lucrative sciences, especially to canon and civil law; and, in general, prelates were jurists, not theologians.

THE CONCILIAR DECREES

The select and even brilliant element in the ecclesiastical culture in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries has generally obscured the view of historians regarding the lamentable state of instruction for the clergy as a whole. Documentary evidence beyond challenge must be produced to incline them to accept evidence for the whole picture. We shall omit investigation of details to justify our statement, and shall turn to the surest and most explicit source of information, the authority of the two general councils of 1178 and 1215, that is, the Third and Fourth Lateran Councils. Literary culture along with every type of academic pursuit was at this time confined within the ecclesiastical domain. Hence we must appeal to the supreme authority of the general councils for a knowledge of conditions as they were and of the improvements which the Church sought to effect. The scholastic legislation of the Third and Fourth Lateran Councils played an important part in the history and organization of education up to the close of the Middle Ages, and some of the decrees governed the development of education in several essential points. Enacted for the welfare of all Christendom, this legislation should be consulted and understood first.

Canon 18 (March 19, 1179) of the Third Lateran Council decreed as follows:

The Church of God as a devoted mother is bound to provide for those in need, not only in the things that pertain to the body but also in those that pertain to the good of souls. Wherefore, that the opportunity of acquiring an education may not be denied to the poor who cannot be aided by their parents' means, let some suitable benefice be assigned in every cathedral church to a master who shall teach gratis the clerics of that church and the poor students, by means of which benefice the material wants of the master may be relieved, and to the students a way opened to knowledge. In other churches also and in monasteries, let it be restored if in times past something of this sort has therein existed. For permission to teach, no one shall exact a fee or under pretext of custom ask something from those who teach; nor shall anyone who is qualified and seeks a license be denied the position to teach. Whoever

acts contrary to this shall be deprived of his ecclesiastical benefice. For it is proper that he have not the fruit of his labor in the Church of God, who through cupidity endeavors to impede the progress of the churches by the sale of permission to teach.(3)

Thirty-six years later the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) renewed the decree of the previous council. Since the earlier statute had not taken effect in a great number of churches, the Council of 1215 confirmed it, at the same time adding certain details and interpretations. Canon 11 ordained as follows:

Since there are some who, on account of the lack of necessary means, are unable to acquire an education or to meet opportunities for perfecting themselves, the Third Lateran Council in a salutary decree (18) provided that in every cathedral church a suitable benefice be assigned to a master who shall instruct gratis the clerics of that church and other poor students, by means of which benefice the material needs of the master might be relieved and to the students a way opened to knowledge. But, since in many churches this is not observed, we, confirming the aforesaid decree, add that, not only in every cathedral church but also in other churches where means are sufficient, a competent master be appointed by the prelate with his chapter, or elected by the greater and more discerning part of the chapter, who shall instruct gratis and to the best of his ability the clerics of those and other churches in the art of grammar and in other branches of knowledge. In addition to a master, let the metropolitan church have also a theologian, who shall instruct the priests and others in the Sacred Scriptures and in those things especially that pertain to the *cura animarum*. To each master let there be assigned by the chapter the revenue of one benefice, and to the theologian let as much be given by the metropolitan; not that they thereby become canons, but they shall enjoy the revenue only so long as they hold the office of instructor. If the metropolitan church cannot support two masters, then it shall provide for the theologian in the aforesaid manner, but for the one teaching grammar, let it see to it that a sufficiency is provided by another church of his city or diocese.(4)

Thus the Fourth Lateran Council took note of the fact that the decree of 1179, requiring a master in each bishopric, had not been generally observed. To facilitate the execution of the decree, the Council of 1215 determined the qualifications of the master. There was to be a professor of grammar in each episcopal city and a professor of theology in each archiepiscopal city. This educational program, which the Council thought progressive, now appears astonishingly poor. Such as it was, however, it was not carried out.

Five years later, Honorius III in his letter of November 16, 1219, lamented the inertia of the prelates. According to the Pope, they excused themselves from the observance of the academic decrees on the pretext of a scarcity of masters of theology. To solve the difficulty, 'Which in all probability was only too real, Honorius decided that the prelate and chapters should choose some of their subjects with an aptitude for theological studies and send them to the schools in order that they might return later to instruct others. To this end, the Pope authorized students and professors to use the benefit of their ecclesiastical revenues with the privilege of absence from residence for five consecutive years.(5) These practical measures undoubtedly contributed to the sudden increase in the student population of great centers, like Paris. But contrary to what might be expected, in their need for masters of theology, the archdioceses did not find their situation improved.

FAILURE OF THE DECREES

The Church, either directly or by means of her legates, made every effort to ensure the execution of the educational decrees of the Lateran Councils. All that we know of these attempts testifies both to the papacy's resolution to pursue the reform and to the prelates' negligence or inability. Thus we see how the legate, Robert de Courson, made an agreement with Hugh III, duke of Burgundy, on November 30,

1215, for the establishment of grammar schools at Dijon.(6) Another legate, John d'Abbeville, presided at the Council of Lerida in 1229 and had measures adopted for the execution of the Lateran decree in what concerned grammar.(7) Then taking action, this legate the same year promulgated a constitution for the Church of Barcelona, whose bishop had not installed a master of grammar. If, after his return from an expedition to Majorca, the bishop had not installed this master, he was to be deprived of the right to confer benefices; and that was to be the case every time a master was lacking.(8) On May 14, 1254, Innocent IV himself appointed a master of grammar for Venice and ordered the Bishop of Castello to provide him with the revenues from a prebend.(9)

In general, there was better observance of the decree relative to the masters of grammar, because it was easier to find such masters and also because the civil power frequently furnished subsidies for their maintenance. Thus it was that the schools began to take on a municipal character, although for a long time they were governed by clerics and were intended especially for aspirants to the ecclesiastical state. On this ground, conflicts later arose between the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities in regard to the course of instruction.

SIGNIFICANT TESTIMONY

The decree relative to the establishment of a master of theology in the archdioceses remained almost a dead letter. The legate Romanus, Cardinal of Sant' Angelo, on January 4, 1227, decreed the appointment of a master of theology to Avignon, but the magistrates, that is, the city government, had to defray the expenses.(10) The legate John d'Abbeville in 1228, in the presence of the prelates of Castile and Leon, promulgated constitutions at Valladolid which aimed at re-establishing the once celebrated school of Palencia and renewed the measures of Honorius III exempting from residence clerics who were devoting themselves to study.(11) On June 21, 1231, Gregory IX imposed upon the cathedral of Reggio in Emilia the grant of a prebend in favor of Master Peter, the theologian, who taught theology in that city for five years.(12) These facts bear witness to the papacy's determination to enforce the Lateran decree regarding the master of theology; they also reveal, on the other hand, how it was beating against a force of inertia difficult to overcome.

We are more surprised, perhaps, to find that in great university centers, like Bologna, where indeed law and the decretals were studied, and where law students often looked forward to receiving holy orders, still there was no master of theology. Thus the Bishop of Bologna in 1219 or 1220 appealed to Master Aycardus, archdeacon of Reggio, to come to his city to teach theology because it had no master.(13) However, there is nothing to show that the archdeacon complied with the request. Similarly the magistrates of Vercelli, in the act of instituting a *studium generale* for their city, April 4, 1228, provided for the installation of a master of theology. Here again, it was the civil power that outstripped the ecclesiastical authority in zeal.(14) As a matter of fact, a document of 1234 shows that at that time the master had not yet been appointed.(15) Doubtless the difficulty of procuring this master accounted for the attempt of the commune to suppress the article in 1234 or 1235.(16)

But more significant than the isolated facts gleaned from historical documents of the period are the direct statements of contemporaries who were well informed on this question of the master of theology. The following testimonies are from writers of the second half of the thirteenth century, when sufficient time had elapsed for the execution of the Lateran decree. A recognized canonist, Bernard of Parma, in his gloss on the decretals of Gregory IX, wrote apropos of the academic legislation of the Lateran: "This article of that legislation has had no more effect than the same law of an earlier date; for those laws were imposed in word, not in act; rather should the contrary be true."(17) Henry of Segusia, the celebrated Cardinal of Ostia, wrote in reference to the same decree: "But what it decrees, what it commands, has thus far not been observed; hence up to this time there has been little or no

improvement in consequence of this statute and many others. . . . There is nothing wrong with the statute, which itself was reasonable and useful, but the fault lies in the disobedience of those who should execute it, of negligent prelates, of those who decree and do not correct."[\(18\)](#) Finally St. Thomas Aquinas, in 1257, in his polemic against William of St. Amour, observes: "Because of the lack of men of learning, thus far among the secular clergy it has not been possible to carry out the decree of the Lateran Council, that in each metropolitan church there should be those who could teach theology. Nevertheless, among the religious, by the grace of God, we see that it has been even more fully observed than is required by the statute."[\(19\)](#)

Thus, according to St. Thomas, the secular clergy had not carried out the decrees of the Council with regard to the masters of theology in the archiepiscopal cities. On the other hand, the religious, and St. Thomas refers particularly to the Friars Preachers, had succeeded even beyond the scope of the decrees; for they had established schools of theology not only in archiepiscopal cities but even in a large number of episcopal cities.

CAUSES OF THE FAILURE

Such impotence or lethargy on the part of the episcopate arouses wonder, and raises a question about the true cause of such conditions. The Cardinal of Ostia, as we have seen, fastened the responsibility on three groups. First, there were the subordinates who did not obey. Clerics who possessed benefices had the right to study and to teach theology for five years without the obligation of residence in the place of their benefice. Probably many took advantage of this concession of Honorius III and went to the schools. But, after studying theology, they did not in their turn become masters. What profit would there have been in doing so? Teaching was a gratuitous work, and their ecclesiastical benefice was already ensured. For a rectification of this, not the solution of Honorius III, but that of the Council was needed: to use the revenues of a benefice to support a master as long as he would teach. The prelates, it is true, deplored the scarcity of masters, and their complaint was not unfounded. But the true reason was that it was almost impossible to find a vacant benefice to apply it to the maintenance of a master in theology. When the Fourth Lateran Council issued the decree, all the benefices were occupied. Many were retained by a prospective candidate or reserved in expectation of the death of the beneficiary; so it was that vacancies were rare. Moreover, like the prelates, the beneficiaries themselves and the civil authorities were always on the watch to obtain a benefice for relatives and friends. And it became next to impossible to dispose of a prebend in favor of a master of theology, who was not easily obtainable at the opportune moment, if indeed that time ever came.[\(20\)](#) I have found record of only one case in which a benefice was granted in favor of a master, as required by the Lateran Councils. And this grant, it must be acknowledged, was not by the appointment of a bishop, but of Baldwin, Count of Flanders and of Hainaut, in 1196, who established a school in the Abbey of the Canons Regular of Valenciennes; he himself assigned to the office of master his own cleric, Master Gonterus.[\(21\)](#) And when the bishop of Avignon, Zohen, former archpriest of Bologna, by his will of February 10, 1257, left a grant in favor of eight students, it was that they might go to study law for five years at the University of Bologna.

In regard to the negligence of the prelates, as charged by the Cardinal of Ostia, it seems that ultimately the question resolved itself into the difficulty of disposing of a vacant benefice in favor of a master. Yet assuredly a number of archbishops, absorbed in temporal interests, might have been lacking in foresight and zeal.

Lastly, our canonist placed part of the responsibility on the Holy See, which failed to see to the execution of the decrees under penalty. That was true for the time which the Cardinal of Ostia was writing about, after the middle of the thirteenth century. At first the popes exercised a strong hand for

the enforcement of the decrees.(22) If suddenly they relaxed their vigor, this change may be accounted for by the fact that they sensed how ineffectual their efforts would be and they adopted, as a substitute, a second plan that was quickly efficacious. It was to a new religious militia that the popes confided the care of providing masters of theology for the whole Christian world. With the new Order in prospect, the prelates considered themselves more or less exempt from the educational ordinance of the Lateran Councils as it regarded the master of theology. The popes, moreover, no longer insisted, for they had found in the schools of the Friars Preachers a provision more dependable than that hoped for by the appointment of a master of theology, always problematical and subject to the action of the archbishop. Indeed it was the institution of an Order of learning, that of the Friars Preachers, which gave actualization to the expressed desire of the Lateran Councils for theological training, and the achievement, as St. Thomas has told us, far surpassed the measure that had been anticipated and required.

FOUNDATION OF THE ACADEMIC ORDER OF FRIARS PREACHERS

That the Order of Friars Preachers was from the first marked by a character essentially doctrinal and academic is attested abundantly by its legislation and its history. It is important here to note that this character was proper to it from its very inception,(23) and that it was impressed upon it in the hope of solving the grave problem just reviewed: the provision of masters for the teaching of Sacred sciences.

As stated earlier, the Order founded by St. Dominic was instituted under the title of "Order of Preachers." It was likewise noted that, in the language of the time, *Ordo Praedicatorum* and *Ordo Doctorum* meant one and the same thing. Thus by their vocation the Preachers were strictly bound to a life of study and teaching. On December 22, 1216, when Honorius III solemnly confirmed the new Order, he justified his decision simply through a definition of the purpose of the Order and the assurance that it would attain its end. Addressing St. Dominic, the Pope wrote: "Considering that the brethren of your Order will be the champions of the faith and the true lights of the world, we confirm your Order."(24) Acquaintance with the extreme reserve of the Church in approving new religious orders only creates astonishment at her assurance about the work of St. Dominic. As we learn from witnesses of his life at the process of his canonization, he urged his brethren, in consequence of their vocation, to apply themselves ceaselessly to the study of the Old and the New Testament.(25) When he dispersed his first companions on August 15, 1217, it was to send them to the great academic centers of Europe, to Paris and to Bologna. Their first duty there was to study. John of Navarre, one of the religious in the first group sent to Paris, tells us this.(26) On February 27, 1220, Honorius III recommended the Friars Preacher of Paris to the masters and students of the University, speaking of them as: "Our beloved sons, brethren of the Order of Preachers, pursuing the study of the Sacred Books in Paris."(27)

Honorius wrote to John of Barastre, dean of St. Quentin and professor of theology at the University of Paris, appointing him master of the Friars Preachers: "By our command (let him) teach the brothers of the Order of Preachers in the theological faculty."(28) The picture was the same at Bologna, where Jacques de Vitry observed the Preachers in 1222 and described them as being among the students of the city and devoting themselves, under the direction of one of their number, to the study of Holy Scripture.

As might be expected, the primitive Constitutions of the Preachers bear a very scholarly stamp. (Any reference cited here strictly concerns the point at issue.) First, intensive study is of obligation. The Constitutions declare that the Preachers must apply themselves to study day and night, at home or on a journey.(29) They even grant the religious permission to stay up at night for purposes of study.(30) To obviate any hindrance to its exercise, they ordain that the canonical hours should be said *breviter et*

succincte;(31) and dispensations are provided in accord with their need to study.(32) The provincials are required to send to academic centers religious who show signs of acquiring ability to teach in a short time, and religious are not to be withdrawn from study until the time arrives for their recall.(33) This provision reads like a passage in the letter of Honorius (November 16, 1219), when he appealed to the episcopate for a similar measure. Finally, and this was a point of paramount importance, the Preachers were not to establish a convent without a doctor, a professor of theology.(34) To teach publicly, he should himself have studied theology for at least four years.(35)

THE PREACHERS AT THE UNIVERSITIES

By its institution as well as by its laws the Order of Preachers created a *clergé universitaire*, according to the apt phrasing of A. Luchaire.(36) The obligation which the Order assumed, the one which, as seemed to be true, the papacy itself had imposed upon it -- to open a school in each of its convents -- actualized the academic projects of the Lateran Council for the teaching of theology. With the rapid extension of the Order, its schools of theology were established not only in archiepiscopal cities, but even in a great number of episcopal centers. Hence the judgment of St. Thomas Aquinas, as noted above.

Strongly established in Paris and Bologna, the two great university centers, the Preachers from the very first drew a considerable number of recruits from among the masters and students. The movement had started with the preaching of St. Dominic and Reginald of Orléans. The second master general of the Order, Jordan of Saxony (1222--36), himself attracted to the Order a thousand subjects, almost all from the schools and universities.(37) This led to a decentralization of learning, with a consequent reanimation of a great part of the body of Christendom. Clothed in the religious habit, these masters, whom it had been impossible to tear away from the great schools, now were ready to go anywhere at a word from their chief; for preoccupation with their own glory, their own pleasure, and their own personal interests, they had substituted an ideal of zeal and devotion. Even more important, the way was thus finally open to an exceptional increase in the number of learned clerics.

The episcopate universally and wholeheartedly welcomed the Friars Preachers. There were repeated recommendations from the Sovereign Pontiffs. The bishops who had found it impossible to procure either preachers to instruct their faithful, or masters to train their clergy, as the Fourth Lateran Council required, found in the activity of the Preachers a solution easy, certain, and economical. Even before the death of St. Dominic, an explicit statement of these views and attitudes went into a letter of April 22, 1221, from the bishop of Metz, Conrad of Scharfeneck, chancellor of the Empire, when he recommended the establishment of the Preachers in his diocese. He said that the community of the Preachers would be of great service to the laity through the preaching of these religious, and to the clerics also through their teaching of the sacred sciences. Moreover, he was mindful of the example of the Pope, who had granted them a house in Rome, and of the large number of archbishops and bishops who had imitated him.(38)

SCHOOLS OF THE PREACHERS

With the spread of Dominican schools, the bishops considered themselves almost exempt from the obligation of carrying out the academic decrees of the Lateran in regard to theological instruction. The Holy See itself favored the new trend which it had set in motion. It granted privileges to the schools of the Preachers, thus profiting the clerics who attended them;(39) and it carefully refrained from giving them competition upon the foundation of new universities. In fact, the Holy See did not ordinarily grant the erection of a faculty of theology; the schools established by the Preachers and the other mendicant religious who in their own degree followed the lead of the Preachers were regarded, if not

as equivalent to a faculty of theology, at least as adequate to that function.⁽⁴⁰⁾ It was in consideration of this circumstance that Clement IV, in a letter addressed to the general chapter of Trier (February 24, 1266), called attention to certain important features in the administration of the Order, and pointed out how imperative it was that studies be sustained in vigor, especially in places like Paris, Bologna, and other university cities. Highly competent masters should be appointed to staff the house in such centers.⁽⁴¹⁾ The thirteenth century also presented the spectacle of persons who, while engaged in the study of the fine arts, law, or medicine, at universities without a faculty of theology, frequented the theological schools of the Preachers in the same city. This occurred in the case of Richard (later bishop of Chichester) at Orléans;⁽⁴²⁾ Engelbert of Admont, at Padua;⁽⁴³⁾ Arnold of Villeneuve, at Montpellier;⁽⁴⁴⁾ indeed, it must have been quite general. Some archbishops, and later on some bishops, attempted of their own accord to carry out for their dioceses the decrees of the Lateran Council. Rather astonishing and a proof of how difficult the secular clergy still found it to procure professors of theology,⁽⁴⁵⁾ is the fact that the prelates appealed to the Friars Preachers to staff their schools. In the course of my reading I have noted the names of more than a hundred Preachers who, from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, taught in the episcopal schools and even in the monastic abbeys. On the other hand, I have found almost no names of secular clerics or of other religious. These facts are easily ascertained from records showing how the Preachers were requisitioned. The Archbishop of Reims asked and obtained from Innocent IV on June 9, 1246, the transfer of the convent of the Preachers to a place nearer his cathedral, so that the friar teaching theology to the canons might more conveniently discharge his duty.⁽⁴⁶⁾ Similarly the Archbishop and the cathedral chapter of Lyons, in a letter addressed to Urban V, February 3, 1363, for the appointment of a Dominican professor, made a point of the fact that the Preachers had been filling the chair of theology in the archdiocese of Lyons since the establishment of their convent,⁽⁴⁷⁾ which was then nearly a century and a half old. This arrangement would continue to the end of the fifteenth century, if not even longer.

THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITIES

Finally, the Preachers were instruments of academic reform. It was not only through the widespread establishment of their convent schools and the provisions of the masters for the secular clergy that they were influential agents of academic reform. Their action was a power of the first order in universities of the thirteenth century with a faculty of theology. In these universities the Dominican school was at the outset incorporated into this faculty. Such was the case at Paris, Toulouse, Oxford, Canterbury, and Naples. At Paris the Order of Preachers even had the privilege of possessing two schools, for the purpose of fostering a growth in its scholarly personnel. In these great studia, the Order placed remarkable masters. Only two need be named: Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. The doctrinal labors of these two geniuses discovered the answer to another serious question, propounded openly from the first years of the thirteenth century: how to assimilate the science of Aristotle into the learning of the Christian world.⁽⁴⁸⁾ In the course of the fourteenth century, when the Holy See began to grant faculties of theology to various universities, the Dominican schools, already long existent, were incorporated into these new institutions. Such in general was the trend of the scholastic development of the Order of Preachers with a sketch of the part it played in the solution of the academic issues of the early thirteenth century.

Through the numerous documents available on this subject, it is possible to study minutely the scholastic organization of the Preachers. By calculating the number of masters employed in the different classes of schools and figuring from the statistics of their houses, we can estimate that at the close of the thirteenth century the Preachers counted a scholarly personnel of at least fifteen hundred members, about half of whom were engaged in the public teaching of theology. This force of religious professors was divided among their own conventual schools, universities, and the episcopal and monastic schools. Eighty years earlier, in spite of the decrees of ecumenical councils, it had been

impossible within all Christendom to find a dozen professors of theology beyond the confines of a few great centers of learning. In the early fourteenth century, the celebrated Italian Friar Preacher, Jordan of Rivalto, summed up in a few words the progress, or rather the revolution, wrought in the domain of the theological instruction in the preceding century: "Where could we find words to estimate the services of that man (St. Dominic) to the Church? It was he who first established schools of theology for instruction in divinity. In the whole wide world there was not a school where anyone might acquire this learning, except perhaps at Paris; yet even that was frequented little and had dwindled to almost nothing. Today all Christendom is full of this learning, and there is a school of divinity in each convent. The Friars Minor and other brothers have also devoted themselves to this study; convents of all orders have their schools of divinity. So great is this achievement that there are no words to give an idea of its worth."[\(49\)](#)

NOTES

- 1 "Study is not the purpose of the Order, but it is of supreme necessity for the prescribed end, namely, preaching and work for the salvation of souls, because we could do neither without study" (Humbert, *De vita regulari*, II, 41).
- 2 Richard of St. Victor, *In Apocalypsim* (PL, CXCVI, 775-97). "Since, therefore, the order of doctor is as it were pre-eminent in the Church, not everyone ought to usurp the office of preaching for himself." Letter of Innocent III, July 12, 1199 (Potthast, no. 780). The order of doctors, that is, of preachers, has a special prerogative in the Church of God (Hostiensis, *Summa aurea*, V, *De haereticis*, no. 16). "Granting that the order of doctors is as it were pre-eminent in the Church of God" (Gregory IX to the Archbishop of Milan [Potthast, no. 9675], text incorporated in the Decretals, c. 14, X, *De haereticis*, V, 7). "Since in the government of the Church the office of preaching holds a pre-eminence, so the *Ordo Praedicatorum* is pre-eminent" (William of St. Amour, *De periculis*, chap. 2). "Through the foresight of the founders, and for its work and support, an illustrious order of doctors (the university) was established there (Paris)" (Alexander IV; Potthast, no. 15801).
- 3 Mansi, XXII, 227; Denifle, *Chartularium*, I, 10; Schroeder, *Councils*, p. 229.
- 4 Mansi, XXII, 986, 999; Denifle, I, 81; Schroeder, p. 252.
- 5 Denifle, *op. cit.*, I, 91.
- 6 Muteau, *Les écoles et collèges en province* (1882), p. 75.
- 7 Episcopal archives of Barcelona.
- 8 Mansi, XXIII, 189; Martène, *Anecdote.*, IV, 597.
- 9 Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana* (1833), VII, 109.
- 10 Fournier, *Les statuts et privilèges des universités françaises* (1891), II, 303.
- 11 Florez, *España sagrada*, XXXVI (1787), 218; Denifle, *Die Universitäten*, p. 476.
- 12 Denifle, *Archiv.*, IV, 240.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 242.

14 The establishment of the studium at Vercelli in 1228 was in reality the result of a contract between the magistrates of that city and the students of the University of Padua who had emigrated from Bologna in 1222. These students must have required a master of theology such as they had had at Padua with the Preachers. The act is found in Baggiolini, *Lo studio generale di Vercelli nel medio evo* (1888), pp. 77-85.

15 Denifle, *Die Universitäten*, p. 292; Irici, *Rerum patriae libri III* (1745), p. 81; Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, VII, 90.

16 Baggiolini, *op. cit.*, pp. 94 f.

17 *Comment. in c. super speculam*, X, *De magistris*, V.

18 Glos. in V Docibiles, c. 5, X. *De magistris*, V, 5.

19 *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum, Opera*, Vivès, XXIX, 29.

20 A. Luchaire, *La société française au temps de Philippe-Auguste* (1909), p. 141. Cf. Thomas de Cantimpré, *Bonum universate de apibus* (1627) Bk. 1, chap. 19, 110s- 5-10. Conditions were still the same in 1344 when Richard de Bury wrote *Philobiblion* (ed. Cocheris, 1856), p. 248; Besso, *Il Philobiblion di Ricardo de Bury* (1914), p. 41.

21 A. Miraeus, *Opera diplomatica et historica* (1723), 11, 837.

22 Honorius III had even deposed a bishop who had not studied grammar. *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, VIII, 1053; *Mon. Germ. historica, Scriptores*, XXXII, 33 (Salimbene).

23 Not only was this doctrinal character, in the etymological sense of imparting instruction, inseparable from the contemporary concept of preaching (carefully distinguished at that time from the moral or penitential sermon), but it was imposed with even greater extension and exactness in the early thirteenth century upon the legates, the Poor Catholics, and the first Dominicans in the preaching carried on in the territory of the Albigenses.

24 *Bullarium O.P.*, I, 4.

25 "Likewise [Brother John of Spain] said that Brother Dominic often advised and exhorted the brethren of the Order by what he said and wrote to study always in the New and the Old Testament: and he knew this because he heard (Dominic) say it and saw his letters" (*Processus* [Bologna], no. 29).

26 "He [Brother Dominic] sent this witness, however unwilling, to Paris with some clerical brethren and one lay brother that they might study, and preach, and establish a convent there" (*ibid.*, no. 26).

27 Denifle, *Chartularium*, I, 95.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 101.

29 "As they ought, to be intent upon study, let them day and night, at home or on a journey, read or meditate on something, and endeavor to retain in memory whatever they can" (Denifle, *Archiv.*, I, 201).

30 "In the cells they may read, write, pray, sleep, and whoever wishes may even stay up at night for purposes of study" (*ibid.*, p. 223).

31 "Let all the hours be said in the church *breviter et succincte* so that the brethren may not lose devotion and their study may not be in the least degree hindered" (*ibid.*, p. 197).

32 *Ibid.*, p. 223.

33 "If he finds some apt for teaching who may be schooled for it in a short time, the prior of the province (or of the kingdoms) will be careful to send them to a place of study where learning flourishes, and those under whose direction they are placed dare not occupy them in other services or send them back to their province until they are recalled" (*ibid.*, p. 218).

34 "A convent may not be established unless there are twelve religious, nor without a license of the general chapter, nor without a prior and a doctor" (*ibid.*, p. 221).

35 "No one may teach publicly, unless he shall have studied theology for at least four years" (*ibid.*, p. 223).

36 *L'université de Paris sous Philippe-Auguste* (1899), p. 53.

37 "He frequented cities in which schools flourished. One year he passed the Lenten season in Paris the next at Bologna; the convents at which he stayed seemed like beehives, with so many entering and many being sent out by him to various provinces. . . . He devoted himself with all his energies to attract good men to the Order, and for that reason he tarried in places where there were students, particularly in Paris" (Frachet, pp. 108, 529; C. Bayonne, *Lettres du bienheureux Jourdain de Saxe* [1865]; *Beati Jordani de Saxonia Opera* [ed. Berthier, 1891]; B. M. Reichert, "Das Itinerar des zweiten Dominikanergenerals Jordanis von Sachsen," in *Festschr. 1100 Jubil. deutsch. Campo Santo Rom.*, 1897, p. 153. "This man (Jordan), ruling and guiding the Order well for almost fifteen years, is said to have received into the Order and clothed in the holy habit a thousand brothers and more" (Bernard Guidonis, *Libellus de magistris ord. Praed.*; Martène, *Script.*, VI, 406; Frachet, p. 102).

38 *Gallia christiana*, XIII, 409; M. D. Chapotin, *Histoire des dominicains de la province de France*, p. 31; Laurent, no. 136. For the complete letter, see *infra*, p. 330. The chancellor had just returned from Rome, where Frederick's coronation had brought him into contact with Honorius III and Cardinal Ugolino in November, 1220. His ideas echo those of the papal curia on the Order of Preachers. The letter, dated April 22, 1221, was written a few days after his arrival home.

39 On February 6, 1245, at the request of the Duchess of undy, Innocent IV made a grant in favor of clerics in the Province of Lyons: "Whoever pursue theological study in the schools of the Friars Preachers in the Diocese of Lyons will receive integrally the same income from their benefices as if they had carried on the same work at Paris" (Denifle, I, 176).

40 In interpreting this action of the popes as a means of ensuring the dominant and privileged position of the University of Paris, Denifle seems not to have envisaged sufficiently the academic problem as a whole (cf. *Die Universitäten*, p. 704). It is indeed true that the popes strove to maintain the authority

and prestige of the University of Paris; but Paris alone could not answer the cultural needs of all the clerics in Christendom. The papacy sought rather to decentralize the student world of Paris, as it did by the foundation (1229) of the University of Toulouse, where theology was taught also (*ibid.*, p. 325; *Chart. univ. Paris*, p. 129).

41 "Moreover, let study advance in the Order, especially at Paris, Bologna, and other places where the *studium generale* is flourishing; there let it be directed by doctors and masters who have been proved capable and suitable" (*Bullarium O.P.* I, 471). The *studium generale* here mentioned was not the *studium* of the Order. It referred to universities in general. But the conventual schools of these cities had to have very good masters, because they were frequented by university students, who desired to devote themselves to the study of theology; either the studia of the Order were incorporated into the University as at Paris and elsewhere, or simply established adjacent to them, as in Bologna, before the erection of the faculty of theology. When Diniz, king of Portugal, gave the Magna Charta to the University of Coïmbra on February 15, 1309, he said that the lectures in theology would be given in the Convents of the Preachers and Minors (Denifle, *Die Universitäten*, p. 525).

42 *Acta sanctorum*, April, 1, 279.

43 Pezsius, *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimorum*, I, 430. E. A. Gloria, *Monumenti dell' universita di Padova* (1222-1318), p. 361.

44 Finke, *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz VIII*, clxxiii, cxc.

45 The author of the reports to Gregory X (1273) entitled, *Collectio de scandalis Ecclesiae*, in speaking of the secular clergy, wrote: "if they happened to frequent the *studia*, they commonly heard lectures in civil law, not in theology . . . for in France studies in civil law flourish, but those in divine law, which attract few auditors among the secular clergy, have been allowed to lapse completely." Döllinger, *Beitäge zur politischen, kirchlichen und Kultur-Geschichte der 6 letzten Jahrhunderte*, III, 188. According to Stroick, the author was Gilbert of Tournai.

46 *Bullarium O.P.*, I, 165.

47 "By an ancient institution according to canonical decrees in the Church of Lyons, from the time of the foundation of the Order of Preachers, one qualified Brother of the said Order, assigned to this work by the same Order, has given lectures regularly in sacred theology in an honorable and solemn place . . . (*cathedra ordinatis*). All the clergy of the aforesaid Church as well as of the whole city came to assist at these lectures" (Denifle, *Chartularium*, III, 98).

48 Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'averroisine latin au XIII^e siècle*, I, 1-63.

49 *Prediche del Beato Fra Giordano da Rivalto*, I, 236.

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

PART TWO
FROM THE RULE OF ST. AUGUSTINE
TO THE RULE OF ST. DOMINIC

Introduction (1)

I am not aware that the Rule of St. Augustine commanded a very large share in the literary output occasioned by the observance of the fifteenth centenary of the death of St. Augustine (430). And yet, from the time he became a Christian, and definitely from the day of his return to Africa from Italy in 388 until the hour of his death in the year 430, Augustine desired to lead the cenobitic life. Thenceforth his life must have been marked by a characteristic spirituality. Recognition of this fact should awaken interest in the program which Augustine imposed on himself and his companions in the monastery or monasteries that he established. This can be ascertained from the Rule which he composed and which bears his name.

More than fifty years ago I made profession *secundum Regulam Beati Augustini et Institutiones Fratrum Praedicatorum*, and I have taught Church history nearly all my life. Hence I have often considered the question of religious rules, their nature and their successive appearance during the centuries. Much of what I have written here has long been known to me; but what concerns the nature and the origin of the Rule of St. Augustine has come to light only in these late years, and before I die I am happy to have learned, as I think I have, the nature of the Rule according to which I made profession. Augustinian monks and sisters, and even persons simply curious about religious history, should find profit in reading what follows.

Erudition and contemporary criticism are quite insufficient regarding the Rule itself, that is, on the legislative texts emanating from St. Augustine. Doubtless our first and chief attention should be focused upon those texts; but in consequence of an historic accident affecting the Rule, a bizarre accident, ignorance of which has since baffled criticism, we are obliged to study the Rule of St. Augustine from a period as far removed from the time of the legislator as the twelfth century, when the Rule was deprived of its first and its essential part; or even later, in the thirteenth century text, when the disappearance of its second part was threatened by the proposal of a project for the substitution of a Rule of St. Dominic for that of St. Augustine.

As the case requires, our study is divided into two parts; the general outline is traced at once in order to orientate the reader and likewise to satisfy the curiosity of those who, having neither the time nor the inclination to read more, simply want to know what this is all about.

Introducing the first part, under the title "What is the Rule of St. Augustine?" I shall study the three legislative texts attributed to St. Augustine. The most ancient (388) is a Rule, very short but very precise, which I shall call the *Disciplina monasterii*; the second, four times as long, is a later addition (391); it is in the nature of a supplement, or better, a commentary on the preceding one, to which it is attached by a transitional device to constitute a single whole: that whole is the true Rule of St. Augustine; lastly, much later (about 423) St. Augustine transcribed for a monastery of women the text of the commentary just mentioned; I shall briefly call this last text the "Transcription." Presuming that it constituted the primitive Rule of St. Augustine, criticism has centered its attention on this tardy and derivative text.

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the Rule of St. Augustine presided over the powerful movement for the reform of the secular clergy with its attempt to renew the practice of the common life. But,

written as it was by St. Augustine at the close of the fourth century, and for Africans, the first part of the Rule, that is, by far the most important part from the legislative point of view, was no longer applicable to men living on a very different plane of civilization. Gelasius II solved the difficulty (1118) by authorizing the new canonical foundations to substitute for the first part of the Rule (the *Disciplina monasterii*) some statutes adapted to the new needs. Thus what formed the essential element of the Rule disappeared, leaving only the second part, the Commentary, which continued to be called, and still is called, although improperly, the Rule of St. Augustine. From the misunderstanding of this fact proceeds the erroneous view commonly held today about the Rule of St. Augustine.

Finally, with the establishment of the Order of Preachers, the ultimate term in the evolution of canonical foundations of the twelfth century, St. Dominic, conforming to the practice in vogue from the time of Gelasius II, added to what remained of the Rule of St. Augustine new Constitutions better adapted to the needs of Christendom, and thus he created a new type of religious life. The orders established in the course of the thirteenth century, all of lay origin, evolved more or less under the action of the Roman Church toward the form determined in the Dominican Constitutions, so much so that Alexander IV, in 1255, thought the time had come to fashion out of the Rule of St. Augustine, with the Constitutions and Customs of the Preachers, a new rule, better adapted to the needs of the time than that of St. Augustine. The project did not succeed, at least under that form; but the regulatory influence of the legislation of the Preachers continued to exercise itself as if it effectively constituted a type Rule for a new age.

1 This study was the last work of Father Mandonnet. He was engaged on the first Part of it when illness overtook him. He had written only the first chapter and the first two paragraphs of the second. At his dictation, we took the third, composing the fourth with the help of a first draft found among his papers. The rest of the study had to be compiled by us from fragments, with only a few notes and the plan designed by him to guide us. In the parts composed by us, we shall indicate as we go along some passages of Father Mandonnet which we were able to gather: notes found in his files, or a page dictated by him in advance, because he judged it particularly important.

I

SECTION ONE The Rule of St. Augustine

CHAPTER XX What Is the Rule of St. Augustine?

THE THREE AUGUSTINIAN LEGISLATIVE TEXTS

Three legislative texts require consideration in the question of the Rule of St. Augustine: they give rise to some crucial problems concerning their authenticity, their mutual relations, their purpose, and the date of their composition. This study will discuss the solution of these various problems.

The three Augustinian texts are well known, and they have been again and again re-edited since the sixteenth century in what have been called the complete works of St. Augustine. But by a disregard of certain historical circumstances, criticism has sought to establish between these texts an unreal connection which actually confuses our ideas, so that, strange as it may seem, we are justified in saying

that what constitutes or did constitute the Rule of St. Augustine is today no longer known even in the world of erudition.

However, the problem is simple. To facilitate the reading of the following pages, I will summarize the solution before going on to the demonstration.

Augustine was always a lover of the common life. Even before his conversion and baptism he had urged among his friends a project for community life where everything would be held in common in an organization similar to that which he later realized in his Monastery.[\(1\)](#)

Some writers place the beginning of Augustine's monastic life during a stay at Cassiciacum, not far from Milan, where with his mother and some friends he spent part of the year 386 and the first months of the next year, until his baptism on Easter (April 14, 387). Monica having died during Augustine's journey to Africa, he returned to Tagaste early in 388 and, as we learn from his historian and friend Possidius,[\(2\)](#) established his first monastery in the paternal home.

Even if they were his friends and few in number, St. Augustine could not gather men together in a community without giving them a rule of life. It was at this time that he wrote his Rule. Brief but precise, it contains everything necessary for the observance of a regular life, along with an exposition of the religious virtues proper to cenobites. This text, not longer than a single page in octavo, is historically the Rule, the only Rule of St. Augustine. The legislator who drew up this text was still only a layman, and from the outset his work was probably known as the *Disciplina monasterii*. It is the name it seems to bestow on itself.

ORIGIN OF THE TEXTS

After about three years of cenobitic life at Tagaste (388-91), Augustine returned to the city of Hippo in the hope of attracting one of his friends to the monastery, but even more with a view to transferring his community to that city or to establishing a new monastery there. Augustine was then constrained to receive the priesthood from the hands of Bishop Valerius, upon an appeal from or rather upon the insistence of the Catholics of the city. Complying with Augustine's desire, Valerius gave him a garden on some church property to establish his monastery there.

Augustine governed the monastery as a priest, after having governed it previously as a layman at Tagaste. Evidently, his authority was now greater. Experience with the Rule during the course of several years had proved to him the worth of additional prescriptions, and the way his companions had practiced it showed a need of some definite explanation on points still requiring elucidation. Therefore he wrote an additional part to his Rule. This new text is both a supplement and a commentary, particularly a commentary, on the *Disciplina monasterii*; it is about four and a half times its length. By a verbal device Augustine annexed this second part to the first so as to make it constitute a single whole. It was this combination, and no other, which henceforth in tradition up to the twelfth century and even after, bore the name of the Rule of St. Augustine.

Toward the end of his life (usually taken as the year 423), in any case in the course of his episcopate, when it was required of him to bring some order into a monastery of women where his sister had died as superior, Augustine wrote a stern letter to these rebellious religious. After concluding his letter, he added to it, in a matter-of-fact way and without any explanation, the commentary on his Rule, transcribing it for a community of women; it forms the Transcription.

THE EDITIONS OF THE AUGUSTINIAN LEGISLATIVE TEXTS

It is not our purpose here to give the history of the three Augustinian legislative texts, but to name the principal places where they can be consulted, noting at the same time the changes that have marked their transmission through the centuries. We shall not go farther back than the edition of St. Augustine's works by the Benedictines of the Congregation of St. Maur (1679-1700). It is considered the best, and since it has been re-edited in the Latin Patrology of Migne (volumes 32 to 47), it is also the most easily accessible.

The errors of interpretation which at present affect the three Augustinian legislative texts exist in the Benedictine edition. The Rule of St. Augustine is acephalous; that is, reduced to the Commentary alone.⁽³⁾ It bears the title, *Regula ad servos Dei*. The beginning of the Rule, or rather of its commentary, has kept the trace of the twelfth century transformation. Whereas the articles forming the *Disciplina Inonasterii* were dropped from it, nevertheless the very first sentence was retained to form the opening words of the Commentary: "Let God be loved above all things, dearest brethren, and then our neighbor, because these are the principal commands given to us." As for the *Disciplina*, the primitive and essential part of the Rule, it will be found separate under the title of *Regula secunda*;⁽⁴⁾ and elsewhere, in the volume of the Patrology relative to St. Benedict, it is listed as *alia regula incerti auctoris* ⁽⁵⁾ (another rule of uncertain authorship). It is noteworthy that each of these texts concludes with the first sentence of the Commentary, a point which indicates their disjunction from a text of the complete Rule: "These are the things which we command you who are assembled in the monastery to observe."

The Transcription of the Commentary is found along with letter 211, addressed to a community of women.⁽⁶⁾ It may be observed here that the Transcription does not begin with the first sentence of the *Disciplina monasterii*, as does the text of the Commentary in the Benedictine edition.

MODERN EDITIONS

The twentieth century has witnessed different attempts at a critical restoration of our three Augustinian texts. Even if it must be granted that perfection has not been achieved, nevertheless the texts are in good form and in any case present no difficulties for the use we have to make of them in this study.

The Transcription annexed to letter 211 was the first favored by a critical study. It was owing to A. Goldbacher, who undertook to edit the letters of St. Augustine in the *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, sponsored by the faculty of letters of the University of Vienna.⁽⁷⁾ There exists no other contemporary edition, as far as I know.⁽⁸⁾

Father P. Schroeder published a critical edition of the whole Rule of St. Augustine,⁽⁹⁾ including what we here call the *Disciplina monasterii* and its Commentary.

Dom B. Capelle contributed a concise criticism of the two abovenamed publications.⁽¹⁰⁾ Dom De Bruyne published the whole Rule in an improved text.⁽¹¹⁾ Father A. C. Vega edited the Augustinian legislative texts, employing the manuscripts of the Escorial which had not yet been considered.⁽¹²⁾ Thus we have the Commentary on the Rule, the *Disciplina monasterii* and an excerpt from the Transcription.

Mention should also be made of a critical edition of the Rule of St. Augustine published in the eighteenth century by the learned canon regular, Eusebius Amort, all the more so because his work, among the most remarkable,⁽¹³⁾ has been ignored by all the critics and historians who have given attention in our time to the Augustinian legislative texts. Amort produced an edition of the whole Rule

(pp. 128-134) accompanying it with an historical and critical apparatus of first rank. Amort did not edit the Transcription.

Lastly, we should not forget that the numerous orders or congregations that are said to follow the Rule of St. Augustine ordinarily publish with their constitutions or statutes the text of the Commentary, under the incorrect but universal title of the Rule of St. Augustine. Thus it is found at the head of the Constitutions of the Friars Preachers. This text is in the original volume of the Dominican liturgy, now in the Archives of the Order in Rome, but formerly in the convent of St. Jacques of Paris. This volume was arranged by Humbert of Romans, fifth master general of the Order, and dates from 1255. There is a modern edition of this text of the Rule of St. Augustine.[\(14\)](#)

TITLES OF THE AUGUSTINIAN LEGISLATIVE TEXTS

The state of the editions of the Augustinian legislative texts having been noted, their titles should receive a word of explanation, because they give rise to much confusion.

In the editions of the sixteenth century, the Augustinian legislative texts were arranged in a numerical order which has been in use since then. In accord with the accepted view, that the original text of the Rule was that attached to letter 211, it was named *Regula prima*, although it was neither a rule (it was the Transcription of the Commentary on the Rule) nor the oldest text (it was chronologically the last, about 423). The *Disciplina monasterii* was called the *Regula secunda*, although it was really the Rule of St. Augustine and the first text that came from his pen. That entitled the *Regula tertia* was none other than the Commentary on the preceding text, which we are accustomed incorrectly to call the Rule of St. Augustine.

Father Vega, while using these appellations, has modified them to some extent.[\(15\)](#) He designates under the name of *Prima regula* or *Consensoria*, a document which is generally considered apocryphal.[\(16\)](#) The *Regula secunda* is the *Disciplina monasterii*; the *Regula tertia*, addressed to the servants of God, is the Commentary on this *Disciplina monasterii*; lastly, the *Regula quarta*, or that "for the virgins," is the Transcription of the Commentary.

In making a comparative study of the three Augustinian legislative texts, De Bruyne designated them by simple abbreviations.[\(17\)](#) EA stands for *Epistula 211 Augustini*, which is the Transcription; RA for *Regula Augustini*, which is the Commentary, and OM for *Ordo monasterii*, which is the *Disciplina monasterii*, or the Rule, properly speaking. The designation, *Ordo monasterii*, accepted by De Bruyne, is found in a manuscript of the ninth century of the municipal library of Laon (328 bis). It is the only title known to have been applied to the *Disciplina monasterii*.

NOMENCLATURE

There is, then, a variety of names for the three Augustinian legislative texts. In the pursuit of this study it is difficult for us to use these different designations, because they do not correspond to our ideas of the nature and chronological order of the three texts. Therefore, from the beginning of this study, in giving an anticipated solution of the problem, we have designated each of the three texts by a title which corresponds to its real nature: the *Disciplina monasterii*, which is, properly speaking, the Rule of St. Augustine; the Commentary, which is the supplement of this Rule; the Transcription, which is an adaptation of the Commentary for women. The Transcription and the Commentary are one and the same text, but a text in two forms, the one drawn up for a community of men, the other for a community of women, so that the Transcription, which in modern times has usurped the first place in

the question of Augustinian Rules, has, to tell the truth, nothing to do with the Rule of St. Augustine; it proceeds from it, but that is all.

CONTEMPORARY CRITICISM AND THE THREE AUGUSTINIAN LEGISLATIVE TEXTS

It is curious to note the positions taken by contemporary criticism on the subject under consideration.

Albert Hauck, in his history of the Church in Germany (1902 ed.),⁽¹⁸⁾ has devoted some important pages to the reform movement among the clergy which began toward the end of the eleventh century and brought about the re-establishment of the common life and individual poverty. Hauck furnished much positive data on the establishment and development of regular canonical life in Germany as well as other information of a general character, but he was in complete uncertainty about the Rule of St. Augustine. Great difficulty, he said, attended the reform of the clergy, and part of the difficulty came from the fact that they did not have the benefit of a rule of life equal in authority to that of St. Benedict for the monks. "At this point something counterfeit came to the rescue. A Rule bearing the name of St. Augustine, and recommended because of his name, began to be heard of toward the close of the eleventh century. Hence it arose could not be determined, but it was thought to have originated in France" (p. 340). And further on in a note, referring to the intervention of Gelasius 11 (1118-19), Hauck wrote: "We no longer have the ancient Rule of St. Augustine. I plan to treat of this matter elsewhere" (pp. 341 ff.).

I am not aware of Hauck's having reverted to this subject again. At any rate, in the later edition of his work (1925), he maintained the passages I have just summarized and translated. It is enough for us to know how an eminent historian of recent years represented the problem of the existence and origin of the Rule of St. Augustine.

More recently the attempt to publish a critical edition of the Augustinian legislative texts again raised the question of their origin. In 1911, Goldbacher edited a critical text of letter 211, and of the legislative text annexed to it (the Transcription); and Schroeder published the complete text of the Rule, namely, the *Disciplina monasterii* and its Commentary. The execution of this twofold work led Dom B. Capelle to a critical study of the two Augustinian texts, and we shall review here some of his conclusions which are useful to the sequence of this discussion.

First, like the two scholars whose texts he criticizes, Capelle holds that the primitive Rule of St. Augustine is the document annexed to letter 211; moreover, it is apparent that such is the opinion held almost universally up to this time. Capelle writes in the first line of his study: "It is a fact long recognized that the Rule of St. Augustine is derived from his letter 211."

This persuasion may have influenced the two German scholars in the constitution of their text. In any case, although he shared their view with regard to the origin of the Rule, Capelle did not allow himself to be swayed by it in his critical study. He has established the authority and the value of the text of the Rule (the Commentary for us), and he concludes: "In detail it can be demonstrated, contrary to the judgment of Goldbacher and Schroeder, that certain lessons in the Rule are always in accord with certain lessons in the letter. It may then be granted that the composer who adapted the letter was scrupulously conservative; he altered the text only when it was imperative to do so, and even then he did it with a reverence and an extreme delicacy. The Rule is wholly the work of Augustine."

I am tempted to emphasize these last statements. As things are stated by Dom Capelle, from the viewpoint of textual criticism alone, it may be affirmed that the Commentary proceeds from the Transcription rather than vice versa: *eadem est ratio contrariorum*. At any rate, there is nothing to

oppose the conclusion that the Commentary might be the primitive composition from which was derived the text accompanying the letter. The two texts are but one and the same under two forms. Which of the two was the first composed now remains to be proved.

CONCLUSIONS OF DOM CAPELLE

Two years after the intervention of Dom Capelle, the problem of the Rules of St. Augustine took an unexpected development and a new direction, thanks to Dom Lambot and especially to Dom De Bruyne. In a series of articles, the former showed his interest in the relation of the legislative texts of St. Augustine to the Rule of St. Benedict⁽¹⁹⁾ and furnished his learned confrere an occasion for entering the discussion. The latter wrote: "Dom Lambot has blazed the trail, and I do not know what timidity has prevented his pursuing it to the end. His article: 'A Monastic Code, Precursor of the Benedictine Rule,' has been for me . . . an unexpected revelation."⁽²⁰⁾

De Bruyne devoted himself resolutely to a demonstration of how the *Disciplina monasterii* could be the work of St. Benedict. It would be none other than a first rule, written while the saint was at Subiaco (about 500-505). He would likewise have added to it for the use of the monks an adaptation of the legislative text annexed to letter 211.

This thesis is the fragile point in the work of Dom De Bruyne; but throughout most of his pages there are facts of primary significance on the relations of the Augustinian texts, not to speak of a good critical edition of the whole Rule of St. Augustine. Consequently I shall refer often to this study and rely upon its findings.

Less than a year later (1931) the Benedictine veteran of erudition, Dom G. Morin, closed the road to the theory according to which "the Benedictines were the first authentic Augustinians outside of Africa." In conclusion he declared: "It will be necessary to be resigned to the loss of the first pretended Rule of St. Benedict."⁽²¹⁾ I do not know that anyone reacted to the negative conclusion of Dom Morin, who, it seems, did not concern himself further with the Rule of St. Augustine.

OPINION OF CRITICS

In 1933 Father Vega, of the Hermits of St. Augustine, in editing the texts already noted, published a critical study on the Rule of St. Augustine. He considered the *Disciplina monasterii* apocryphal, and of all the legislative texts he thought the Commentary alone authentic; as for the Transcription annexed to letter 211, not only did it not constitute the primitive text, but it was not even the work of St. Augustine. Moreover, Vega deemed only a provisional study possible until new research should confirm or contradict what had been held.

Judging from the account which Father B. de Gaiffier devoted to the work of Father Vega, it seems that the well-informed Bollandists share the prevailing opinion: "The text entitled 'The Rule of St. Augustine' is derived, as everyone knows, from the letter addressed by the Bishop of Hippo to a convent of nuns in rebellion against their superior." Speaking of the Commentary under the title *Regula tertia*, he says: "The latter, most often called *Regula S. Augustini*, is an adaptation of letter 211."⁽²²⁾

Father Merlin, in a study which I regret not to have been able to obtain from the editor, but which I know from the precise account of Father A. d'Alès,⁽²³⁾ treated of the Rule of St. Augustine in his brochure: *Saint Augustin et la vie monastique* (1933). "The author thinks that this Rule (the

Commentary) served as a guide for the composition of letter 211 destined for the direction of communities of religious women and was not in itself an adaptation from this letter 211."

Lastly, Father Mellet, O.P., in an appealing little volume, *L'itinéraire et l'idéal monastique de saint Augustin* (1934), assembled and within the scope of his subject completely analyzed the texts of St. Augustine on religious life in common. The first chapter of the second part has the title: *La règle de saint Augustin*. The author writes: "St. Augustine did not, like St. Benedict, formulate his thought in a monastic code, in a 'Rule.' What is called the 'Rule of St. Augustine' is only a letter (letter 211) addressed to nuns at Hippo (p. 53); and finally this conclusion: "For the rest, it can be affirmed that St. Augustine, who wrote the letter, did not himself modify it for the use of the monks" (pp. 58 f.).

If we refer to one of the great French ecclesiastical encyclopedias, such as the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (24) or the *Dictionnaire d'histoire ecclésiastique*,(25) we find it stated there, as in so many other places, that the Commentary of the Rule, known under the name of Rule of St. Augustine, is none other than the legislative text from epistle 211 transcribed for a community of men.

In consequence of all these statements-and the number could be increased -- there is a general tendency to regard the *Disciplina monasterii* as apocryphal, either by ignoring it, or by positively rejecting it; nevertheless, therein is the essential part of the Rule of St. Augustine. Again, with the exception of Vega and Merlin, everyone holds also that what is ordinarily called the Rule of St. Augustine (the Commentary for us) is an adaptation for men from the legislative text attached to letter 211, whereas I think the contrary is true.

CONCLUSIONS OF AMORT

In reading the various works which I have just enumerated -- and I believe I have perused them attentively -- I have wondered that none of the authors appeared to be acquainted with the work of Eusebius Amort, cited above, the *Vetus disciplina canonicorum regularium*, which dates from 1747. Therein the learned canon regular Amort thoroughly treated the problem concerning the Rules attributed to St. Augustine, and he did it with remarkable skill. He assembled a collection of documents relative to the subject. He published them entire or in their essential parts and in texts good for the period. Thus we have access at the same time to the whole Rule of St. Augustine, namely the *Disciplina monasterii* and its Commentary, the principal part of the life of St. Augustine by his friend and disciple Possidius, the two sermons on the common life of clerics, numerous excerpts taken from manuscripts, and, finally, a very methodical and objective criticism regarding the origin of the three Augustinian legislative texts. Amort examined in detail all the positions taken before him on this problem and weighed the pros and cons with a Moderation truly Augustinian. He could not but conclude, however, and this is most essential, that the authentic Rule of Augustine was composed of what we call here the *Disciplina monasterii* and its Commentary, and if some of his secondary opinions are not acceptable, the thesis as a whole seems to be well established. Here is the most important of his conclusions: "Indeed, it seems to me that the *Regula secunda* (the *Disciplina monasterii*) and the *Regula tertia* (the Commentary) were written by D. Augustine, but separately, for distinct Purposes; for it is clear that the *secunda* was written for monks, but already in the time of St. Augustine perhaps both were united as one continuous work." And elsewhere: "Yet, if anyone questions my conjecture in this regard, I think it likely that the Rule was written for the men established in the first monastery, which Augustine as a prior built in the garden granted to him by Valerius the bishop; afterward, however, it was adopted with a few changes or additions by the legislator himself for other monks also and for nuns."

Thus for Amort the three legislative texts are the work of Augustine. The *Disciplina monasterii* was written first for the first monastery that Augustine founded, and the Commentary was drawn up later, with an adaptation appropriate for the brothers and the sisters, and already in the time of Augustine the Commentary was annexed to the *Disciplina monasterii* to form a single work. This position -- I have omitted some details intentionally -- seems to correspond to the historic facts.

NOTES

1 "Many of us who were friends had debated the matter in spirit. Recognizing and detesting the turbulent vexations of life, we had almost resolved to live apart from the world. The retreat we determined upon was to be such that, if we possessed anything, we would contribute it to the community and form one household for all; in the sincerity of friendship there would be neither this one's nor that one's. The goods of all would constitute one treasury, and the whole would be as much at the disposal of each as of all. We thought that ten of us might form this society; some of us were wealthy, particularly Romanianus, a fellow townsman, and one of the intimate friends of my youth, whom serious fluctuations of fortune had brought into our midst. The weight of his influence helped to persuade us, for his wealth was much greater than ours. And we agreed that every year two of us should act as managers to provide for the temporal needs of all those in retirement. Afterward, however, when there was consideration of whether their wives would allow this, for some were married and wished to abide in that state, the whole program, which was so pleasing and so well formed, dissolved and went to pieces in our hands" (*Confess.*, Bk. VI, chap. 14; *PL*, XXXII, 731).

2 I am going to give together the texts of Possidius and St. Augustine relative to the monasteries. "And it pleased him (Augustine), after he received the grace of baptism to return to Africa to his own home and property to serve the Lord in company with friends and other men. Having embraced this way of life, he persevered in it for three years, abandoning all the cares of the world; with those who abode with him, he lived for God in fasts, prayers, and good works, meditating on the law of the Lord day and night. And what God revealed to him in his meditations and prayers, he taught to souls far and near in sermons and books" (Possidius, *Vita S. Augustini episcopi*, chap. 3; *PL*, XXXII, 36).

"Therefore, having been ordained a priest, he soon instituted a monastery in the church, and he began to live with the servants of God according to the custom and rule established by the holy apostles (cf. Acts 4:32): no one was to have anything as his own in the company, but all was to be common to them and distribution made to everyone according to his need; he himself had already adopted this life upon his return from across the sea to his own estates" (*ibid.*, 5) "Furthermore, divine learning was fostered under this holy Augustine, and the clerics of the Church of Hippo began to ordain those serving God in the monastery with him. And then as the truth of the teaching of the Catholic Church became illumined and grew more illustrious from day to day, through the lives of the holy servants of God in their observance of continency and absolute poverty, peace and unity were first established and continued to advance, while the Church sought and took bishops from the monastery which owed its origin and flourishing state to the leadership of that memorable man. For I knew nearly ten men, holy, venerable, penitent, and learned, whom the blessed Augustine gave upon request to various Churches, among them some of the more important. Then when the Churches of the Lord were established, these very men who had been called from the regularity of holy lives instituted monasteries in their own dioceses" (*ibid.*, chap. 11).

I (Augustine), whom you see as your Bishop by the grace of God, came in my youth to this city (to Hippo in 388), as many of you know. I looked here for a place to establish a monastery and live with my brethren. For I had forsaken all ambition as regards this world. I came to this city (in 391) to see a friend, whom I thought I might win to the service of God in the monastery . . . Then, prevailed upon, I was made a priest and advanced through this rank to the episcopate. And because I proposed to live in

a monastery with brethren, in the institute known to you, in accord with my desire, the elderly Valerius of blessed memory gave me the garden in which the monastery now stands. I assembled there brethren of upright intention, men who had nothing, as I had nothing, and imitating me, As I practiced poverty and sold what I had, and begged from the poor, so they did and desired thus to do that we might live in common: for God Himself is common to us as our great and most rich reward. I was raised to the episcopate. . . . I desired to have in the episcopal house a monastery of clerics. . . . Behold how we live. No one in our society is permitted to have anything as his own" (St. Augustine, *Sermo* 355; *PL*, XXXVIII, 1569-70).

3 *PL*, XXXII, 1377-84.

4 *Ibid.*, 1449-52,

5 *Ibid.*, LXVI, 995-98.

6 *Ibid.*, XXXIII, 960-65.

7 *S. Aurelii Augustini operum sectio II, S. Augustini epistulae* (Pars IV) from the edition by A. Goldbacher (1911) (Vol. LVII of the *Corpus*), pp. 356-71. The Transcription begins on p. 359.

8 Father de Labriolle gives an elegant French translation in *Choix d'écrits spirituels de S. Augustin* (1932).

9 *Die Augustinerchorherrn-Regel. Entstehung Kritischer Text und Einführung der Regel*, in *Archiv für Urkundenforschung* (1926), pp. 271-306.

10 "L'épître 211^e et la règle de saint Augustin," in *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, III (1927), 369-78.

11 "La première règle de saint Benoît," in *Revue Bénédictine*, XLII (1930), 316-42.

12 *La regla de san Agustín. Edición crítica precedida de un estudio sobre la misma y los códices de El Escorial* (1933). Drawn from the *Archivo agustiniano*.

13 *Vetus disciplina canonicorum regularium et saecularium*, Vol. I (1747).

14 *Analecta O.P.*, II (1896), 616-19.

15 *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

16 Vega edits it (*op. cit.*, pp. 57-59); *PL*, LXVI, 993-96. See De Bruyne, "La Regula consensoria. Une règle des moines priscillianistes," *Rev. bénéd.*, XXV (1908), 82-88.

17 Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 316.

18 *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, "Die Hohenstaufenzeit" (1902), pp. 338 ff.

19 *Revue liturgique et monastique*, XIV (1929), 320-37; *Revue bénédictine*, XLI (1929), 333-41; XLII (1930), 77-80.

20 *Revue bénédictine*, XLII (1930), 316-42. 21

21 *Ibid.*, XLIII (1931), 145-52.

22 *Analecta bollandiana*, LII (1934), 92.

23 *Recherches de science religieuse*, XXV (1935), 83 f.

24 I, 2472.

25 V, 496.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

PART TWO
FROM THE RULE OF ST. AUGUSTINE
TO THE RULE OF ST. DOMINIC

Introduction (1)

I am not aware that the Rule of St. Augustine commanded a very large share in the literary output occasioned by the observance of the fifteenth centenary of the death of St. Augustine (430). And yet, from the time he became a Christian, and definitely from the day of his return to Africa from Italy in 388 until the hour of his death in the year 430, Augustine desired to lead the cenobitic life. Thenceforth his life must have been marked by a characteristic spirituality. Recognition of this fact should awaken interest in the program which Augustine imposed on himself and his companions in the monastery or monasteries that he established. This can be ascertained from the Rule which he composed and which bears his name.

More than fifty years ago I made profession *secundum Regulam Beati Augustini et Institutiones Fratrum Praedicatorum*, and I have taught Church history nearly all my life. Hence I have often considered the question of religious rules, their nature and their successive appearance during the centuries. Much of what I have written here has long been known to me; but what concerns the nature and the origin of the Rule of St. Augustine has come to light only in these late years, and before I die I am happy to have learned, as I think I have, the nature of the Rule according to which I made profession. Augustinian monks and sisters, and even persons simply curious about religious history, should find profit in reading what follows.

Erudition and contemporary criticism are quite insufficient regarding the Rule itself, that is, on the legislative texts emanating from St. Augustine. Doubtless our first and chief attention should be focused upon those texts; but in consequence of an historic accident affecting the Rule, a bizarre accident, ignorance of which has since baffled criticism, we are obliged to study the Rule of St. Augustine from a period as far removed from the time of the legislator as the twelfth century, when the Rule was deprived of its first and its essential part; or even later, in the thirteenth century text, when the disappearance of its second part was threatened by the proposal of a project for the substitution of a Rule of St. Dominic for that of St. Augustine.

As the case requires, our study is divided into two parts; the general outline is traced at once in order to orientate the reader and likewise to satisfy the curiosity of those who, having neither the time nor the inclination to read more, simply want to know what this is all about.

Introducing the first part, under the title "What is the Rule of St. Augustine?" I shall study the three legislative texts attributed to St. Augustine. The most ancient (388) is a Rule, very short but very precise, which I shall call the *Disciplina monasterii*; the second, four times as long, is a later addition (391); it is in the nature of a supplement, or better, a commentary on the preceding one, to which it is attached by a transitional device to constitute a single whole: that whole is the true Rule of St. Augustine; lastly, much later (about 423) St. Augustine transcribed for a monastery of women the text of the commentary just mentioned; I shall briefly call this last text the "Transcription." Presuming that it constituted the primitive Rule of St. Augustine, criticism has centered its attention on this tardy and derivative text.

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the Rule of St. Augustine presided over the powerful movement for the reform of the secular clergy with its attempt to renew the practice of the common life. But,

written as it was by St. Augustine at the close of the fourth century, and for Africans, the first part of the Rule, that is, by far the most important part from the legislative point of view, was no longer applicable to men living on a very different plane of civilization. Gelasius II solved the difficulty (1118) by authorizing the new canonical foundations to substitute for the first part of the Rule (the *Disciplina monasterii*) some statutes adapted to the new needs. Thus what formed the essential element of the Rule disappeared, leaving only the second part, the Commentary, which continued to be called, and still is called, although improperly, the Rule of St. Augustine. From the misunderstanding of this fact proceeds the erroneous view commonly held today about the Rule of St. Augustine.

Finally, with the establishment of the Order of Preachers, the ultimate term in the evolution of canonical foundations of the twelfth century, St. Dominic, conforming to the practice in vogue from the time of Gelasius II, added to what remained of the Rule of St. Augustine new Constitutions better adapted to the needs of Christendom, and thus he created a new type of religious life. The orders established in the course of the thirteenth century, all of lay origin, evolved more or less under the action of the Roman Church toward the form determined in the Dominican Constitutions, so much so that Alexander IV, in 1255, thought the time had come to fashion out of the Rule of St. Augustine, with the Constitutions and Customs of the Preachers, a new rule, better adapted to the needs of the time than that of St. Augustine. The project did not succeed, at least under that form; but the regulatory influence of the legislation of the Preachers continued to exercise itself as if it effectively constituted a type Rule for a new age.

1 This study was the last work of Father Mandonnet. He was engaged on the first Part of it when illness overtook him. He had written only the first chapter and the first two paragraphs of the second. At his dictation, we took the third, composing the fourth with the help of a first draft found among his papers. The rest of the study had to be compiled by us from fragments, with only a few notes and the plan designed by him to guide us. In the parts composed by us, we shall indicate as we go along some passages of Father Mandonnet which we were able to gather: notes found in his files, or a page dictated by him in advance, because he judged it particularly important.

I

SECTION ONE The Rule of St. Augustine

CHAPTER XX What Is the Rule of St. Augustine?

THE THREE AUGUSTINIAN LEGISLATIVE TEXTS

Three legislative texts require consideration in the question of the Rule of St. Augustine: they give rise to some crucial problems concerning their authenticity, their mutual relations, their purpose, and the date of their composition. This study will discuss the solution of these various problems.

The three Augustinian texts are well known, and they have been again and again re-edited since the sixteenth century in what have been called the complete works of St. Augustine. But by a disregard of certain historical circumstances, criticism has sought to establish between these texts an unreal connection which actually confuses our ideas, so that, strange as it may seem, we are justified in saying

that what constitutes or did constitute the Rule of St. Augustine is today no longer known even in the world of erudition.

However, the problem is simple. To facilitate the reading of the following pages, I will summarize the solution before going on to the demonstration.

Augustine was always a lover of the common life. Even before his conversion and baptism he had urged among his friends a project for community life where everything would be held in common in an organization similar to that which he later realized in his Monastery.[\(1\)](#)

Some writers place the beginning of Augustine's monastic life during a stay at Cassiciacum, not far from Milan, where with his mother and some friends he spent part of the year 386 and the first months of the next year, until his baptism on Easter (April 14, 387). Monica having died during Augustine's journey to Africa, he returned to Tagaste early in 388 and, as we learn from his historian and friend Possidius,[\(2\)](#) established his first monastery in the paternal home.

Even if they were his friends and few in number, St. Augustine could not gather men together in a community without giving them a rule of life. It was at this time that he wrote his Rule. Brief but precise, it contains everything necessary for the observance of a regular life, along with an exposition of the religious virtues proper to cenobites. This text, not longer than a single page in octavo, is historically the Rule, the only Rule of St. Augustine. The legislator who drew up this text was still only a layman, and from the outset his work was probably known as the *Disciplina monasterii*. It is the name it seems to bestow on itself.

ORIGIN OF THE TEXTS

After about three years of cenobitic life at Tagaste (388-91), Augustine returned to the city of Hippo in the hope of attracting one of his friends to the monastery, but even more with a view to transferring his community to that city or to establishing a new monastery there. Augustine was then constrained to receive the priesthood from the hands of Bishop Valerius, upon an appeal from or rather upon the insistence of the Catholics of the city. Complying with Augustine's desire, Valerius gave him a garden on some church property to establish his monastery there.

Augustine governed the monastery as a priest, after having governed it previously as a layman at Tagaste. Evidently, his authority was now greater. Experience with the Rule during the course of several years had proved to him the worth of additional prescriptions, and the way his companions had practiced it showed a need of some definite explanation on points still requiring elucidation. Therefore he wrote an additional part to his Rule. This new text is both a supplement and a commentary, particularly a commentary, on the *Disciplina monasterii*; it is about four and a half times its length. By a verbal device Augustine annexed this second part to the first so as to make it constitute a single whole. It was this combination, and no other, which henceforth in tradition up to the twelfth century and even after, bore the name of the Rule of St. Augustine.

Toward the end of his life (usually taken as the year 423), in any case in the course of his episcopate, when it was required of him to bring some order into a monastery of women where his sister had died as superior, Augustine wrote a stern letter to these rebellious religious. After concluding his letter, he added to it, in a matter-of-fact way and without any explanation, the commentary on his Rule, transcribing it for a community of women; it forms the Transcription.

THE EDITIONS OF THE AUGUSTINIAN LEGISLATIVE TEXTS

It is not our purpose here to give the history of the three Augustinian legislative texts, but to name the principal places where they can be consulted, noting at the same time the changes that have marked their transmission through the centuries. We shall not go farther back than the edition of St. Augustine's works by the Benedictines of the Congregation of St. Maur (1679-1700). It is considered the best, and since it has been re-edited in the Latin Patrology of Migne (volumes 32 to 47), it is also the most easily accessible.

The errors of interpretation which at present affect the three Augustinian legislative texts exist in the Benedictine edition. The Rule of St. Augustine is acephalous; that is, reduced to the Commentary alone.⁽³⁾ It bears the title, *Regula ad servos Dei*. The beginning of the Rule, or rather of its commentary, has kept the trace of the twelfth century transformation. Whereas the articles forming the *Disciplina Inonasterii* were dropped from it, nevertheless the very first sentence was retained to form the opening words of the Commentary: "Let God be loved above all things, dearest brethren, and then our neighbor, because these are the principal commands given to us." As for the *Disciplina*, the primitive and essential part of the Rule, it will be found separate under the title of *Regula secunda*;⁽⁴⁾ and elsewhere, in the volume of the Patrology relative to St. Benedict, it is listed as *alia regula incerti auctoris* ⁽⁵⁾ (another rule of uncertain authorship). It is noteworthy that each of these texts concludes with the first sentence of the Commentary, a point which indicates their disjunction from a text of the complete Rule: "These are the things which we command you who are assembled in the monastery to observe."

The Transcription of the Commentary is found along with letter 211, addressed to a community of women.⁽⁶⁾ It may be observed here that the Transcription does not begin with the first sentence of the *Disciplina monasterii*, as does the text of the Commentary in the Benedictine edition.

MODERN EDITIONS

The twentieth century has witnessed different attempts at a critical restoration of our three Augustinian texts. Even if it must be granted that perfection has not been achieved, nevertheless the texts are in good form and in any case present no difficulties for the use we have to make of them in this study.

The Transcription annexed to letter 211 was the first favored by a critical study. It was owing to A. Goldbacher, who undertook to edit the letters of St. Augustine in the *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, sponsored by the faculty of letters of the University of Vienna.⁽⁷⁾ There exists no other contemporary edition, as far as I know.⁽⁸⁾

Father P. Schroeder published a critical edition of the whole Rule of St. Augustine,⁽⁹⁾ including what we here call the *Disciplina monasterii* and its Commentary.

Dom B. Capelle contributed a concise criticism of the two abovenamed publications.⁽¹⁰⁾ Dom De Bruyne published the whole Rule in an improved text.⁽¹¹⁾ Father A. C. Vega edited the Augustinian legislative texts, employing the manuscripts of the Escorial which had not yet been considered.⁽¹²⁾ Thus we have the Commentary on the Rule, the *Disciplina monasterii* and an excerpt from the Transcription.

Mention should also be made of a critical edition of the Rule of St. Augustine published in the eighteenth century by the learned canon regular, Eusebius Amort, all the more so because his work, among the most remarkable,⁽¹³⁾ has been ignored by all the critics and historians who have given attention in our time to the Augustinian legislative texts. Amort produced an edition of the whole Rule

(pp. 128-134) accompanying it with an historical and critical apparatus of first rank. Amort did not edit the Transcription.

Lastly, we should not forget that the numerous orders or congregations that are said to follow the Rule of St. Augustine ordinarily publish with their constitutions or statutes the text of the Commentary, under the incorrect but universal title of the Rule of St. Augustine. Thus it is found at the head of the Constitutions of the Friars Preachers. This text is in the original volume of the Dominican liturgy, now in the Archives of the Order in Rome, but formerly in the convent of St. Jacques of Paris. This volume was arranged by Humbert of Romans, fifth master general of the Order, and dates from 1255. There is a modern edition of this text of the Rule of St. Augustine.[\(14\)](#)

TITLES OF THE AUGUSTINIAN LEGISLATIVE TEXTS

The state of the editions of the Augustinian legislative texts having been noted, their titles should receive a word of explanation, because they give rise to much confusion.

In the editions of the sixteenth century, the Augustinian legislative texts were arranged in a numerical order which has been in use since then. In accord with the accepted view, that the original text of the Rule was that attached to letter 211, it was named *Regula prima*, although it was neither a rule (it was the Transcription of the Commentary on the Rule) nor the oldest text (it was chronologically the last, about 423). The *Disciplina monasterii* was called the *Regula secunda*, although it was really the Rule of St. Augustine and the first text that came from his pen. That entitled the *Regula tertia* was none other than the Commentary on the preceding text, which we are accustomed incorrectly to call the Rule of St. Augustine.

Father Vega, while using these appellations, has modified them to some extent.[\(15\)](#) He designates under the name of *Prima regula* or *Consensoria*, a document which is generally considered apocryphal.[\(16\)](#) The *Regula secunda* is the *Disciplina monasterii*; the *Regula tertia*, addressed to the servants of God, is the Commentary on this *Disciplina monasterii*; lastly, the *Regula quarta*, or that "for the virgins," is the Transcription of the Commentary.

In making a comparative study of the three Augustinian legislative texts, De Bruyne designated them by simple abbreviations.[\(17\)](#) EA stands for *Epistula 211 Augustini*, which is the Transcription; RA for *Regula Augustini*, which is the Commentary, and OM for *Ordo monasterii*, which is the *Disciplina monasterii*, or the Rule, properly speaking. The designation, *Ordo monasterii*, accepted by De Bruyne, is found in a manuscript of the ninth century of the municipal library of Laon (328 bis). It is the only title known to have been applied to the *Disciplina monasterii*.

NOMENCLATURE

There is, then, a variety of names for the three Augustinian legislative texts. In the pursuit of this study it is difficult for us to use these different designations, because they do not correspond to our ideas of the nature and chronological order of the three texts. Therefore, from the beginning of this study, in giving an anticipated solution of the problem, we have designated each of the three texts by a title which corresponds to its real nature: the *Disciplina monasterii*, which is, properly speaking, the Rule of St. Augustine; the Commentary, which is the supplement of this Rule; the Transcription, which is an adaptation of the Commentary for women. The Transcription and the Commentary are one and the same text, but a text in two forms, the one drawn up for a community of men, the other for a community of women, so that the Transcription, which in modern times has usurped the first place in

the question of Augustinian Rules, has, to tell the truth, nothing to do with the Rule of St. Augustine; it proceeds from it, but that is all.

CONTEMPORARY CRITICISM AND THE THREE AUGUSTINIAN LEGISLATIVE TEXTS

It is curious to note the positions taken by contemporary criticism on the subject under consideration.

Albert Hauck, in his history of the Church in Germany (1902 ed.),⁽¹⁸⁾ has devoted some important pages to the reform movement among the clergy which began toward the end of the eleventh century and brought about the re-establishment of the common life and individual poverty. Hauck furnished much positive data on the establishment and development of regular canonical life in Germany as well as other information of a general character, but he was in complete uncertainty about the Rule of St. Augustine. Great difficulty, he said, attended the reform of the clergy, and part of the difficulty came from the fact that they did not have the benefit of a rule of life equal in authority to that of St. Benedict for the monks. "At this point something counterfeit came to the rescue. A Rule bearing the name of St. Augustine, and recommended because of his name, began to be heard of toward the close of the eleventh century. Hence it arose could not be determined, but it was thought to have originated in France" (p. 340). And further on in a note, referring to the intervention of Gelasius 11 (1118-19), Hauck wrote: "We no longer have the ancient Rule of St. Augustine. I plan to treat of this matter elsewhere" (pp. 341 ff.).

I am not aware of Hauck's having reverted to this subject again. At any rate, in the later edition of his work (1925), he maintained the passages I have just summarized and translated. It is enough for us to know how an eminent historian of recent years represented the problem of the existence and origin of the Rule of St. Augustine.

More recently the attempt to publish a critical edition of the Augustinian legislative texts again raised the question of their origin. In 1911, Goldbacher edited a critical text of letter 211, and of the legislative text annexed to it (the Transcription); and Schroeder published the complete text of the Rule, namely, the *Disciplina monasterii* and its Commentary. The execution of this twofold work led Dom B. Capelle to a critical study of the two Augustinian texts, and we shall review here some of his conclusions which are useful to the sequence of this discussion.

First, like the two scholars whose texts he criticizes, Capelle holds that the primitive Rule of St. Augustine is the document annexed to letter 211; moreover, it is apparent that such is the opinion held almost universally up to this time. Capelle writes in the first line of his study: "It is a fact long recognized that the Rule of St. Augustine is derived from his letter 211."

This persuasion may have influenced the two German scholars in the constitution of their text. In any case, although he shared their view with regard to the origin of the Rule, Capelle did not allow himself to be swayed by it in his critical study. He has established the authority and the value of the text of the Rule (the Commentary for us), and he concludes: "In detail it can be demonstrated, contrary to the judgment of Goldbacher and Schroeder, that certain lessons in the Rule are always in accord with certain lessons in the letter. It may then be granted that the composer who adapted the letter was scrupulously conservative; he altered the text only when it was imperative to do so, and even then he did it with a reverence and an extreme delicacy. The Rule is wholly the work of Augustine."

I am tempted to emphasize these last statements. As things are stated by Dom Capelle, from the viewpoint of textual criticism alone, it may be affirmed that the Commentary proceeds from the Transcription rather than vice versa: *eadem est ratio contrariorum*. At any rate, there is nothing to

oppose the conclusion that the Commentary might be the primitive composition from which was derived the text accompanying the letter. The two texts are but one and the same under two forms. Which of the two was the first composed now remains to be proved.

CONCLUSIONS OF DOM CAPELLE

Two years after the intervention of Dom Capelle, the problem of the Rules of St. Augustine took an unexpected development and a new direction, thanks to Dom Lambot and especially to Dom De Bruyne. In a series of articles, the former showed his interest in the relation of the legislative texts of St. Augustine to the Rule of St. Benedict⁽¹⁹⁾ and furnished his learned confrere an occasion for entering the discussion. The latter wrote: "Dom Lambot has blazed the trail, and I do not know what timidity has prevented his pursuing it to the end. His article: 'A Monastic Code, Precursor of the Benedictine Rule,' has been for me . . . an unexpected revelation."⁽²⁰⁾

De Bruyne devoted himself resolutely to a demonstration of how the *Disciplina monasterii* could be the work of St. Benedict. It would be none other than a first rule, written while the saint was at Subiaco (about 500-505). He would likewise have added to it for the use of the monks an adaptation of the legislative text annexed to letter 211.

This thesis is the fragile point in the work of Dom De Bruyne; but throughout most of his pages there are facts of primary significance on the relations of the Augustinian texts, not to speak of a good critical edition of the whole Rule of St. Augustine. Consequently I shall refer often to this study and rely upon its findings.

Less than a year later (1931) the Benedictine veteran of erudition, Dom G. Morin, closed the road to the theory according to which "the Benedictines were the first authentic Augustinians outside of Africa." In conclusion he declared: "It will be necessary to be resigned to the loss of the first pretended Rule of St. Benedict."⁽²¹⁾ I do not know that anyone reacted to the negative conclusion of Dom Morin, who, it seems, did not concern himself further with the Rule of St. Augustine.

OPINION OF CRITICS

In 1933 Father Vega, of the Hermits of St. Augustine, in editing the texts already noted, published a critical study on the Rule of St. Augustine. He considered the *Disciplina monasterii* apocryphal, and of all the legislative texts he thought the Commentary alone authentic; as for the Transcription annexed to letter 211, not only did it not constitute the primitive text, but it was not even the work of St. Augustine. Moreover, Vega deemed only a provisional study possible until new research should confirm or contradict what had been held.

Judging from the account which Father B. de Gaiffier devoted to the work of Father Vega, it seems that the well-informed Bollandists share the prevailing opinion: "The text entitled 'The Rule of St. Augustine' is derived, as everyone knows, from the letter addressed by the Bishop of Hippo to a convent of nuns in rebellion against their superior." Speaking of the Commentary under the title *Regula tertia*, he says: "The latter, most often called *Regula S. Augustini*, is an adaptation of letter 211."⁽²²⁾

Father Merlin, in a study which I regret not to have been able to obtain from the editor, but which I know from the precise account of Father A. d'Alès,⁽²³⁾ treated of the Rule of St. Augustine in his brochure: *Saint Augustin et la vie monastique* (1933). "The author thinks that this Rule (the

Commentary) served as a guide for the composition of letter 211 destined for the direction of communities of religious women and was not in itself an adaptation from this letter 211."

Lastly, Father Mellet, O.P., in an appealing little volume, *L'itinéraire et l'idéal monastique de saint Augustin* (1934), assembled and within the scope of his subject completely analyzed the texts of St. Augustine on religious life in common. The first chapter of the second part has the title: *La règle de saint Augustin*. The author writes: "St. Augustine did not, like St. Benedict, formulate his thought in a monastic code, in a 'Rule.' What is called the 'Rule of St. Augustine' is only a letter (letter 211) addressed to nuns at Hippo (p. 53); and finally this conclusion: "For the rest, it can be affirmed that St. Augustine, who wrote the letter, did not himself modify it for the use of the monks" (pp. 58 f.).

If we refer to one of the great French ecclesiastical encyclopedias, such as the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (24) or the *Dictionnaire d'histoire ecclésiastique*,(25) we find it stated there, as in so many other places, that the Commentary of the Rule, known under the name of Rule of St. Augustine, is none other than the legislative text from epistle 211 transcribed for a community of men.

In consequence of all these statements-and the number could be increased -- there is a general tendency to regard the *Disciplina monasterii* as apocryphal, either by ignoring it, or by positively rejecting it; nevertheless, therein is the essential part of the Rule of St. Augustine. Again, with the exception of Vega and Merlin, everyone holds also that what is ordinarily called the Rule of St. Augustine (the Commentary for us) is an adaptation for men from the legislative text attached to letter 211, whereas I think the contrary is true.

CONCLUSIONS OF AMORT

In reading the various works which I have just enumerated -- and I believe I have perused them attentively -- I have wondered that none of the authors appeared to be acquainted with the work of Eusebius Amort, cited above, the *Vetus disciplina canonicorum regularium*, which dates from 1747. Therein the learned canon regular Amort thoroughly treated the problem concerning the Rules attributed to St. Augustine, and he did it with remarkable skill. He assembled a collection of documents relative to the subject. He published them entire or in their essential parts and in texts good for the period. Thus we have access at the same time to the whole Rule of St. Augustine, namely the *Disciplina monasterii* and its Commentary, the principal part of the life of St. Augustine by his friend and disciple Possidius, the two sermons on the common life of clerics, numerous excerpts taken from manuscripts, and, finally, a very methodical and objective criticism regarding the origin of the three Augustinian legislative texts. Amort examined in detail all the positions taken before him on this problem and weighed the pros and cons with a Moderation truly Augustinian. He could not but conclude, however, and this is most essential, that the authentic Rule of Augustine was composed of what we call here the *Disciplina monasterii* and its Commentary, and if some of his secondary opinions are not acceptable, the thesis as a whole seems to be well established. Here is the most important of his conclusions: "Indeed, it seems to me that the *Regula secunda* (the *Disciplina monasterii*) and the *Regula tertia* (the Commentary) were written by D. Augustine, but separately, for distinct Purposes; for it is clear that the *secunda* was written for monks, but already in the time of St. Augustine perhaps both were united as one continuous work." And elsewhere: "Yet, if anyone questions my conjecture in this regard, I think it likely that the Rule was written for the men established in the first monastery, which Augustine as a prior built in the garden granted to him by Valerius the bishop; afterward, however, it was adopted with a few changes or additions by the legislator himself for other monks also and for nuns."

Thus for Amort the three legislative texts are the work of Augustine. The *Disciplina monasterii* was written first for the first monastery that Augustine founded, and the Commentary was drawn up later, with an adaptation appropriate for the brothers and the sisters, and already in the time of Augustine the Commentary was annexed to the *Disciplina monasterii* to form a single work. This position -- I have omitted some details intentionally -- seems to correspond to the historic facts.

NOTES

1 "Many of us who were friends had debated the matter in spirit. Recognizing and detesting the turbulent vexations of life, we had almost resolved to live apart from the world. The retreat we determined upon was to be such that, if we possessed anything, we would contribute it to the community and form one household for all; in the sincerity of friendship there would be neither this one's nor that one's. The goods of all would constitute one treasury, and the whole would be as much at the disposal of each as of all. We thought that ten of us might form this society; some of us were wealthy, particularly Romanianus, a fellow townsman, and one of the intimate friends of my youth, whom serious fluctuations of fortune had brought into our midst. The weight of his influence helped to persuade us, for his wealth was much greater than ours. And we agreed that every year two of us should act as managers to provide for the temporal needs of all those in retirement. Afterward, however, when there was consideration of whether their wives would allow this, for some were married and wished to abide in that state, the whole program, which was so pleasing and so well formed, dissolved and went to pieces in our hands" (*Confess.*, Bk. VI, chap. 14; *PL*, XXXII, 731).

2 I am going to give together the texts of Possidius and St. Augustine relative to the monasteries. "And it pleased him (Augustine), after he received the grace of baptism to return to Africa to his own home and property to serve the Lord in company with friends and other men. Having embraced this way of life, he persevered in it for three years, abandoning all the cares of the world; with those who abode with him, he lived for God in fasts, prayers, and good works, meditating on the law of the Lord day and night. And what God revealed to him in his meditations and prayers, he taught to souls far and near in sermons and books" (Possidius, *Vita S. Augustini episcopi*, chap. 3; *PL*, XXXII, 36).

"Therefore, having been ordained a priest, he soon instituted a monastery in the church, and he began to live with the servants of God according to the custom and rule established by the holy apostles (cf. Acts 4:32): no one was to have anything as his own in the company, but all was to be common to them and distribution made to everyone according to his need; he himself had already adopted this life upon his return from across the sea to his own estates" (*ibid.*, 5) "Furthermore, divine learning was fostered under this holy Augustine, and the clerics of the Church of Hippo began to ordain those serving God in the monastery with him. And then as the truth of the teaching of the Catholic Church became illumined and grew more illustrious from day to day, through the lives of the holy servants of God in their observance of continency and absolute poverty, peace and unity were first established and continued to advance, while the Church sought and took bishops from the monastery which owed its origin and flourishing state to the leadership of that memorable man. For I knew nearly ten men, holy, venerable, penitent, and learned, whom the blessed Augustine gave upon request to various Churches, among them some of the more important. Then when the Churches of the Lord were established, these very men who had been called from the regularity of holy lives instituted monasteries in their own dioceses" (*ibid.*, chap. 11).

I (Augustine), whom you see as your Bishop by the grace of God, came in my youth to this city (to Hippo in 388), as many of you know. I looked here for a place to establish a monastery and live with my brethren. For I had forsaken all ambition as regards this world. I came to this city (in 391) to see a friend, whom I thought I might win to the service of God in the monastery . . . Then, prevailed upon, I was made a priest and advanced through this rank to the episcopate. And because I proposed to live in

a monastery with brethren, in the institute known to you, in accord with my desire, the elderly Valerius of blessed memory gave me the garden in which the monastery now stands. I assembled there brethren of upright intention, men who had nothing, as I had nothing, and imitating me, As I practiced poverty and sold what I had, and begged from the poor, so they did and desired thus to do that we might live in common: for God Himself is common to us as our great and most rich reward. I was raised to the episcopate. . . . I desired to have in the episcopal house a monastery of clerics. . . . Behold how we live. No one in our society is permitted to have anything as his own" (St. Augustine, *Sermo* 355; *PL*, XXXVIII, 1569-70).

3 *PL*, XXXII, 1377-84.

4 *Ibid.*, 1449-52,

5 *Ibid.*, LXVI, 995-98.

6 *Ibid.*, XXXIII, 960-65.

7 *S. Aurelii Augustini operum sectio II, S. Augustini epistulae* (Pars IV) from the edition by A. Goldbacher (1911) (Vol. LVII of the *Corpus*), pp. 356-71. The Transcription begins on p. 359.

8 Father de Labriolle gives an elegant French translation in *Choix d'écrits spirituels de S. Augustin* (1932).

9 *Die Augustinerchorherrn-Regel. Entstehung Kritischer Text und Einführung der Regel*, in *Archiv für Urkundenforschung* (1926), pp. 271-306.

10 "L'épître 211^e et la règle de saint Augustin," in *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, III (1927), 369-78.

11 "La première règle de saint Benoît," in *Revue Bénédictine*, XLII (1930), 316-42.

12 *La regla de san Agustín. Edición crítica precedida de un estudio sobre la misma y los códices de El Escorial* (1933). Drawn from the *Archivo agustiniano*.

13 *Vetus disciplina canonicorum regularium et saecularium*, Vol. I (1747).

14 *Analecta O.P.*, II (1896), 616-19.

15 *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

16 Vega edits it (*op. cit.*, pp. 57-59); *PL*, LXVI, 993-96. See De Bruyne, "La Regula consensoria. Une règle des moines priscillianistes," *Rev. bénéd.*, XXV (1908), 82-88.

17 Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 316.

18 *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, "Die Hohenstaufenzeit" (1902), pp. 338 ff.

19 *Revue liturgique et monastique*, XIV (1929), 320-37; *Revue bénédictine*, XLI (1929), 333-41; XLII (1930), 77-80.

20 *Revue bénédictine*, XLII (1930), 316-42. 21

21 *Ibid.*, XLIII (1931), 145-52.

22 *Analecta bollandiana*, LII (1934), 92.

23 *Recherches de science religieuse*, XXV (1935), 83 f.

24 I, 2472.

25 V, 496.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XXI

The Rule of St. Augustine Composed of Two Texts

The Rule of St. Augustine, therefore, consists of the *Disciplina monasterii*, a short but precise and complete Rule, plus a Commentary which supplements it closely, and forms with it a single whole. To demonstrate the truth of this statement, I shall appeal to the several classes of arguments, or evidences here enumerated: 1. Evidence of the manuscript tradition; 2. Evidence of the historical tradition; 3. Evidence of criticism of the Rule; 4. Evidence of the Transcription annexed to letter 211.

MANUSCRIPT TRADITION

The question of manuscript tradition is of prime importance when an attempt is being made to establish the source and ascertain the nature of a writing that has endured for a number of centuries; in the case of the Rule of St. Augustine, the period covers fifteen centuries. Moreover, here it concerns the transmission not of a work of some extent, like so many other writings of Augustine, but of only a few pages, a booklet, a *libellus*, as the author himself styled it, and in consequence more apt to disappear. In the Augustinian monasteries the Rule was to be read for the community every week. It must have comprised only a few pages; certainly its size would not have helped to ensure its preservation through the centuries. The transmission of the Rule of St. Augustine for any length of time was therefore attended by a special hazard, in addition to risks that prevail under ordinary conditions in the domain of manuscript writing. For that reason we might expect to encounter a very defective state of manuscript tradition, one presenting notable difficulties.

Fortunately no such problem exists. The tradition will be found uniform, precise, and permanent, as discovered through critical works undertaken to establish the text of the Rule of St. Augustine. These works, particularly the achievement of Schroeder and De Bruyne, are not numerous, but they leave no doubt on the matter. Their authors may have had some inexact notions in regard to the origin of the Augustinian legislative texts, but at least they present a vigorous and harmonious account of what has been the manuscript tradition of the Rule. Moreover, an explicit confirmation of their conclusions may be read in those of Eusebius Amort.

In the line of manuscript tradition, as far back as it can be traced and up to the twelfth century, the Rule of St. Augustine appears in an identical form. Made up of two parts, distinct but unified, it comprises a single whole. De Bruyne, who weighed the matter carefully in the edition of the Rule which he published,⁽¹⁾ presents a text composed first of what has been called the *Disciplina monasterii*, and then of what is a Commentary upon it.

The first part begins thus: "*Let God be loved above all things, dearest brethren, and then our neighbor, because these are the principal commands given to us.*" The second part begins: "*These are the things which we command you who are assembled in the monastery to observe.*"

No mistake should be made about the respective beginnings of the two parts, because at the time of the suppression of the *Disciplina monasterii* in the twelfth century, the first of these sentences was transferred to the beginning of the second part, where it is ordinarily found today; but this was not the original arrangement.

De Bruyne has very closely examined this question on the relation of the two parts of the Rule. I cannot do better than to quote his findings, to which, moreover, I fully subscribe. Speaking of the union of the *Disciplina monasterii* (OM) and the Commentary (RA), he says:

All historians have noted this union ... the two writings have never at the same time existed separately. This union is not a case of simple juxtaposition which could be accidental; it is a close union: there is never an *explicit* after OM [*Disc. monas.*], never an *incipit* before RA [*Comm.*]. . . On the other hand, one part does not run into the other, for the distinction is marked by a paragraph and a capital letter (C), by the two lines in uncial. (L), by three lines in uncial (AB). Manuscript P is an exception: the texts follow without a break. The two writings always follow in the same order.

THE WORK OF ST. AUGUSTINE

The independent information contributed by Eusebius Amort only confirms what we have just said. Amort published the Rule of St. Augustine from a manuscript of the twelfth century of the Collegiate Church of Ranshofen. It conforms to the tradition described by De Bruyne. Even more significant, Amort states that the other copies of the Rule found in Bavaria and Austria at the time of his writing, and dating from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, conform to that of Ranshofen. The case is similar for those of more ancient origin, which are in three other places.[\(2\)](#)

No doubt exists about what constituted the Rule of St. Augustine. A short Rule, called the *Disciplina monasterii*, and a Commentary on that Rule, taken together compose our treatise in the manuscript tradition, though each is shown to be distinct from the other in the copy by diacritical marks. Besides, the unity and duality arise rather from the contents than from the form, as will be evident upon further examination.

As to the antiquity of the manuscripts in which the Rule has been preserved, the oldest leads us back, according to specialists, to the seventh century, perhaps even to the sixth, with the Latin manuscript 12634 from the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, proceeding from Corbie. Other manuscripts are from the ninth and from the following centuries.[\(3\)](#) The age of this documentation shows what a chronological extent this tradition covers and how far from the truth were the authors who formerly thought that the Rule of St. Augustine was an eleventh or twelfth century production.

Lastly, the assignment of an author in the manuscripts is generally, with but one exception, on account of an "absent-minded slip of the copyist," in favor of the one St. Augustine. As is the custom with manuscripts even from ancient Roman times, it is at the *explicit* of the work that the title and the name of the author are found. In this case we meet the same one constantly: *Explicit regula sancti Augustini* [\(4\)](#) ("Here ends the Rule of St. Augustine"), or equivalently, in the text in use with the Preachers: *Explicit regula beati Augustini episcopi* ("Here ends the Rule of Blessed Augustine, Bishop"). The formula is more euphonic, because it conforms to the rule of the *cursus*. In Augustinian monasteries the Rule was chanted. Today, with the Preachers, it is simply read, but the beginning and the end are chanted.

Such, then, is the manuscript tradition of the Rule of St. Augustine. From the beginning it explicitly attributes to St. Augustine the two parts of the Rule. It would be hard to find anything more clear and simple. How it was possible to entangle a problem which offered so little in the way of difficulty becomes the real question. An explanation of this singular phenomenon has already been sketched.

THE HISTORICAL TRADITION

We may regret that the manuscript tradition of the Rule does not run a little closer to the very years of St. Augustine's life, yet this documentary insufficiency can, to a certain extent, be made good, because the historical tradition notably bridges the gap. The Rule of St. Augustine has exercised a historical influence of varied character, particularly on the formulation of later rules. By ascending the rounds of this kind of ladder we can reach even the time of St. Augustine.

Under the title *Regula Tarnatensis*, we have a Rule that has an obscure origin; but its composition is ordinarily placed in the sixth century. It recognizes and utilizes the two parts of the Rule of St. Augustine, and a large proportion of the conclusion is almost a literal translation of it.⁽⁵⁾

With the Rule of St. Benedict in the first third of the sixth century we stand chronologically on more solid ground. His Rule recognizes and uses that of St. Augustine to such an extent that Dom Lambot and especially Dom De Bruyne thought the *Disciplina monasterii* might be the work of St. Benedict.⁽⁶⁾ Dom Morin, as we have noted,⁽⁷⁾ showed that this view would have to be rejected. But critics have indicated that the whole Rule of St. Augustine was known and used by St. Benedict and that consequently it is of earlier origin than the Benedictine Rule.

Dom Morin, in the article cited, proposes as the approximate date of the composition of the *Disciplina monasterii*, independent of every consideration of Augustinian origin, the year 440: "This would be some ten years after the death of St. Augustine," as Dom Lambot wrote,⁽⁸⁾ when he noted passages taken from the Rule by the *Regula sanctorum virginum* of St. Caesarius of Arles, an excellent edition of which he has recently produced.⁽⁹⁾

The historical criticism thus reaches very close to the time of St. Augustine, but it is particularly by a study of the text that the Rule may be discovered to verge on the very threshold of the career of its author, even the year 388. But just as we advance the existence and the integral content of the Rule of St. Augustine, tracing it to the very period of its author, so we still affirm the permanence of the Rule in the same form at the beginning of the twelfth century. Not only does that period provide manuscripts,⁽¹⁰⁾ showing accord with the evidence as already revealed by tradition, but it likewise records the fact of the notable transformation of the Rule as the effect of the letter of Gelasius II (August 11, 1118). This circumstance will be treated fully in the next chapter; but we call attention to it at this point to complete our demonstration.

MARKS

The papal letter, in fact, acquaints us with the contents of the Rule of St. Augustine at this period, and the text we shall reproduce will reveal its identity with that already described. Gelasius' intervention had as a particular result the disappearance of the first part, the legislative element, and the reduction of the Rule to the second part, or Commentary, and in this state of mutilation there has been transmitted to us since the twelfth century what is today inappropriately called the Rule of St. Augustine.

The suppression of the *Disciplina monasterii* was not effected in the beginning by a total decapitation. Theologian that he was, St. Augustine had written in the first line of his Rule: "Let God be loved above all things, dearest brethren, and then our neighbor, because these are the principal commands given to us." The first commandment of the Gospel, written therein by the legislator and containing in itself the whole content of the Rule, could hardly be suppressed. There was fidelity to this idea at the time of the suppression of the *Disciplina monasterii*. It harmonized, moreover, with the desire expressed by the Pope. The first and essential formula was retained, therefore, and was transferred to the beginning of the Commentary' where it still is today, followed by the formula with which the second part of the Rule began in its original arrangement: "These are the things which we command you who are

assembled in the monastery to observe." The regard shown for this legitimate scruple in the suppression of the *Disciplina monasterii* is a proof in point for the evidence that the *Disciplina* was then considered the first part of the Rule of St. Augustine.

Therefore, taking the evidence as a whole, we may accept as solidly established the Augustinian authorship of the complex unit which bears, or rather, which did bear, the name of the Rule of St. Augustine.

Nor do we think there can be any doubt about the primitive contents of the Rule: a law that was short, but precise, and complete in itself, with a long addition composed later in the form of a Commentary and supplement to the first ethical prescriptions. After the composition of the second part, the whole circulated *per modum unius*, under the title of the *Rule of St. Augustine*, until the twelfth century, when the *Disciplina monasterii* was suppressed, henceforth to be replaced by special legislation better adapted to the needs of the new chapters and orders of canons regular. After this suppression, strictly speaking, there was no longer a Rule of St. Augustine.

Now it is time to pass to the study of the texts of the Rule. They not only confirm what we have just said, but would suffice, even of themselves, for the same demonstration.

CRITICISM OF THE RULE

Our consideration of the Rule of St. Augustine is made neither from a literary nor from a religious point of view. Our sole aim is to select from the document a number of characteristics of such a nature as to contribute data about its authenticity, its origin, and its purpose.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S FOUNDATION

First of all, there is a matter of preliminary interest. What we know about the foundation of the monasteries of St. Augustine supplies initial information on the Rule. St. Augustine evidently wrote the Rule in view of the type of religious life which he organized, because a monastery, housing a community of men more or less numerous, could not conceivably function without a Rule to determine the observances of those living in common. Although our knowledge of life in the Augustinian monasteries is limited, we can gather precise data concerning the time of their establishment and the role of St. Augustine himself.

During his stay in Italy, Augustine learned of monastic life in the Orient and in Italy. Dom Gougaud has exhaustively treated this aspect of the subject.⁽¹¹⁾ Augustine, upon returning from Italy toward the close of 388, attempted to establish his first monastery at Hippo. This we know from his own words in a sermon to the Catholics of Hippo during his episcopate: "I, whom you see as your Bishop by the grace of God, came in my youth to this city as many of you know. I sought for a place here to establish a monastery and live with my brethren; for I had forsaken all ambition as regards this world."

This first project of St. Augustine must have failed; Hippo must have appealed to its future Bishop as having advantages not afforded by the little city of Tagaste, where in reality he did succeed in founding an establishment. It is interesting to see Augustine three years later renew his first project and attempt to transfer the institution from Tagaste to Hippo. The fact that Augustine was only a layman, and a recent convert, may have created difficulties for him. In any event, for the initial venture he went to his native city, Tagaste, where he sold his possessions, gave the proceeds to the poor, and established his monastery under the rule of poverty. It should be noted that he does not in any way refer positively and explicitly to the first establishment. From his biographer and friend Possidius, who lived many years

with him, we know definitely about the foundation at Tagaste, the first monastery. From him we learn not only that Augustine made the first foundation immediately after his return to Africa, but that he remained in the monastery for three years and that he lived there with his companions "in fasts, prayers, and good works, meditating on the law of the Lord day and night. What God revealed to him in his meditations and prayers, he taught to souls far and near in sermons and books."

During these three years Augustine was still a layman, and this fact suggests a problem. By what authority could he conduct a monastery? The very text of his first Rule, the *Disciplina monasterii*, will be examined to learn whether his status is in any way indicated.

After three years, as he himself says, he went to Hippo to attract one of his friends to the religious life, and likewise to establish a monastery there. It was on this occasion that the Catholic inhabitants of the city constrained the aged Bishop to confer the priesthood on Augustine. Knowing the intensity of the new priest's desire to live the common life, the Bishop gave him a site on church property for the establishment of his monastery.

This foundation at Hippo probably occasioned a transfer of the monastery from Tagaste. Direct information to this effect is wanting, but the evidence of historical sources inclines in favor of it. Possidius, for example, remarks that ten bishops, of whom he was one, came out of the community at Hippo during the lifetime of Augustine, whereas he makes no allusion to the monastery of Tagaste. It seems that the latter had disappeared.

At any rate, Augustine, the priest at the head of the monastery, enjoyed an authority quite superior to the authority he could exercise as a layman during the years at Tagaste. It should not come as a surprise, therefore, to discover an addition to the short Rule, *Disciplina monasterii*, in the Commentary in which the author refers to himself as a priest and shows the consciousness of his new power.

As a matter of record, we should note that, after Augustine became a bishop, his desire was to have a monastery of clerics in his episcopal home. But that development in his life belongs to a period later than the one when the Rule was formulated.

THE DISCIPLINA

Before approaching the study of our legislative texts, or rather to have at hand an instrument requisite for the purpose, we must first transcribe the text of the *Disciplina monasterii*, since the consideration will center principally on this text. The text is not especially rare -- we have elsewhere indicated the names of certain editions. But it is not readily available to everyone. Therefore we present it here before proceeding to our discussion. The form of the text is the one established by Dom De Bruyne. The reference for it has been indicated above.

DISCIPLINA MONASTERII [\(12\)](#)

1. Let God be loved above all things, dearest brethren, and then our neighbor, because these are the principal commands given to us.

2. This is how we ought to pray or say the psalms. In the morning three psalms should be said: the sixty-second, the fifth, and the eighty-ninth; at Tierce, let a psalm be said with a

1. Ante omnia, fratres carissimi, diligatur Deus, deinde proximus, quia ista sunt praecepta principaliter nobis data.

2. Qualiter autem nos oportet orare vel psallere describimus; id est in matutinis dicantur psalmi tres: sexagesimus secundus, quintus et octogesimus nonus; ad tertiam prius psalmus ad

responsory, then two antiphons, a lesson, and a concluding prayer; in like manner at Sext and None; at evening, moreover, one responsory psalm, four antiphons, again one responsory psalm, a lesson, and a concluding prayer. And at a convenient time after the evening exercise, all being seated, the lessons may be read; moreover, after this let the customary psalms be recited before retiring. Night prayers, for the months of November, December, January, February, twelve antiphons, six psalms, three lessons; for March, April, September, October, ten antiphons, five psalms, three lessons; for May, June, July, August, eight antiphons, four psalms, two lessons.

3. Let them (the brethren) work from morning to the hour of Sext; and from Sext to the hour of None they may be free for reading; and at None they may return books; and after they have eaten, they may work again in the garden, or wherever it will be necessary, until evening.

4. Let no one do anything for himself alone, whether for clothing or anything else; for we desire to live the apostolic life.

5. Let no one do anything with murmuring, lest he perish by a judgment like that for murmurers.

6. Let them obey with fidelity, honor their father after God, and respect their superior as becomes the holy.

7. Seated at the table let them be silent to listen to the reading. if, moreover, any need shall arise, their superior shall see to it. On Saturday and Sunday, as is the custom, those who wish may have wine.

8. If any need to go out of the monastery for any purpose, let two go. No one may eat or drink out of the monastery without permission, for this is not in accord with monastic discipline. If the brethren are commissioned to sell any of the goods of the monastery, let them be careful to do nothing contrary to the

respondendum dicatur, deinde antiphonae duae, lectio et completorium; simili modo sexta et nona; ad lucernarium autem psalmus responsorius unus, antiphonae quattuor, item psalmus unus responsorius, lectio et completorium. Et tempore opportuno post lucernarium, omnibus sedentibus, legantur lectiones; post haec autem consuetudinarii psalmi ante sonnum dicantur. Nocturnae autem orationes, mensae novembri, decembri, januario et februario, antiphonae duodecim, psalmi sex, lectiones tres; martio, aprili, septembri et octobri, antiphonae decem, psalmi quinque, lectiones tres; maio, junio, julio et agosto antiphonae octo, psalmi quattuor, lectiones duae.

3. Operentur a mane usque ad sextam, et a sexta usque ad nonam vacent lectioni, et ad nonam reddant codices, et, postquam refecerint, sive in horto, sive ubicumque necesse fuerit, faciant opus usque ad horam lucernarii.

4. Nemo sibi aliquid suam vindicet proprium, sive in vestimento, sive in quacumque re; apostolicam enim vita optamus vivere.

5. Nemo cum murmure aliquid faciat, ut non simili iudicio murmuratorum pereat.

6. Fideliter obediant, patrem suum post Deum honorent, praeposito suo deferant sicut decet sanctos.

7. Sedentes ad mensam taceant audientes lectionem. Si autem aliquid opus fuerit, praepositus eorum sit sollicitus. Sabbato et dominica, sicut consuetudo est, qui volunt, vinum accipiant.

8. Si opus fuerit ad aliquam necessitatem monasterii mitti, duo eant. Nemo extra monasterium sine praecepto manducet neque bibat, non enim hoc ad disciplinam pertinet monasterii. Si opera monasterii mittantur fratres vendere sollicite servent ne quid faciant contra praeceptum, scientes quoniam Deum

law, knowing that they may offend God in His servants; if they are buying something for the monastery, let them discharge the business carefully and faithfully as servants of God.

9. Let there be no idle word among them; let them be about their own work from the morning; similarly after the prayers of Tierce let them go to their own work; they should not stand about talking, unless perchance it may be for the good of the spirit. Let them sit in silence at their duties, unless perchance the necessity of the work require that something be said.

10. If anyone shall not have tried to fulfill these things in all virtue, with the help of God, and shall have disregarded them with a stubborn spirit, and if, having been admonished once and again, he shall not amend, let him know that he must subject himself as is proper to monastic discipline. Moreover, if his age admits of it, he may be punished.

Observing these things faithfully and piously in the name of Christ, you will profit, and our joy will be great in your salvation. Amen.

These are the things which we command you who are assembled in the monastery to observe.

The first purpose for which you have been gathered together. . . .

exacerbant in servis ipsius; sive aliquid, emunt ad necessitatem monasterii, sollicito et fideliter, ut servi Dei, agant.

9. Otiosum verbum apud illos non sit, a mane ad opera sua sedeant, post orationes tertiae eant similiter ad opera sua; non stantes fabulas contexant, nisi forte aliquid sit pro animae utilitate. Sedentes ad opera taceant, nisi forte necessitas operis exegerit ut loquatur quis.

10. Si quis autem non omni virtute, adjuvante miseri cordia Domini, haec conatus fuerit implere, contumaci vero animo despexerit, semel atque iterum commonitus, si non emendaverit, sciat se subijcere disciplinae monasterii sicut oportet. Si autem talis fuerit aetas ipsius, etiam vapulet.

Haec autem in nomine Christi fideliter et pie observantes et vos proficietis et nobis non parva erit laetitia de vestra salute. Amen.

Haec eunt quae ut observetis praecipimus in monasterio constituti.

Primum, propter quod in uno estis congregati. . . .

An attentive study of this first part of the Rule would require an extended discussion. Our consideration will be limited to the most important points affecting the general problem. To begin with we shall examine the form and the material contents of the *Disciplina monasterii*.

THE TITLE

The first question might be whether the *Disciplina* had a title. In the manuscript tradition where the *Disciplina monasterii* is always united to the Commentary, the title of *Rule of St. Augustine* is given to the two parts *per modum unius*; the existence of a special title for the *Disciplina* does not have to be supposed.

Before the composition of the second part of the Rule, however, the first part, as a separate document, may have had a title that persisted later. Dom De Bruyne noted that he came upon no indication of a

title except in the Laon manuscript 328 bis (ninth century), where he found the designation, *De ordine monasterii*. De Bruyne retained this title in his edition of the *Disciplina*; at first sight, it seems to correspond well with the contents, and for want of any other inscription, it seems advisable to accept it. *Ordo* applies quite well to the contents of articles two and three, which define the *ordo officii*, and the periods of work, prayer, and reading, since successive exercises are thus regulated by the hours of the day. But this term does not apply to the rest of the Rule, which prescribes moral acts that are not determined by time and that generally cannot be included in the notion of *ordo*.

Twice in this section there occur two qualifying expressions which the Rule applies to itself. Such are the following:

8. "For this is not in accord with monastic discipline."

10. "Let him know that he must subject himself as is proper to monastic discipline."

Thus, what the author establishes in the Rule, according to his own words, is the *Disciplina monasterii*, that is, monastic observance.

THE CONTENT

The *Disciplina monasterii* is composed of a succession of ten articles. Ordinarily the manuscript tradition does not number them; they are numbered here for convenience. The material in the *Disciplina* is well arranged. Though there is no outward mark of division, it is, in fact, divided into two sections.

Articles two and three, which are the most important, have a precise statutory form and refer to what the brethren must do. The second, much longer than the third, enumerates the hours of the Divine Office and what is to be chanted, along with provision for the seasonal variations. The third determines the time for prayer, work, reading, and the one meal of the day, at the hour of Sext, so that in these matters there could be no uncertainty for persons subject to this Rule.

The other paragraphs of the Rule have a religious or moral import: on poverty, obedience, silence, and business outside the monastery. Short though they are, the articles, taken together, constitute a unified whole. The Rule begins with a general proposition, the evangelical precept of love for God and neighbor. In the last paragraph the lawmaker acknowledges the satisfaction he experiences when there is a faithful and devout observance of what is proposed. The word *Amen* at the close signifies the end of the document.

The *Disciplina* is in itself a true Rule, adequate for the direction of a community of men, provided there is a head, an authority. Does the *Disciplina monasterii* vest power in an authority? The presence of such a mechanism in any social group, whatever its nature, is a prime necessity. It is mentioned in the Rule, but in an unusual way. Authority is referred to only indirectly. Neither the existence nor the rights of such an authority are defined; but it is indicated in the article concerning the obedience of the subjects, which says:

6. "Let them obey with fidelity, honor their father after God, and respect their superior, as becomes the holy."

Here two authorities are mentioned, a father and a superior, and the attitude of the subjects to both is aptly implied in a somewhat veiled formula. The father is not named again in the *Disciplina*; the

superior is referred to a second time in article seven, in a passage indicating that he is particularly responsible for the temporal administration of the monastery. The Commentary on the Rule contains a more explicit parallel passage that throws light on the question. It will be considered later.

Meanwhile let us note that the author of the *Disciplina* does not take it upon himself to give an imperative character to his Rule or to confer upon those who are at the head of his monastery an authority at all definite. Obedience seems operative here as a general virtue, rather than as something enjoined by the preceptive force of a clearly defined law. (13) To understand this condition, we need merely reflect on the position of Augustine in founding his first monastery. He was a layman, who gathered around himself a few friends of good will; for all he outlined a short but precise formulary of life. As we read it we have the impression that it is a piece of tentative legislation in which authority is hardly asserted. In fact, Augustine, being an ordinary Christian, had no official authority. His community lived under a regime of individual good will, directed toward life in common. Once he becomes a priest, the situation will be different.

THE WORDING

In the light of this information (that is, of an Augustine newly baptized, and still a layman, taking the initiative in founding a monastery of which he was to be the head and the legislator), certain features of wording in the Rule are explicable, such as perhaps raised a doubt of its authenticity in the minds of certain critics, who thought the style of the *Disciplina* not Augustinian.

It might readily be objected that the question of style can hardly be thought of in connection with this first part of the Rule. The formulas are too short and too concise to justify any issue on that score. Nevertheless, where comparison is possible, as in the texts that have been cited or will be cited later in reference to the authorities of the monastery, the relationship between the language of the *Disciplina* and that of the Commentary is marked. But no one denies the Augustinian style of the second part of the Rule. Our object now, however, is to show that the wording of the *Disciplina monasterii* does present certain significant peculiarities which, far from ruling out the hand of St. Augustine, actually help to identify it.

As we have already pointed out, we need to recall merely that the lawmaker who composed the Rule was a layman, but recently converted. Thus certain structural features in the document may be explained.

At times the author of the Rule seems to consider himself apart from those for whom he writes, whereas at other times he identifies his lot with theirs. Thus, in article two, which begins: "This is how we ought to pray or say the psalms," it is evident that in liturgical matters he includes himself with those who are living the common life.

But other paragraphs read as though the author were not one of the subjects or were not bound by their obligations. In the third article he says: "Let them (the brethren) work from morning to the hour of Sext. . . ."

The form of the verb (*operentur*) shows that the prescription refers to "those who are in the monastery," but seems not to include the author. That is explicable: it was provision for manual work, and Augustine was fully occupied with his engrossing labors as an apostle and writer. (14) For him the problem of work was solved.

What subtle phrasing he employed to distinguish the authority of a father and that of a superior! As a layman, Augustine could call himself father. After his ordination, he could speak of himself as a priest, and then it is evident that he not only announces a program, but imposes it: "We command."

In the last sentence of the *Disciplina*, Augustine allows a second and last reference to himself. If the *fratres carissimi*, to whom he has addressed himself in the opening words, will observe what has been proposed, he acknowledges: "Our joy will be great in your salvation."

The general structure of the *Disciplina monasterii* is thus more comprehensible if it is considered in the light of the personal position of Augustine when he began his career as a lawgiver; it was that of a fervent layman, eager for the common life.

Augustine defined the common life in a few words. Having declared that none of the brethren should consider anything his own, he added, giving totality of view in a single thought: "For we desire to live the apostolic life." The expression *optamus* ("we desire") bears witness to the fact that this voluntary choice was the cornerstone of the monastic foundation and that, like others, Augustine was binding himself to lead the apostolic life. For Augustine, to lead the apostolic life meant to possess no personal property. He explains this more fully at the beginning of his Commentary, where he refers to the celebrated scriptural text: "For thus you read in the Acts of the Apostles that they had all things in common, and distribution was made to everyone according as he had need" (4:32-35).[\(15\)](#)

All ecclesiastical tradition has been and will be faithful to this concept of the apostolic life as constituted by the common life and by individual poverty. This expression, "to lead the common life," was revived as a reform appeal when the Sovereign Pontiffs of the eleventh and twelfth centuries endeavored to re-establish it among the clergy and propagate the Rule of St. Augustine.

A careful analysis of the *Disciplina monasterii* thus enables us to identify the Rule, not only as the work of St. Augustine, but even as the first piece of legislation composed by him when he founded his first monastery at Tagaste in 388.

Before concluding this study of the text of the *Disciplina monasterii*, certain features of the program it proposed should be examined, because they were accountable for its suppression in the twelfth century.

Article two, comprising a detailed outline of the entire Divine Office, is remarkable; liturgists have signalized it as the oldest *ordo officii* known in the Church.[\(16\)](#) Viewed in the light of this liturgical entry, the date of composition was usually placed toward the middle of the fifth century. What we have established here should show that the correct date would be the same as for that of the composition of the *Disciplina monasterii*, the year 388. As to the language, the omissions, and the provisional indications, specialists in the history of liturgy could raise many problems; but it is readily conceivable that this fourth-century liturgical Office would not correspond even remotely with that which the Church had developed by the end of the twelfth century.

Likewise, to impose manual labor upon clerics from the hour of rising until noon and from three in the afternoon until nightfall seems quite totally out of accord with the temper of the men and the age, if we consider the economic changes in medieval Europe.

Lastly, though adequate for appetites cultivated in an African climate, the provision for a single meal at None, or three o'clock in the afternoon, would create tremendous difficulties in view of the physical needs of men in northern countries.

THE COMMENTARY IS NOT A RULE

The tone of the *Disciplina monasterii* manifestly marks it as a provisional law to be tested by trial. This is revealed by what we have just explained and will be substantiated to a greater degree by what will be said on the legislative complement which Augustine decided to add to his first Rule.

After three years' trial of the *Disciplina* and his own elevation to the priestly dignity, Augustine had full authority to legislate, as was not the case in the period of his life as a layman. The transfer of the monastery from Tagaste to Hippo or, if one prefers, the new foundation in that city at the time of Augustine's ordination, naturally gave occasion for the writing of the text that we call the Commentary on the *Disciplina monasterii*, because it is that above all, though it may also be called a complement. This remark leads to our next consideration.

First we must clear the way by disposing of a prejudice which, since the twelfth century, has obscured the clear understanding of the problem of the Rule of St. Augustine.

Up to that time, the Rule of St. Augustine signified the *Disciplina monasterii* and the complement now about to be considered. This combined work became acephalous in the twelfth century, when the *Disciplina* was dropped and the Commentary retained. Though structurally longer in extent than the *Disciplina*, the Commentary was much poorer in legislative prescriptions, and, strictly speaking, there was no longer a Rule of St. Augustine.

Dom De Bruyne's study did not lead to a solution of the problem about the origin of the Rules. But, after a slight examination of the Commentary, he rightly concluded that it could not be a Rule. To him we are indebted for opening the way to our thesis.

Referring to the second part of the Rule which he designates by the letters RA, meaning Regula Augustini, he writes: "RA contains excellent prescriptions, gripping and profound remarks; but, it must be said, it is not a Rule. . . . I cannot imagine a man founding a monastery of men and giving them RA as a Rule."⁽¹⁷⁾ As he penned those words, did Dom De Bruyne feel like one uttering something rash: to declare that what for centuries was known as the Rule of St. Augustine was not a Rule? What an unheard-of statement! Yet, Dom De Bruyne was right.

That is the truth, quite the exact truth. Reduced to what it is now, whether under the form of the Commentary for the brothers, or under the form of the Commentary for the sisters, the Rule of St. Augustine (let us still call it that) would not ensure the common life of three people for even two days, because it lacks the essential elements, however rudimentary, indispensable to that end.

In reading this Rule of St. Augustine, we sense that it is addressed to a group leading a common life and practicing individual poverty; but that does not save the Rule, called since the twelfth century the Rule of St. Augustine, from being an amorphous composition where nothing precise is established for the direction of a social organization however embryonic. Allusions are made to what is done or ought to be done in the community; but without exact determination. For example, there is the statement that what is not appointed must not be sung. But nowhere is it definite that one must sing, or what one must sing, or that the choral Office has an assigned place in the occupations of the religious. To this end there is not any sign of an *ordo* for the day, week, or year: no trace of liturgy. Still we read: "Be instant in prayer at the hours and times appointed." Yet neither hours nor times are indicated in the text. And so it is for everything. However, the loftiest considerations of a moral and religious order are therein couched in a Latinity still close to that of the classical age. All this may strike us as disconcerting.

It is over fifty years since I began to hear read in the refectory every week what we now call the Rule of St. Augustine, and often I asked myself how this venerable text could be an instrument to direct and guide a monastery of men with any regularity. I did not know how to answer the query, and the accidental information I could gather merely confused me.

About thirty years ago, after reading Hauck's conclusion recorded above, I gave up interest in a problem which then appeared insoluble. Fortunately Benedictine learning reopened the question of the Augustinian Rules. Dom Lambot and Dom De Bruyne tried to orientate it in the Benedictine tradition, and then Dom Morin showed their mistake, but it was their priceless work of erudition that led me to approach this problem. If I have succeeded, as I think I have, in establishing a sound solution, it is because they furnished me with the initial data for the proof.

In bringing to light, under the name of *Ordo monasterii*, the almost forgotten *Disciplina*, which I did not know existed, Dom Lambot laid the cornerstone of the problem. Dom De Bruyne, by declaring that the Rule of St. Augustine is not a Rule and by studying thoroughly the relation of the three legislative texts, put into my hands exactly what I needed for constructing a demonstration.

RELATION OF THE TWO PARTS

The second part of the Rule of St. Augustine contains what might be called a treatise on the spirit and the virtues proper to the religious state: fraternal charity, individual poverty, humility, prayer in community, conduct at table, religious deportment, relations with seculars and especially with women, fraternal correction, the common life, regulation of disputes and faults, mutual duties of superiors and subjects, benefits to be derived from observance, and so on.

These moral considerations follow closely the order of the precise and short rules of the *Disciplina*: the precept of charity, choral Office, hours of work and of meals, duty outside the monastery, correction of faults, and the like. Added for the purpose of interpreting the spiritual and religious significance of the particular prescriptions, these form a true spiritual commentary on the *Disciplina*: that explains the name assigned to it.

Furthermore, this second part of the Rule might also be classed as complementary legislation, though this trait may not be strikingly evident. A Rule like the *Disciplina monasterii*, tested in daily living for three years under the observant eye of Augustine, would have proved its quality and its possibilities of improvement. It was natural that the lawgiver should have profited by these years of reflection and experience when the circumstances of his priesthood and the occasion of a new foundation afforded him an opportunity to revise his legislation.

A comparative study of the two parts of the Rule will show that each part -- in fact, each article in the two parts -- is not contradictory in any way, but in a certain measure is complementary. This work has already been done by Dom De Bruyne, who applied himself to the comparison of the Augustinian texts with such precision and skill that his achievement dispenses us from repeating the examination. His conclusion merits the full confidence of our readers.

In paragraph four, entitled "Comparison between RA and OM" (that is, according to the denomination we have agreed on, comparison between the Commentary and the *Disciplina monasterii*), Dom De Bruyne writes: "Four statements are easily posited: these two documents have many differences; they are never contradictory; in general, they are complementary; in rare passages where they are parallel, there is agreement . . ."

"In general, OM [*Disciplina monasterii*] does not touch matters treated in RA [the Commentary]; it indicates points which RA does not mention. For instance, it omits prescriptions relative to the sick (nos. 9-13), the bath (no. 13), the habit (nos. 10, 12), the oratory (no. 7), the long passage on custody of the eyes in the presence of women (nos. 9, 10). On the other hand, it considers the Divine Office (no. 2), the horarium (no. 3), silence (no. 8), etc. Evidently its purpose was to complete RA."

Here Dom De Bruyne is mistaken about the relative order of these two texts because of the theory by which he attributed the composition of the *Disciplina monasterii* to St. Benedict; he has inverted the order, but the facts remain the same: *eadem est ratio contrariorum*. He continues: " Between the two writings there is no contradiction; rather is the contrary true. Thus OM prescribes that books be returned every day at the hour of None. According to RA, the books may be asked for every day.(18)

Thus it may be maintained that nothing prevents the two parts of the Rule of St. Augustine from constituting a single whole; but rather that the one even demands, coordinates, and completes the other in reciprocal content. Still it seems that this complementary character, slight as it is, ought not to be exaggerated. The addition to the Rule is much more of a commentary than a complement.

On closer scrutiny this last remark appears a bit superficial and calls for modification. The Commentary was an addition of prime importance for the Rule, and its very existence would suffice to show that the Rule of St. Augustine normally consists of the two known parts, and that it is unquestionably the work of the Bishop of Hippo.(19)

THE PRECEPTIVE FORCE

We have noted the absence of any preceptive formula in the *Disciplina monasterii*. The authority of the father and of the superior, which article six mentions indirectly, seems not to flow from the imperative force of a definite legislation, but solely from the virtue of the subjects. The formula is subtly indirect and aptly expresses the relations of the two persons: "Let them honor their father after God and respect their superior as becomes the holy."

The Commentary in turn names the father and the superior in a parallel text, where there exists a new authority. "Obey your superior as a father, serving with honor, and offend not God; and yet more, the priest who has charge of you all."

Here the superior has become father, and the father has become a priest, but their respective hierarchy is maintained, because a few lines farther on, in regard to corrections, we read: "It is more particularly the office of the superior to refer whatever exceeds his capability to the priest whose authority among you is greater."

The *praepositus* (superior) evidently holds the same subordinate position in the Rule and in the Commentary; therefore, it is the *presbyter* (priest) of the Commentary who was *pater* (father) in the *Disciplina monasterii*.

Augustine himself is this priest who was once the father. Did not this elevation in his rank among them belong to the time of his return from Hippo? A change had come. The father who did not venture to impose his authority while proposing the *Disciplina monasterii* to his friends could now speak as a master. Experience with his Rule over a period of two or three years had taught him how difficult it was to have men live in community, and he had noted in practice points wherein the *Disciplina monasterii* would have to be clarified or supplemented; that was his purpose with his Commentary.

But there is a question which exceeds all others in importance, though it might not occur to a reader of the two legislative texts if it were not indicated: it is the question of their preceptive force. Preceptive force does not exist in the *Disciplina*: obedience appears only as a general virtue, and not as one of subordination to a special authority who has the right to command. In the Commentary the Rule has a formal imperative force. The two above-mentioned texts may be compared:

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>"Fideliter obedient; patrem suum post Deum honorent; praeposito suo deferant sicut decet sanctos."</p> | <p>"Let them obey with fidelity; honor their father after God and respect their superior as becomes the holy."</p> |
| <p>Praeposito tanquam patri obediatur, honore servato, ne in illo offendatur Deus; multo magis presbytero qui omnium vestrum curam gerit."</p> | <p>"Obey your superior as a father, serving with honor, and offend not God; and much more, the priest who has charge of you all."</p> |

Furthermore, in planning his Commentary on the Rule, Augustine's first thought was to give to both texts an imperative character.

This was not difficult in the case of the Commentary, since he was about to compose it. Therefore, in the opening words and throughout, we find imperative expressions applicable to any law.

As for the *Disciplina*, which did not have this character, Augustine provided by introducing between the two parts of his Rule a formula pertaining to what precedes in the *Disciplina*, and to what follows in the Commentary; by a skillful transitional passage, the formula can and must apply to the two parts.

Haec sunt quae ut observetis praecipimus in monasterio constituti. "These are the things which we command you who are assembled in the monastery to observe." *Haec* refers both to what has been read and to what is to be read; the *praecipimus* here has a force in virtue of which its meaning reverts to the *Disciplina* and gives it the imperative value not inherent in its precepts. The formula so truly welds the *Disciplina* and its Commentary into one that tradition accepted them as a single whole and separated them only at the beginning of the twelfth century in circumstances to be treated later. This unity was effected not merely on a structural basis but, as has been shown, on a profound constitutional likeness. St. Augustine's skill ensured for the two parts of his Rule that which gives value to legislation, its preceptive force. Therefore in the textual revisions imposed on each of the parts when separated, the two precepts, that of charity and that of the lawgiver ("These are the things which we command you to observe"), were retained in each section of the original whole.

THE WELDING TRANSITION

Why did not Augustine, who devoted so much time to writing, compose a new edition of the Rule? The document in question was a law, and a legislative text is not simply the production of an author. The text was in force in an established community and was consecrated by usage; it could be supplemented or revised, but not entirely abolished. All legislative history proves this. This truth would be evident again in 1255 with regard to the same Rule of St. Augustine. There was the proposal of Alexander IV that it should be fused with the Constitutions of the Preachers, but the project fell through. Both legislative texts had been established and had the force of law; usage had consecrated them.

We may add that each of the two parts of the Rule kept a distinct character and, except in the guaranty of the preceptive force, each served its special purposes, according to its own particular *raison d'être*. It would not have been proper to fuse them. The *Disciplina*, short and concise, with numbers and hours, determined in a definite way the schedule of life; on this point it required only rare additions. The Commentary, genial, literary, and hortatory in tone, was meant to interpret the spirit of the Rule, to develop its religious significance. This complementary diversity in itself contributed to the unity of the whole; the structural and organic welding strengthened the impression of totality. Such was the Rule of St. Augustine as it came from his own hands, the fruit of his own religious life.

No one would question this assertion if the first part of the Rule of St. Augustine had not disappeared in the twelfth century, and if subsequently the Commentary, which was used as a separate document, was not generally regarded as apocryphal in the edition for men and as derived from letter 211, addressed to religious women. The prevalence and uncontested acceptance of this historical prejudice from the twelfth century on oblige us to complete the proof by a study of the text of the letter, not only for the purpose of restoring it to the place it ought to have in reference to the Commentary, but also to explain the error made on this subject.

EVIDENCE OF THE TRANSCRIPTION ANNEXED TO LETTER 211

With the exception of Father Vega, all recent critics and many older ones also, hold it as established that the *Regula fratrum* (Commentary) is a transcription of the *Regula sororum* (Transcription), adapted for a monastery of men. Thus, in discussions relative to the three Augustinian legislative texts, the dependence is regarded as an established fact, and even as something in the category of an evident truth. Anyone who does not wish to accept this a priori and who pursues a close consideration of the case will find that there is nothing to justify such a prejudice and also that it is the *Regula sororum* which proceeds from the *Regula fratrum*.

The prejudice is an ancient one. It came into being less than half a century after the disappearance of the *Disciplina monasterii* brought about an obstruction in historical perspective. The celebrated *Dialogue of the Cluniac and the Cistercian*, dating from 1156,⁽²⁰⁾ supports the idea that the Rule of St. Augustine was drawn up for women. Moreover, the tone is controversial. In recalling this feminine origin of the Rule, the Cistercian denies to the Norbertines, for whom he does not spare his sarcasm, the right to consider that they are called to the priesthood more than Benedictines.⁽²¹⁾ The assertion is made as a discovery. Another contemporary work, purporting to express the opinion of many, purely and simply creates a doubt about the authenticity of the Rule.⁽²²⁾

In the sixteenth century Erasmus again opened the question about the dependence of the two Rules. He did it, however, with a reserve characteristic of him. Neither in his work nor in his life did the celebrated humanist like to take a decided stand. But subsequent writers were less reserved. Erasmus brought out an edition of the works of St. Augustine which was reprinted many times.⁽²³⁾ In what he has called the *Censura Regulae D. Augustini*, he stated his belief that the original text was that annexed to the letter to the sisters, the other being only an adaptation for men.⁽²⁴⁾ He did not even assert that the adaptation was the work of Augustine.

Amort has called attention to the names of some leading authors who adopted Erasmus' view;⁽²⁵⁾ but ordinarily these authors did not employ the somewhat evasive tone affected by the celebrated humanist in the expression of his judgment. At any rate, in our time all doubt about the dependence of the *Regula fratrum* upon the *Regula sororum* has yielded to an acceptance of it as an established fact.

How did the Commentary in the edition for women acquire such a distinction? After the suppression of the *Disciplina*, critics were confronted with a single text in both forms. The Commentary in the edition for men was an isolated treatise, unattached to any other. In the other form, however, it was annexed to a letter of St. Augustine which served as its passport and as a guaranty of its authenticity. Its fortune was made.

The style of letter 211 (modern notation) is so characteristic of Augustine that it never occurred to anyone to question its authenticity. There is certainly no doubt about that. But does the same hold true for the legislative text annexed to it? On this, too, all seem to agree, except Father Vega, who denies the authenticity. (26) The Rule, as a matter of fact, simply follows the letter without any word to indicate a dependence, without any sign of direction either in the letter or in the Rule to require that these two texts be kept together or that they form a single whole.

This objection or this premise was not new. Amort raised it and refuted it. (27) We do not see what weight it could have in seriously compromising the Augustinian origin of the *Regula sororum*. The legislative text addressed to the sisters would not have been adequate in itself, as we have already concluded, for the guidance and direction of a community; but there is nothing to show that the sisters did not already have a Rule, perhaps even the one given to the men, the *Disciplina monasterii*. Assuredly, the *Regula sororum* was written for women. Considering this fact, we should not regard it as strange that it was affixed to a letter in which Augustine vigorously censured those to whom it was addressed, a community of religious women. Circumstances justified the procedure of their superior, the Bishop of Hippo. We should not forget that the *Regula sororum* and the *Regula fratrum* are one and the same text under different forms, and the position of Augustine when he wrote to the convent which his sister had governed justified his sending to the religious these exhortations to higher perfection which he had composed for their use and which he had already given to a monastery of men.

THE TRANSCRIPTION IS ST. AUGUSTINE'S

Moreover, Augustine's way of sending the Rule attached to his letter, without any preface to the *Regula sororum*, should not seem difficult to explain, simply because of our preoccupation with critics with whom Augustine did not have to be concerned. Furthermore, he had not done otherwise in the formulation of his Rule for the men. After composing the short Rule, the *Disciplina monasterii*, later he added the complement or the Commentary which, while meant to form a whole with the *Disciplina*, has no external mark to indicate this dependence. Only through the contents of the Commentary can we arrive at a conclusion about its positive dependence on the *Disciplina monasterii*.

Hence there seems to be no sufficient reason for rejecting the authenticity of the form of the Commentary known as the *Regula sororum*. But it is one thing to accept it as the work of St. Augustine and quite another to hold that the Commentary called *Regula fratrum* was derived from it, and not conversely.

The *Regula fratrum* and the *Regula sororum* are not two different texts, but one and the same text in two forms; not that the author would have composed a neuter text which he would transcribe later for masculine and feminine use (such an idea in this case would be chimerical), but, having composed one, he must have drafted a second from the first. Not even by a comparison of the two texts would it be possible to say a priori which was the first written. It is interesting, however, that Dom Lambot found some lessons better in the men's edition than in the other. This we can understand, since the text for the men was the original,

Editors and critics who have closely examined the manuscripts and it may easily be done -- are unanimous in saying that the transcription from one text to the other was executed carefully and with scrupulous exactitude. They are mistaken, I think, in holding that the text for the brothers was derived from that for the sisters; but this view does not alter the relationship which they note between the two forms.

De Bruyne writes: "Schroeder has acknowledged and Capelle has more insistently declared that the writer of RA (the Commentary for the brothers) was very conservative. He altered the letter of the text only when it was indispensable to do so. It was but slightly affected; here are the principal changes."[\(28\)](#) De Bruyne notes these changes, which fill little more than a page; nor do I think the foregoing conclusion should be modified for that reason. The connection between the two texts is such that we must take for granted that the Commentary, whether for the brothers or the sisters, constitutes but a single text and that the two adaptations of the text are the work of the same hand.

All the literature of the Middle Ages shows evident traces of the current fashion of taking and adapting passages from earlier documents for later ones. Rules, statutes, or constitutions not only did not escape this common practice, but furnish even more characteristic examples of it. In any case, it is more easily ascertained that what is striking in this sort of taking and adapting is the apparent freedom with which literary sources have been transformed. The dependence of the two Augustinian texts in the conservative manner noted above is probably unique. That is one reason why there should be no hesitation in attributing the Commentary of the brothers and the Commentary of the sisters to St. Augustine.

But nothing, absolutely nothing, proves that the text for the sisters served as a starting point for the text for the brothers. It is true that, if the Rule of St. Augustine is made to consist, as it is today, of the text of the Commentary alone in either of its forms, there is difficulty in deciding on the priority of dependence. Fortunately there is more to the Rule of St. Augustine, and when it is reconstituted in its two parts, on the basis of the manuscript tradition, the women's form of the Commentary loses every title to be considered the primitive text.[\(29\)](#)

The demonstration developed in the preceding paragraphs suffices to reverse the order, gratuitously accepted today, of the relation existing between letter 211 and the Commentary on the Rule. The text of the Commentary annexed to the letter is merely a Transcription of the first, or original, Commentary.

Furthermore, a direct study of the Commentary in the women's form leads to the discovery of new evidence for the prior claim of the men's form. First of all, it is unlikely that Augustine would have waited until the year 423, the date of letter 211, to enact a legislative text. For about forty years his interests had been linked with the common "apostolic" life. Thirty-five years before, he had founded his first monastery; all during the ensuing period he was engaged in founding or governing communities of men or of women. For a long time also he had been writing for the direction of monks.

It is not less unlikely that he would have begun legislating for women when the communities of which he was the founder and immediate father were composed of men. Then, too, we should note that the introductory considerations in the Commentary express the very personal views of Augustine on the life of clerics, such as he developed them in his celebrated sermons on clerics and such as Possidius briefly summarized in describing life in his monastery in 391.[\(30\)](#)

ORIGIN OF THE TRANSCRIPTION

Moreover, this supposed Rule of the sisters is not called such anywhere in writing. Letter 211 furnishes no clue on the subject. The document makes no claim for itself. As for the manuscript tradition, only one Rule of St. Augustine is recognized from the beginning, and that is the Rule for the men with its two parts.

So far as is known, this Rule for sisters was received and practiced by no other convent of women than the one to which the letter was addressed by Augustine. So true is this, that in the following century, when Caesarius of Arles was about to draw up a rule for women, he found inspiration in the text of St. Augustine, and borrowed, not from the Commentary attached to letter 211, but from the Commentary for the men. We may not even say that the women to whom the letter was addressed received this text as a Rule: as we have remarked, there is no introduction to explain why this legislation is attached to the Bishop's letter. On the other hand, by using the findings of Dom De Bruyne, I have shown the connection between the Commentary and the *Disciplina monasterii*. Augustine could not have composed the Commentary without reference to the *Disciplina*. This Commentary alone would never serve the purpose of a Rule, nor would its import be fully comprehensible without the *Disciplina*, since it was the spiritual development of the *Disciplina*.

True, we might suppose that the sisters were already following the first Rule in an adapted form. But such a supposition proves nothing as regards the Commentary. If St. Augustine had drawn up the Commentary at the time he composed the letter, he would have written the document as a single whole. At the close of his reprimand, for instance, after announcing what he was about to do, he would have changed the subject and explained that he was not stopping with words of reproach but was composing for their immediate and express use a legislative complement on the details of their Rule. As things are, does not the absence of such an explanation give evidence that the Commentary was something Augustine had on hand and that he was satisfied simply to transcribe it for all useful purposes? As the *Disciplina* was written for men and existed only in that form, the transcribed Commentary was also for men.

How and when did St. Augustine compose it? Lacking any direct information, the only way we can settle the question is to assign this legislative document to the literary and particularly the monastic career of the Bishop of Hippo. A legislative text, one elaborated in two characteristic stages like the true Rule of St. Augustine, does not come into being by chance; it stands as evidence of definite conditions, of living history: an experimental period of trial, followed by an occasion for imperative promulgation, and at length the final interpretation in a commentary. Thus the Rule holds the history of Augustine's foundations.

Through an independent study of the Transcription annexed to letter 211, we can approach some conclusions.

Along with the classic Commentary, the Rule of St. Augustine includes a basic or capital text not found in the Transcription annexed to letter 211. That basic or capital text is the *Disciplina monasterii*, written by St. Augustine at the time of the foundation of his first African monastery. These two divisions, the *Disciplina* and the Commentary, are welded into a single law by the transitional precept: *Haec sunt quae ut observetis praecipimus in monasterio constituti* ("These are the things which we command you who are assembled in the monastery to observe"). And finally, the Commentary was transcribed in the feminine form for the use of religious women. It is time now to consider how this unity was dissolved in the twelfth century and how the Rule was reduced to its Commentary.

1 *La première règle de saint Benoît*, pp. 318-26.

2 *Op. cit.*, pp. 128, 138 f.

3 De Bruyne, *op. cit.*, 316 f.

4 *op. cit.*, p. 327.

5 *PL*, LXVI, 977-86.

6 *La première règle*, *loc. cit.*

7 *L'ordre des heures canoniales*, *loc. cit.*

8 *Op. cit.*, p. 151.

9 *S. Caesarii Arelatensis Episcopi Regula Sanctarum Virginum aliaque opuscula ad sanctimoniales directa*, Bonn, 1933 (*Florilegium Patristicum*, Fasc. XXXIV).

10 De Bruyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 316 f.; Arnort, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

11 *Revue Mabillon*, XXIV (1934), 149.

12 The following is the Latin text.

[For the online version we have reproduced the Latin text as a table in the body of the article. -- The Webfriar]

1. Ante omnia, fratres carissimi, diligatur Deus, deinde proximus, quia ista sunt praecepta principaliter nobis data.

2. Qualiter autem nos oportet orare vel psallere describimus; id est in matutinis dicantur psalmi tres: sexagesimus secundus, quintus et octogesimus nonus; ad tertiam prius psalmus ad respondendum dicatur, deinde antiphonae duae, lectio et completorium; simili modo sexta et nona; ad lucernarium autem psalmus responsorius unus, antiphonae quattuor, item psalmus unus responsorius, lectio et completorium. Et tempore opportuno post lucernarium, omnibus sedentibus, legantur lectiones; post haec autem consuetudinarii psalmi ante sonnum dicantur. Nocturnae autem orationes, mensae novembri, decembri, januarii et februario, antiphonae duodecim, psalmi sex, lectiones tres; martio, aprili, septembri et octobri, antiphonae decem, psalmi quinque, lectiones tres; maio, junio, julio et augusto antiphonae octo, psalmi quattuor, lectiones duae.

3. Operentur a mane usque ad sextam, et a sexta usque ad nonam vacent lectioni, et ad nonam reddant codices, et, postquam refecerint, sive in horto, sive ubicumque necesse fuerit, faciant opus usque ad horam lucernarii.

4. Nemo sibi aliquid suam vindicet proprium, sive in vestimento, sive in quacumque re; apostolicam enim vita optamus vivere.

5. Nemo cum murmure aliquid faciat, ut non simili iudicio murmuratorum pereat.

6. Fideliter obediant, patrem suum post Deum honorent, praeposito suo deferant sicut decet sanctos.

7. Sedentes ad mensam taceant audientes lectionem. Si autem aliquid opus fuerit, praepositus eorum sit sollicitus. Sabbato et dominica, sicut consuetudo est, qui volunt, vinum accipiant.

8. Si opus fuerit ad aliquam necessitatem monasterii mitti, duo eant. Nemo extra monasterium sine praecepto manducet neque bibat, non enim hoc ad disciplinam pertinet monasterii. Si opera monasterii mittantur fratres vendere sollicite servent ne quid faciant contra praeceptum, scientes quoniam Deum exacerbant in servis ipsius; sive aliquid. emunt ad necessitatem monasterii, sollicite et fideliter, ut servi Dei, agant.

9. Otiosum verbum apud illos non sit, a mane ad opera sua sedeant, post orationes tertiae eant similiter ad opera sua; non stantes fabulas contexant, nisi forte aliquid sit pro animae utilitate. Sedentes ad opera taceant, nisi forte necessitas operis exegerit ut loquatur quis.

10. Si quis autem non omni virtute, adjuvante miseri cordia Domini, haec conatus fuerit implere, contumaci vero animo despexerit, semel atque iterum commonitus, si non emendaverit, sciat se subicere disciplinae monasterii sicut oportet. Si autem talis fuerit aetas ipsius, etiam vapulet.

Haec autem in nomine Christi fideliter et pie observantes et vos proficietis et nobis non parva erit laetitia de vestra salute. Amen.

Haec eunt quae ut observetis praecipimus in monasterio constituti.

Primum, propter quod in uno estis congregati. . . .

13 "Let them obey with fidelity . . . as becomes the holy."

14 In the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* or in *Histoire de la littérature chrétienne* of De Labriolle (Paris, 1924, table no. 8), there is a chronological list of the works of St. Augustine which gives evidence of his steady literary activity from the time of the foundation of his monasteries. It is in accord with what Possidius wrote when he described the occupations of St. Augustine at this time.

15 These are the very expressions employed by Possidius in describing the life of the Monastery in 391: one might think he was alluding to the beginning of the Commentary drawn up at that time.

16 "The *ordo* just analyzed is assuredly rudimentary. From it we can glean only a very imperfect notion of the practices it was intended to regulate. Nevertheless, liturgists will refer to it. It is the oldest that can be examined. In the history of the Office, it belongs to a period of transition when Prime had not yet been adopted everywhere, and Compline was beginning to have a place with the other canonical hours" (Lambot, "Un ordo officii du V^e siècle," *Revue bénéd.*, XLII (1930), 80).

17 *La première règle*, p. 329.

18 *Ibid.*

19 Here ends the text dictated by Father Mandonnet.

20 This interesting opusculum was the object of several studies, the last of which was by J. Storm, who succeeded in determining the date of the composition as 1256, but was unable to determine the author. Dr. V. Redlich supplied the missing data; the Dialogue was written at Adelspach by a certain Irungus, a Cluniac who became a Cistercian and who, it seems, must be identified with Irungus of St. Emmeran.

These points agree with what was otherwise known about the nature and geographical background of the work.

21 The following is the text of the passage:

Cluniac: "Whence do you hold that their Rule was written for women?" Cistercian: "From the prologue of the same Rule." Cluniac: "Their Rule has no prologue." Cistercian: "Because they dropped it and changed the feminine form into the masculine" (*Dialogus*, Martène, *Anecd.*, V, 1625).

Here it would seem that the Cistercian is confusing the *Disciplina* and Epistle 211. The Premonstratensians in the course of the twelfth century caused the effective disappearance of the *Disciplina monasterii* which served as a prologue to their Rule at the time of their foundation (1119-20). But it was Epistle 211 which served as a prologue (if the term may be used) to the feminine form of the Commentary. The Cistercian's mistake would be repeated more than once in the course of the next eight centuries (MHV).

22 "To be sure, concerning the Rule, which many of the canons assigned to St. Augustine, because it bears that title, I am audacious enough to declare something as certain. For if I shall say it is not his, the title itself, which everywhere includes the name of Augustine, will contradict me. Again, if I assert that it is his, two objections can be raised, and they are voiced by many: first, that it is not included, as many of his works are, in the Book of Retractations, and secondly, that it is notably lacking in the quality of diction and gravity of style characteristic of that Aurelius. . . . No one, therefore, may believe his brother to be a prevaricator of the way of the Lord in regard to that Rule, the authorship of which is contested by many (*De diversis ordinibus ecclesiae*; *PL*, CCXIII, 833).

23 Cf. *Bibliotheca erasmiana*, 2nd series, Ghent, 1893, pp. 13 f.

24 "This Rule, both in thought and diction, points to Augustine. In its gracious humility and in its humaneness, it reflects the author, although probably it was not written for clerics but for women who lived together under the direction of Augustine's sister. He calls her a superior, but ultimate authority was vested in the priests. With some changes, it was adapted for the use of men" (cited by C. Pennotti, *Historia tripartita*, 1624, p. 48).

25 *Ibid.*, 148

26 Vega (p. 6) says that the *Regula* sororum is not St. Augustine's; and farther on (pp. 10-12) he demonstrates only that it was not written at the same time as the Letter. It was written earlier for the men; the adaptation might have been made on occasion of the Letter, and that would not affect the character of the document.

27 *Op. cit.*, p. 149 to the end.

28 *La première règle de saint Benoît*, p. 328.

29 From the beginning of this part, up to this point, with the exception of the second paragraph, the text was taken from a first draft made by Father Mandonnet.

30 The sermons *De vita et moribus clericorum suorum* are in *PL*, XXXVIII, 1568 ff.

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XXII

The Rule Decapitated

THE CANONICAL REFORM OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

THE Church had never at any time surrendered her ideal of fostering the apostolic life among the clergy, that is, the common life and the renunciation of private property.

Of all the efforts directed to this end, those of St. Augustine were among the most illustrious. He had succeeded in assembling in his episcopal monastery all the clergy of the Church of Hippo. His example, his spoken and written word, exerted a mighty influence on the whole Church in Africa. Many of his sons, called forth from his monastery, continued his traditions as bishops in other episcopal sees. Finally, the very persecution of the African Church helped to spread the spirit of these institutions in Europe. Suffice it to say that the clerical apostolate of St. Augustine, popularized by his writings, endured as the ideal which later reformers sought to realize in the same sphere.

It is no wonder, therefore, that the name and the institution of St. Augustine were hailed, almost as a standard, in the second half of the eleventh century when the movement for clerical reform resulted in the organization of the canons regular.

This movement for the religious reform of the clergy is studied little today. At least it is not given the attention it merits. In fact, its importance parallels that of the contemporaneous movement for monastic reform.⁽¹⁾

The reform is connected, as an effect, with Gregory VII's attempt to re-establish the position of the Church by wresting from the civil power the sway it had arrogated to itself for domination in the ecclesiastical world. Persistently striving to emancipate the Church from interference of the secular power in episcopal elections and recognizing that a radical transformation in the Church required first of all a transformation in the habits of the clergy, this great Pope appealed to all men of good will to cooperate with him in his efforts. The actual accomplishment of the reform appears to us as something sporadic; and, in fact, so it was. The canonical institution, with the reform of the clergy, was not achieved at one stroke; it was not generally undertaken simply at the decision of a central authority. On the contrary, it sprang up now here and now there, impelled by individual initiative, aroused by the preaching of earnest reformers like Peter Damian. Moreover, these individual attempts received from the Roman Curia efficacious suggestion, exhortation, encouragement, and support. These efforts, tenaciously followed by a long series of reforming popes, acquired a real coordination.

Thus the movement for canonical reform presents a double aspect which is remarkable. On the one hand, it was spontaneous and to some extent subject to the hazard of local initiative. On the other hand, it possessed in the popes a centralizing force that ensured its continuity and development. This phenomenon should be kept in mind for an understanding of the unity of spirit and, in a measure, of organization animating a movement that apparently was so spontaneous and varied.

What influence did the institution and the Rule of St. Augustine exert in the canonical reform? It is hard to say. Too much obscurity still veils the origin of the movement. As we just said, however, the name of St. Augustine recurs frequently in the texts; but perhaps the use of this name does not always signify that the Rule of the Bishop of Hippo was adopted or that it was even known. The Augustinian institution was mentioned, because it was the synonym for a clerical life in common and for an absolute renunciation of individual property, which other forms of the "canonical life" did not exact so

rigorously. It may also be ascertained that from the close of the eleventh century the Rule of St. Augustine was used in a number of cases in canonical communities.⁽²⁾ As further light is thrown on this phenomenon, it becomes evident that the part played by the Rule grew in proportion to the development of the movement. In the twelfth century, on account of the organized unity of the reform, the Rule of St. Augustine was extended to the whole canonical order, and its influence was so important that the two expressions, "Regular Canonical Order" and "Augustinian Order," could be regarded as nearly equivalent. Almost forgotten until then, the legislative text was more and more widely diffused up to the close of the Middle Ages.

The sudden and remarkable success of an institution and of a Rule seven centuries old could hardly be sustained without some repercussion. Marvelously adapted as the Rule of St. Augustine was to the use which the ecclesiastical reformers expected to make of it, inevitably it had to undergo a drastic modification in view of the very purposes it was to serve and from the contemporary conditions in which it was to be applied. What actually happened did violence to the Rule. This violence was its decapitation.

THE BROTHERS OF SPRINGIRSBACH

An understanding of the revivals of the Rule of St. Augustine during the twelfth century requires a study of the history of legislation. In the orders of canons regular which, like those of St. Victor and of Prémontre', were founded in that period.

The text of St. Augustine in use among the Premonstratensians at the time of their organization (about 1120), included the *Disciplina monasterii* along with the Commentary. The ancient liturgical books of Prémontre' -- the ultra-conservative character of this kind of writing is known to all -- preserved the text up to the seventeenth century.⁽³⁾ In this text of the *Disciplina* only the *Ordo officii* is missing; this omission of the liturgical article occurs in such a way that it seems also to have been omitted from the primitive legislation.⁽⁴⁾ Again, however, there is reliable evidence to show that the whole *Disciplina monasterii* was dropped from the legislation and the life of the Premonstratensians⁽⁵⁾ about the middle of the twelfth century. Between the dates marking the passage of three decades of years, the Rule of

Augustine, which had been retained until then in its traditional and primitive form, saw its first part cut off in the legislation of the Order of Prémontre'.⁽⁶⁾

Apparently in other canonical foundations similar changes were made in the law. The general form of the text of the Rule in the next century shows this: the *Disciplina* is nowhere to be found.

The research required to verify the facts in these evolutions is, unfortunately, difficult to manage. Little is known about the primitive legislation of religious foundations. It seems that earlier legislation was naturally allowed to disappear as soon as it was supplanted by later legislation, which alone was of immediate interest to the contemporaries. In the age of manuscripts the out-of-date text often disappeared. Moreover, on account of the fragmentary character of documentation, research in this field could hardly result in the finding of exact data about the time and the cause of the disappearance.

But such a transformation could not have been effected by chance or without leaving some evidence. The text of the Rule enjoyed considerable authority; it was a traditional law, recently restored to honor everywhere by the canonical reform, and its sanction was the name of St. Augustine. A suppression of the *Disciplina monasterii*, the most important part of this text, was indeed daring. It was not customary in that age to treat with slight consideration any authorized text, especially a legal text. Only a power

equal to that of patristic authority could, while imposing the Rule of St. Augustine, dispense with some parts of it. Evidently the popes had that authority.

At this point a fundamental document testifies to the persistence of the Rule of St. Augustine in its traditional form through the first twenty years of the twelfth century, and likewise notes the date and the causes of the official suppression of the *Disciplina monasterii*. The document is a letter of Pope Gelasius II to the canons of Springirsbach, dated August 11, 1118.

The brothers of this community of canons regular of the Diocese of Trier had followed, at least from the year 1107, the Rule of St. Augustine.⁽⁷⁾ Then they found themselves face to face with a serious problem: what the Rule of St. Augustine prescribed in regard "to the Office, manual work, and fasting" was, they declared, impossible of fulfillment in their province. Therefore they referred the matter to the central authority of the canonical reform, the Pope.

Let us pause here. The text which details a number of prescriptions for the Office, manual labor, and fasting is not the Commentary, but the *Disciplina monasterii*. It suffices to reread these texts. The brothers of Springirsbach, therefore, had the *Disciplina* in their Rule of St. Augustine and regarded it as constituting an essential part of the Rule. They could not have conceived its not being a part of it.

THE INTERVENTION OF POPE GELASIUS II

Quite as much may be said of Pope Gelasius II. Moreover, he was in a position to know whether the *Disciplina* had not always constituted an integral part of the Rule in other localities. His reply to the canons' question shows eloquently that the Pope did not have the least doubt about the authenticity of the first part of the Rule. It must, therefore, be concluded that in 1118 the *Disciplina monasterii* was still officially part of the Rule of St. Augustine.

We should note that the three points enumerated by the brothers of Springirsbach include exactly all the positive prescriptions of the *Disciplina*, those by which it is distinguished from the Commentary. Further, they represent the three essential points to be regulated in a common life: prayer, work, and sustenance. It is the *Disciplina*, then, in its entirety that creates the difficulty. In the last analysis, it is the very Rule of the Bishop of Hippo; because, as we have shown, the *Disciplina* alone constituted a Rule in the strict sense of the word, a law capable of organizing the common life of a society of men.

A glance at St. Augustine's prescriptions will be enough to show how the difficulties of the German canons were justified. The *Ordo Officii* detailed by the *Disciplina monasterii* is the most archaic on record. The fast, which was to be broken only for a single meal at three o'clock in the afternoon, could indeed be kept in warm countries, but it was not practical in the twelfth century for people in Germany.⁽⁸⁾ The Benedictine rules of the period assigned a single meal for the periods of the great fast; but the legislation of the *Disciplina* would thus have imposed upon the canons a fast for three hundred sixty-five days in the year. In regard to manual labor, the only kind mentioned, the *Disciplina* defined the necessity, amount, and schedule for a program suitable in the primitive state of Augustinian monasteries where clerics and laymen lived together. But it was no longer applicable in the same degree for the ordinary clerics in the service of a church. Consequently, in 1118 it seemed that the Rule of St. Augustine, in its essential prescriptions contained in the *Disciplina monasterii*, could not be applied.

PONTIFICAL DECISION

What would be the Pope's reply to the question sent by the canons of Springirsbach? This reply must be examined in detail. We here set down the letter. The Latin text will be found in Migne (CLXIII, 496).

(Rome, August 11, 1118) To the Reverend Superior and his brethren of the Church of Springirsbach, health and apostolic benediction.

Our attention has been called to the problem raised among you concerning the Rule of St. Augustine: to wit: "Certain prescriptions are included therein for the Office, manual labor, and fasting, which cannot be observed in our provinces." Suitable moderation ought to be a guide in such matters. With the grace of God, whatever pertains to advancement in virtuous living ought to be observed. On the other hand, what the same Doctor has written on the Office cannot be followed, because it does not now accord with the usage of Rome and other Churches. The Rule of St. Benedict likewise contains certain prescriptions on observances of this kind, but the practice in the monasteries now is quite different; nevertheless, the profession of the monks is not on that account invalidated. Therefore, we command that the Office be celebrated among you according to the custom of the Catholic Church. Indeed, manual labor and fasting should be undertaken with consideration for the climate of the country and the ability of persons, but in that regard the customs common among the regular brethren should be followed.

The sanctions of the holy Fathers teach us how we should refrain from intercourse with the excommunicated. Nevertheless, if, on account of such intercourse, any have fallen through weakness or through the influence of the wicked, the prior may absolve them and impose a suitable penance.

May your brotherhood never cease to intercede with the Almighty God for our tribulations and those of the Roman Church.

The text is clear. To the difficulty of the brothers, the Pope replies that prudent moderation should direct their observance of the Rule. He begins by excluding one class of propositions: "whatever pertains to advancement in virtuous living," that is, all the moral prescriptions of the Augustinian text. These maxims of the religious spirit comprise the ethical part of the Rule, which the Commentary expands in its development. Altogether they represent the essential observances which the canons will maintain and put into practice with the help of God's grace.

Gelasius commands the brothers to celebrate the Office according to the custom then approved by the Catholic Church. The *Ordo officii* in the *Disciplina* thus becomes obsolete. On this point the Pope is categorical; for it concerns a rule, the lapse of which in no way derogates from the religious profession.

The Pope's advice is less categorical about the other two prescriptions: it is proper to undertake manual labor and fasting according to the climate and the health of individuals. Lastly, in these matters, he urges them to follow the "customs common among the regular brethren."⁽⁹⁾

By direct order of the Pope, therefore, the three essential prescriptions of the *Disciplina monasterii* were abolished. As a reference to the text of the Rule will show, articles 2, 3, and 9 thus became a dead letter; the other paragraphs of the *Disciplina* had a moral import, and in substance they were treated and developed in the Commentary. The suppression of the three categorical precepts was equivalent, therefore, to the suppression of the whole *Disciplina monasterii*. More significantly, it marked the elimination of what gave to the whole Augustinian legislation a definite and detailed constitutional character, making it, properly speaking, a Rule. Of the work of St. Augustine, there survived only the spiritual and moral Commentary, *ea quae ad mores bonos pertinent*; the Rule was decapitated.

SUBSTITUTION OF HEADS

A head had to be substituted; accordingly Gelasius II substituted for the invalidated articles the contemporary liturgy of the Church and that religious law which he called *communis fratrum regularium consuetudo*, which was to organize the life of the canons.

There is something remarkable about the second injunction. From the ninth century on, the word "regular" signified a manner of life conformed to the Rule par excellence, the Rule of St. Benedict. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, when all the monks were of course Benedictine, regular life and monastic life were synonymous terms. Different in character was the *vita canonica*, organized by the canonical decrees (those of the Synod of Aachen in 816 were of particular importance) or by the rules of mitigated observance, like those of Chrodegang of Metz, which did not impose austerity, poverty, and the common life with the same rigor, or, above all, with the same efficacy. In the tenth and eleventh centuries the canonical life was really a clerical life. It might quite naturally be supposed that the Gregorian movement which sought to restore the apostolic life, or the perfect community, among clerics, had for an ideal a kind of transposition of the "regular" or Benedictine life. Thence was to emerge the life of the canon regular; the very expression seems pleonastic, since "canon" means "rule" (the authors of the twelfth century emphasize the fact); but with historical perspective it acquires a remarkable significance.

This should be well understood. The Gregorian reformers did not, as is sometimes thought, intend to impose Benedictine life on the clerics. In that case the choice, or rather the rediscovery, of the Rule of St. Augustine in view of the canonical reform would have been quite inexplicable. Was not the Rule of St. Benedict available, if their purpose was to Benedictinize the clerics? Indeed such an undertaking would not have been possible. What the reformers wished to ensure in the regular life was the ascetic observances, the customs of poverty, and the common life practiced in the cloisters of St. Benedict, yet compatible with clerical life in the economic and social environment of the age.

By 1118, "regular" customs of this type had been in practice for more than half a century in canonical foundations, established almost everywhere. The practices constituted the *communis consuetudo fratrum regularium*, which were enjoined as a substitute for the *Disciplina monasterii*. Like the latter, they guaranteed a precise and organized code of common life; they regulated the day, the work, the fast, the offices. Along with the Commentary of St. Augustine, these customs were adopted as the true Rule of the canons regular of Springirsbach. Thus, by the letter of Gelasius II, the Augustinian legislation of this community was organized.

THE UNIVERSAL BEHEADING

The difficulty confronting the German canons proved to be general. The difficulties they encountered in the observance of the *Disciplina monasterii* were experienced in varying degrees by all the new foundations of clerics regular. The fact that the Rule of St. Augustine had been proposed to all the canonical communities established under the inspiration of the reform to meet the widespread needs of the Church meant that the problem of the brothers of Springirsbach by the same token extended through the whole canonical order. Was the solution of Pope Gelasius to be universally applied?

Without fear of error, we might reply a priori, because we know the outcome of the canonical evolution and the ultimate form of legislation in these institutes. All have legislation similar to that adopted at Springirsbach. Along with the Commentary severed from the Rule of St. Augustine, there are *Consuetudines*, or written customs, which constitute the true law. For this assertion there need be no mere reliance on pure deduction. Amort has published, together With the complete text of the Rule

of St. Augustine (Disciplina and Commentary), a document which he found in a manuscript of the early twelfth century in the monastery of Ranshofen(10) in Upper Austria. It is entitled *Determinatio Gelasii papae in regulam, beati Augustini ad regulares canonicos*, and is the bull of Gelasius II to the brothers of Springirsbach, without its particular references, that is, without the address and the part treating of the excommunicated.

The document includes only the Pope's precepts which substitute the contemporary liturgy and the *communis fratrum regularium consuetudo* for the proscribed articles of the *Disciplina*. Lastly, certain minute but judicious variants gave it a universal import (in provinciis, ubique).

Evidently it represents a general legislative enactment addressed to all the canons regular to "determine," according to the technical sense of the word in the twelfth century, or definitively state what was to be done about the Rule of St. Augustine. What was ordained for the brothers of Springirsbach became in time a general rule. How did this happen?

Did the Pope himself remand the text of his bull for the purpose of extending his decree to all the canons? In that period a current practice in the Roman Curia was to draw upon an earlier bull to promulgate the same answer to the same question. As it is, the acts of Gelasius as they are now published contain no record of such a procedure.

SPONTANEOUS EXTENSION

It is more normal and more in harmony with the history under consideration, to suppose that the letter to the friars of Springirsbach, minus its individuating features, spread directly of itself from monastery to monastery, by way of personal initiative. For was not that the way the canonical reform spread? We have remarked that it was first advanced not so much by an act of central authority as by the zeal of individual promoters, approved and confirmed by the popes. Impressed by the renown of certain communities, founders decided to imitate them, and often adopted their legislation, rules, and customs. From St. Ruf, Marbach, and Springirsbach also(11) there radiated an influence upon houses which otherwise maintained their own independence. This influence was rapid and far-reaching. All Christian Europe was astir at the time: merchants, knights, crusaders, scholars, pilgrims, religious. Numerous and profound exchanges were not yet impeded by national barriers. This explains phenomena at first disconcerting, namely, the simultaneous renaissance of the Rule of St. Augustine during the second half of the eleventh century in widely distant foundations,(12) and the general and rapid extension of the Rule to the whole canonical order. It also makes comprehensible the way the *Disciplina* was generally relinquished in the first half of the twelfth century.

Another text, noted also by Amort, contributes light to the situation. It contains some decrees of the thirteenth century, edited by Duellius, containing reference to the decision of Gelasius about the Rule of St. Augustine in these terms:

Let it be the general custom in singing the Office
To follow the churches wherever we are . . .
And labor and fasting ought to be undertaken
As the location and custom of the land require.
The papal rescript teaches that those practices ought to be retained
Which up to now have been retained in the Springirsbach cloister.(13)

Gelasius' decision radiated directly from Springirsbach. In this way it gradually provoked or sanctioned the universal lapse of the *Disciplina monasterii*. The papal bull was all that was required to effect this

transformation. As the voice of pontifical authority, it could correct and interpret the apostolic rule. The text cited by Amort indicates how its application became general. A history of this aspect of the canonical evolution would, no doubt, require further research; but that goes beyond the limits of our subject. It is enough that we are able to affirm with precision that the Rule of St. Augustine became acephalous, August 11, 1118, by the authority of Gelasius II on the petition of the brothers of Springirsbach.

The *Disciplina monasterii* truly exercised the part of a head in the Augustinian Rule; it was by far the shortest part, but from an institutional point of view the most important, because it and it alone contained the regulations necessary for the exercises of a common life: as in man it is the head that directs the functions essential to life. Consequently, from that time on, no Augustinian community was founded without immediately annexing to the decapitated Commentary some legislation more explicit and better adapted, in the way of customs or constitutions⁽¹⁴⁾ to take the place of the *Disciplina*.

Customs or constitutions of this type thereafter formed the true rule, the living Augustinian Rule. After the decree of Gelasius II, the Commentary which was retained under the incorrect name of the Rule of St. Augustine was no longer a rule, unless regarded as the complement of the new rules substituted for the *Disciplina*. Henceforth what were classed as pieces of Augustinian legislation resembled the statues of emperors during the decadence: the same body (minus the head) remained intact, but the head was changed with the time.

EVIDENCE

In this circumstance we find the key to the later history of the Augustinian institution. It explains the radical diversity among the branches of this religious family, a diversity that has no counterpart in the Benedictine Order. This disappearance of the *Disciplina* accounts especially for the foundation, the nature, and the remarkable expansion of Augustinian customs in the following centuries. Strange as it may seem, the transformation which deprived St. Augustine's Rule of its essential part, far from arresting its success, rendered it remarkably fruitful.

In conclusion, one last detail: the beheading of the Rule of St. Augustine was not effected at a single blow or without sutures. Even now there are traces indicating that delay attended the procedure. These traces are a sign of the intervention of Gelasius. He had not purely and simply ordered the suppression of the *Disciplina*. He had authorized the omission of only the regular prescriptions. Those treating of "virtuous habits" were to be retained. The *Disciplina* opened with the essential precept of the Christian life: "Let God be loved above all things, dearest brethren, and then our neighbor, because these are the principal commands given to us"; this precept of permanent value was detached from the *Disciplina* and was made the first sentence of the *Regula fratrum*. In this revised form the Rule of St. Augustine was transmitted to posterity.⁽¹⁵⁾ This introductory exhortation would of itself prove that the *Disciplina* was at the head of the Rule. Moreover, that is what Gelasius' letter established.

It seems, however, that this solution was not adopted from the first nor was it always accepted later. For example, Hugh of St. Victor, in his commentary on the Rule of St. Augustine, does not quote a word from the *Disciplina*. The text on which he comments begins: *Haec sunt quae ut observetis* ("These are the things which we command that you observe").⁽¹⁶⁾ It is true that Hugh introduced his commentary with a short first chapter entitled: *De charitate Dei et proximi, de unitate cordium et communitate rerum*. Perhaps he considered that this chapter contained the equivalent of the thought in the precept of the *Disciplina*: "Let God be loved. . . ." Hugh might have adopted this method because he did not wish to pass over the formula of the *Disciplina*; yet, since it did not properly belong to the

text on which he was commenting, he chose simply to substitute for it an equivalent explanatory passage in the guise of a prologue.

Amort gives several samples of beginnings of the Rule. (17) Humbert of Romans, in his *Expositio super regulam B. Augustini*, says that in the thirteenth century certain texts began with *Haec sunt*; others with *Ante omnia*. (18) The matter would require still further investigation, but we have said enough for our purpose. The evidence of what happened to the Rule of St. Augustine in the twelfth century is sufficient. Let us now judge of the consequences.

NOTES

1. This paragraph and the following were dictated to us in advance by Father Mandonnet. On the canonical movement, consult the recent studies of Wirges, Herding, and Mouraux.

2 Certainly in 1089; perhaps even in 1067; Schroeder, *Die Augustinerchorherrenregel*, p. 302.

3. G. v. d. Velden, *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, IX (1933), 148-56.

4 The Rule is divided into readings for each day of the week.

5 Van Voorlezen, p. 153.

6 It reappeared in the seventeenth century on the occasion of the reform of Ponth-Mousson, brought about by the Council of Trent. In 1614 the abbot of Pont-à-Mousson published a little volume containing the text of the Rule of St. Augustine with its two primitive parts along with a study on the regular reform and on the obligation of the Rule.

The author remarks that the Premonstratensians alone follow the Rule of St. Augustine in its entirety. Under this form it has never been changed or abrogated in the Order of Prémontré and is therefore part of the substance of its law "*prout apud nos est compilata*."

If what the author says is true, the *Disciplina* was therefore never suppressed in the law of Prémontré. But it is certain that from the middle of the twelfth century it was considered a dead letter.

7 Hauck, IV, 359, 363.

8 The case is similar for monastic abstinence. The Customs of Hirsau have a provision for meat, although this provision does not exist in the Customs of Cluny on which they were based. "Moreover, it was in the Clunysian province of Germany that the first licit derogations from abstinence from meat appeared (in the Order of Cluny). Peter the Venerable himself made note of it in his statutes." Guy de Valous, *Le monachisme clunysien des origines au XV^e siècle*, I, *L'Abbaye de Cluny, les monastères clunysiens* (1935), p. 269.

9 The rest of the letter answers another question of the friars which does not concern us here.

10 Amort, p. 134.

11 Hertling in *Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol.*, LIV (1930), 357.

12 *Ibid.*, LIII (1929), 470.

13 Duellius, *Statuta* no. 3; Amort, p. 134.

14 The existence of customs along with the traditional rule was general in orders of the twelfth century, whether Benedictine or Augustinian. What was properly distinctive in Augustinian legislation was that these customs actually took the place of a rule.

The rule was an ancient text, authentic and confirmed by tradition (the Holy See began to intervene in the confirmation of rules only in the twelfth century), supported by the authority of the Fathers: specifically, St. Augustine, St. Benedict, and St. Basil.

The customs consisted of special regulations as complements of the rule. In the twelfth century there was never a question of the confirmation of the customs. Then what were originally simple and supplementary observances were later enriched by social and organic elements. The evolution of the titles applied to these ordinances is significant: *consuetudines*, *institutiones*, and only as the thirteenth century dawned, *constitutiones*.

In addition, there were statutes, a supplementary and variable form of legislation elaborated by a central authority, the head of the order, and especially the general chapter. The statutes conferred upon religious orders a perpetually adaptable legislation. Ultimately they might be assimilated to the customs. Among these statutes, one of the most celebrated was the Charter of Charity of Cîteaux, one of the first, if not the very first, religious prescription solemnly confirmed by the Holy See.

15 Adam Scotus, *Liber de ordine, habitu, et professione canonicorum ordinis praemonstratensis* (*PL*, CXCVIII, 514).

16 *PL*, CLXXVI, 881.

17 Amort, p. 135.

18 Cf. Humbert, *De vita regulari*, I, 61.

[CONTENTS](#)

SECTION TWO

The Augustinian Rule of St. Dominic Introduction

FOR a long time scholars took for granted that the Rule of St. Augustine was a late work. After the eleventh century they thought that they could find in Epistle 211 a legal text, from which the Rule was derived. Soon this notion became widely accepted. A better knowledge of the history of the manuscript would have refuted this hypothesis, but it did not lack some historical warrant. The second half of the eleventh, the twelfth, and the thirteenth centuries marked the flourishing period of the Augustinian institution.

When the Rule of St. Benedict, after a decisive and glorious influence on Christendom through several centuries, began to slacken in its fecundity in spite of its later reforms, the Rule of St. Augustine saw its influence suddenly increase with the canonical institutions of which we have spoken. The radical transformation which was reshaping the whole social order of Europe in that epoch had its repercussion also in the domain of religious life. The center of civilization was shifting. It was formerly bound up with the feudal order, in which, after the fall of the Roman Empire in the West, the Benedictine foundation, by means of a rule and customs remarkably adapted to the rudimentary state of civilization, had succeeded in preserving all the essential values of life, from the economic to the spiritual. Now that center was passing to towns and communes which were rising here, there, everywhere. The flow of economic life was easier; men became less crude, more cultured. The bourgeois and the traders grew rich. A class, a mentality, a law, and institutions unknown to earlier centuries came into being. Crises occurred which the Church had not yet learned to handle.

This new world had new religious needs: greater spirituality, guidance, a stronger sacramental life, the practice of prayer and asceticism in lay fraternities. Already a reaction had set in against the newly acquired wealth, and ardent desires for a return to the simplicity of the Gospel awakened in the hearts of many. In every domain the emergencies which the Church had to meet took an original turn. At the same time the changing civilization embraced elements unknown to the earlier ages of Christendom. Soon the Church had to engage in more and more frequent struggles against a host of forces: Jews, Mussulman invaders, pagan doctrines, new or revived heresies, political revolutions, social upheavals, and the unenlightened pietism of a laity provoked to anticlericalism by the economic compromises and vices of some of the clergy. All these conditions had to be met by the Church through her clergy. The old monastic order, chiefly concerned with the spiritual perfection of its own members and hindered by institutions formerly so precious, seemed unequal to the pace of the new social order and no longer able to meet the demands made on it, particularly in the cities. The Church needed a reformed and learned priesthood, a militia of regular clergy free to undertake multiple labors. For this clerical reform it was imperative to employ a legislation adaptable to contemporary conditions and contemporary law.

As life in the towns developed a new culture and departed from feudal customs, it developed the urbanity which gave birth to the Rule of St. Augustine. This venerable text, therefore, with its genuine spiritual value and its authority, was endowed with a unique potency for adaptation in the new social order. It was but necessary to substitute for the detailed prescriptions of the *Disciplina*, laws more appropriate to particular situations. Thus revised, the Rule of St. Augustine renewed the work of clerical reform, for which it had formerly been used by the Bishop of Hippo. The Church, and especially the popes, soon regarded it as an instrument for molding clerical lives to serve the new and daily more urgent needs of Christendom. Throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Church, by means of this Rule, sought to create an army of priest whose life would be decidedly more active,

while yet retaining the spiritual and contemplative bases of the regular life, the reform of which was being simultaneously pursued.

The flexibility of the Rule of St. Augustine made possible its use for purposes other than the clerical reform. Other needs of the age, other attempts at radically different forms of religious life, discovered in the Rule an invaluable standard whereby the new aspirations of the lay world might be actuated.

By the program which it represented, by the significance given to it at the time, the Rule, or rather the institution, of St. Augustine was still more fundamentally the bond of a holy ideal, of a powerful religious "movement" which rose and swept on to development in the late eleventh century. This movement for the "apostolic life" is perhaps the principal key, not only to the canonical changes, and the heretical, schismatic, or orthodox trends of the laity in the twelfth century, but even to the tendencies which led to the foundation of the mendicant orders in the thirteenth century. Because of its basic connection with the movement and its adoption by this same movement, the institution of St. Augustine subsequently enjoyed a rapid and magnificent expansion.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RULE

That expansion gives great importance to this study about the later destiny of the institution in the twelfth century: it is a grand page in Church history. The development and expansion that we are about to sketch is not a mere extension; it is specially a vital progress. The Augustinian Rule more and more consciously became suited for the task imposed upon it by the needs of the Church and the demands of the apostolic movement. We will follow the trend of this progress.

To give a true understanding of the renaissance of the Rule, this study of the Augustinian legislation has to give conspicuous attention to the statutes, customs, or constitutions, which replaced the *Disciplina* and formed what became the living Rule of St. Augustine. It is not surprising that this consideration develops, by a necessary transition, into an almost exclusive study of the destiny of one of these rules, that of the Friars Preachers, the capital importance of which will soon become evident. The fact that the following pages are devoted mostly to this rule should not be interpreted as the author's complacency in the institutions of the Order to which he belongs. The exposition itself will doubtless prove that the intrinsic nature of the subject called for the extensive treatment given it.

The outline for this section was determined by the character of the subject under consideration. A short historical review of the part played by the Augustinian institution in the movement for the restoration of the apostolic life in the twelfth century quite naturally led to investigation of the origin of St. Dominic's legislation. This research opened the way for a sketch to describe the extension and influence of the law of the Preachers, the true heir in the thirteenth century of the apostolic institution, which the decapitated text of St. Augustine was no longer able to direct except in name.

CHAPTER XXIII

The Rule of St. Augustine, Teacher of the Apostolic Life REFORM OF THE CHURCH

From the time of his conversion, about 1035, Peter Damian concentrated all his thought on the reform of the Church. During the pontificate of Leo IX his influence grew. Other apostles imitated him. Then came the persistent efforts of Hildebrand, subdeacon and later archdeacon of the Roman Church. However diverse their ways, all pursued a single end: the purification of the Church by liberating the clergy from the trammels of the world and the flesh, which, little by little, had enslaved them. From the

beginning of the century, the Church waged a vigorous war against clerical marriage and the vice of concubinage as well as against simony, of which almost the whole Church, from pope to lowliest priest, had at some time felt the contamination. Peter Damian and his disciples made their appeals to the Churches of Italy, sounding the call to reform in ardent exhortation. Elevated to the pontifical throne, Hildebrand vigorously launched the investiture struggle for the release of the sacred hierarchy from domination by the lay power. The clergy here and there saw a gradual breaking in the network of temporal chains which had nearly everywhere proved a hindrance to their spiritual mission.

But along with the negative work of liberation, and indeed in order to render it possible, another work, and that positive, was indispensable. To win over the clergy to the reform, and to induce them to break the bonds which they themselves had forged, a new spirit, a new mode of life, a vital ideal had to be invoked. It did not have to be fashioned, nor was delay required to search it out; the reformers carried it in their souls. The campaign against simony and Nicolaitanism was begun in the name of the restoration of the ancient discipline.⁽¹⁾ The zeal of the reformers and the challenge of their fiery words became an appeal which no society, particularly no Christian society, could resist: it was a call to return to the primary sources, to the spirit of the early councils, and beyond that to the life of the primitive Church. The program proposed to the clergy was clearly conceived: it was the imitation of the life of the apostles.

RETURN TO THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

In the synod of 1059, the mighty Hildebrand had recalled this ideal and defended it with all the authority of his official power.⁽²⁾ A few years later Peter Damian, in a letter to the newly elected Alexander II earnestly recommending a point of capital importance for the reform of the clergy, gave full expression to his views.⁽³⁾ The life for which he appealed was that which St. Augustine had exacted of his clerics. Jerome described it in his celebrated letters to Nepotianus and to Heliodorus. It was the life of the apostles and of the primitive Church, the life which had been taught to them, proposed to them, and bequeathed to them by Jesus Christ.

Evidently the rule of the canons followed from the norm of the apostolic life; and while any member of a spiritual society follows the discipline of his own order, he in a certain way imitates the child of the infant Church. Let us, therefore, regard the form which the Church, newly clothed in the faith under the apostles, maintained as the way of life. "The multitudes of the believers," as St. Luke says (Acts 4:32), "had but one heart and one soul; neither did any one say that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but all things were common unto them." . . . Or will clerics ask for what Christ did not permit to His apostles? For when He sent them to preach, as Mark says, "He commanded that they should take nothing for the way but a staff only; no scrip, no bread, nor money in their purse." . . . Any cleric, therefore, who attempts to enjoy the revenues of property, will not be able to keep to the course of the apostles.⁽⁴⁾

A cleric should possess nothing as his own. "The possession of goods has the effect of making clerics independent of the rule of their bishop, and they bend their necks to secular power in the shameful dishonor of degrading surrender. . . . And it is certain that such a one, having violated his order for love of money, is unworthy of any ecclesiastical dignity."⁽⁵⁾ The possession of property thus peoples the clerical order with incompetents. But especially, by suppressing imitation of the apostolic life, it removes the very foundations of the spiritual office inherited by the clergy from the apostles, the office of preaching.⁽⁶⁾ Immediately after the verse in the Acts of the Apostles describing the common life, we are told that the apostles with great power gave testimony to the resurrection of Jesus Christ and that a great grace was in each of them.

"What does the writer of the sacred history aim at. . . . unless he wishes to show clearly that only those are fit for the office of preaching who possess none of the wealth of the world; and because they have nothing for themselves, possess all things in common?"(7) Freed from the encumbrance of terrestrial goods and like light-armed soldiers (*expediti*), these clerics will serve in the army of the Lord on the field of battle, strong in the armament of their virtues.(8)

POVERTY AND PREACHING

For Peter Damian, poverty in common and preaching were the very essence of the life of the apostles and of the primitive Church, which he exhorted the clergy to imitate. Poverty and preaching have an inseparable affinity. If poverty is practiced, there will be results from preaching. In one of his letters to some clerics, urging them to adopt the community life, we read:

Whereas the bishops hold their primacy from the apostles, priests constitute in the Church the order of the seventy disciples. . . . Now, when the Lord sent the seventy disciples two by two before Him,(9) he admonished them that He who would teach others must himself live without reproach. From the outset He proposed as a principle of prime importance that they scorn pecuniary reward, despise the inclinations of avarice, and possess nothing as their own. "Carry neither purse nor scrip nor shoes." According to St. Mark, He also forbade them to have bread or money in their purse, or to wear two coats, requiring them to walk shod with sandals, carrying only a staff. Why was this done? . . . Why do we read this text in church, if not to put into practice what we read? Those who exercise the office of apostles throughout the ages must of course follow the example of the apostles. God forbid, then, that His preachers possess the goods of this world in order that the men whom He has raised up to extinguish the fire of concupiscence in the hearts of their hearers may protect themselves from the plague of ambition and avarice which infests others.(10)

For Peter Damian the *ordo clericorum* (clergy) was identified in ideal with the *ordo canonicorum* (clergy living in community), and this body with the *ordo praedicatorum*. The bond of identity, the soul which inspired, made lawful, and gave unity to these diverse offices, could be none other than the *vita apostolica*, the *conversatio primitivae ecclesiae*. Every cleric who lived this life, even though he was only a monk, was a minister as well as one ordained for preaching. Here Peter makes the first assault in a clash of arms between monks and canons, which lasted more than a century. Laymen and heretics in the following century had their own ideas about the matter: Did not imitation of the apostles in itself confer the right to preach and exercise the pastoral ministry?(11)

This apostolic life, however, was no arbitrary fabrication of variable character. On the contrary, it was a most thoroughly determined reality, described in definite detail by the passages in the New Testament cited by Peter Damian: the texts in which Jesus defines the apostolic spirit which the apostles and disciples should have;(12) the text of the Acts which depicts the common life of the primitive Church.(13) These half-dozen verses set forth in concrete and striking details the ideal of the common life and of preaching in poverty.

TWO EPISODES

Every Christian might know that ideal and meditate upon it. In simple faith the medieval soul could feel increasing in himself the desire to realize it in himself and to see it truly realized in the clergy. Did he not hear the priest read the Epistle and Gospel in the church on Sundays? Peter Damian rightly recalled this fact. In an age when the liturgical life was the one and true nourishment of faith, this public reading was not without efficacy. We may recall two striking scenes previous to the eleventh century which show the power of these two texts when heard in church, two scenes that are likewise two dates in the history that we intend to describe.

The scene is in Africa. St. Augustine desired to justify to his people the common life which he exacted of his clerics. He assembled the congregation in the church. There they stood. He sat in their midst. Then the Deacon Lazarus came forward and read the text from the Acts of the Apostles. When he finished, Augustine took the book. "Now I wish to read; it gives me greater joy to read these words to you than to speak any of my own." And he read the text again; then he added: "That is the way we should like to live; pray for us that we may do so."[\(14\)](#)

Eight centuries later, in a little village of Umbria, the son of a rich merchant, who had received the grace of conversion three years earlier, was living as a hermit near a little church. One day at Mass he heard the account of the mission of the disciples read from the Gospel. He pondered the text; the thought of it overwhelmed him. He was St. Francis, who then began to preach penance.[\(15\)](#)

Two centuries had already passed since the preaching of Peter Darnian and his followers had called to the attention of the clergy and of the laity the meaning of these two texts, vibrant with energy for a renaissance and even a revolution, Indeed it was a revolution that began. From the barbarous ages the inspiration of St. Augustine was revived and amplified. Its spirit of zeal for the conquest of souls was accentuated in imitation of the apostles, thus completely renewing the *vita apostolica*.[\(16\)](#)

For several centuries after Peter Damian's time the ideal of the apostolic life was realized with prodigious success. In widely different circles this concept became an effective force. It gave birth to unforeseen institutions, and it stimulated a revival of ecclesiastical law. Out of it developed orthodox as well as heretical movements. It provoked reform, unrest, shocks, and revolutions. The correction of the clergy, the canonical movement, the itinerant preaching of the twelfth century, the rise of double monasteries, and the founding of the mendicant orders; the violent anticlerical heresies, the Albigensian war, and the Inquisition, were but the principal entries on the balance sheet. In short, the ideal of the apostolic life was one of the most powerful stimulating forces of Christian civilization in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and opened the way to important developments.

The concept was adaptable to varied designs. Yet the *vita apostolica* remained the motivating spring of all these currents and, in spite of all their divergent tendencies, was the source of their profound affinity.

UNITY OF THE MOVEMENT

This unity of spirit is explicable only in view of the source just traced. These currents and revolutions did not find accord on a political or social level, nor even on an administrative or intellectual plane. Religion formed their basis of harmony, and that not on a visible range of orthodoxy, schism, or heresy, but in the invisible depths of Christian evangelical inspiration.[\(17\)](#) There alone they attained oneness: oneness of origin in the New Testament counsels noted above; oneness of motivation, by earnest and ceaseless meditation, for a fuller execution of the sacred program; finally, oneness of orientation for the reform of the Church.[\(18\)](#)

In this history, which touches on so many points, only certain aspects need be treated here, namely, those fundamental ones in which the Rule of St. Augustine appears, for it had a part in these changes. The restoration of the apostolic life was to be made in the name of St. Augustine and according to the example he had set. His sermons were on the lips of all the reformers in the eleventh century. The *Disciplina monasterii* of Augustine gave the password for bringing the Rule again upon the scene: *Apostolicam enim vitam optamus vivere*. The Commentary opened with the description of the common life as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, fundamental charter of life in the primitive Church. "The first purpose for which you have been brought together is that you dwell in unity in the house, and that

you have but one soul and one heart in God. And call not anything your own, but let all things be common. . . . For thus you read in the Acts of the Apostles."

In the first movement which rose out of this current for the renewal of the apostolic life, namely, the canonical reform, the Rule of St. Augustine was revived. This Rule became so firmly rooted in the reform that for several centuries thereafter the canonical institution and the Augustinian institution were thought of as one.

THE CANONICAL REFORM

To effect a reform of the clergy, it was necessary to begin with the canons. That division of the sacred ministry which lived a mitigated common life in fidelity to the "canons" at a mother church, or with the bishop in his episcopal house, was easier to reach than others.

In substance, the program of the Gregorian reformers purposed to correct the ecclesiastical order as regarded marriage, incontinency and simony; to urge renouncement of the peculium and the apportioning of alms as permitted by the canonical rule for two centuries past;(19) to foster zeal among the canons for the perfect common life; and finally, little by little, to influence the whole clerical order. The abuses under attack were so deeply rooted among the clergy that this program would never have even partially succeeded had it not been for the powerful psychological reform effected through the inspiring appeal of the *vita apostolica*.

After ten years of work at isolated reforms(20) Hildebrand in 1059, at the Synod of Rome, uttered a virulent denunciation of the old canonical rule and the distribution of money;(21) he reviewed the new, yet ancient design of the reform program. A canon, then and there drawn up and reiterated four years later by another synod,(22) proposed a new life to all chaste clerics, that very life which Peter Damian was then propagating through his preaching and his writing, the common life, the apostolic life itself.

We command the clerics who, in obedience to our predecessor, have cherished chastity to dwell close to the church for which they were ordained, as it becomes those zealous for religion,(23) and to eat and sleep under one roof and possess in common all that comes to them from this church; we exhort them to do all in their power to develop the apostolic life, that is, the common life, that having become perfect they may merit to dwell in heaven with those who now receive the hundredfold reward.(24) The ideal of reform which this official text proposed to all clerics was that to be upheld by all the great pontiffs at the close of the eleventh century; Alexander II, Gregory VII, and Urban II, strove to promote it by every possible means.

It is not within our scope to describe how, toward the close of the century, this program was carried out with exclusive application to the canons, and, later on, to one division of the canons. It need only be remarked that in the early part of the twelfth century the canonical reform swept on to a grand expansion while yet sustaining the fullness of the initial ideal. Forty years after the Synod of Rome, Urban II again sketched the lines of the program in a formula, the force of which is now comprehensible: "to revive the practices taught by the apostles and carried out in the early days of the Church ."(25) It is noteworthy that the popes of this period in their official decrees recognized the apostolic life, or the *conversatio primitivae Ecclesiae*, as the ideal explicitly proper to the canons.(26)

The reformed canons embraced with their whole soul the fullness of this heritage as proclaimed in the words of Peter Damian. The movement stimulated the writing of numerous polemic and apologetic works which vigorously and insistently treated this elemental duality in their clerical life: common poverty and pastoral preaching. The canons sought to reserve this privilege to themselves.(27)

What is of still greater importance is that the canons were intent on stabilizing their apostolic life through the adoption of a rule. Having attempted to correct the old *Institutionis formw canonicorum* of Aachen,(28) and having made trial of a Rule given by Gregory VII,(29) the canons finally chose the apostolic Rule of St. Augustine, adaptable as it was to the role awaiting it in the last quarter of the eleventh century.(30) From then on it was regarded as the basic law of the canonical institution.

CANONICAL CUSTOMS

According to the degree in which it was practiced in the first decades, the *Disciplina* conferred upon canonical life a note of remarkable austerity. Though the original articles of the Rule were abandoned in the early twelfth century, the Commentary continued in use and exerted a deeper influence than that possible by a mere symbol or standard. Whereas the Rule of 816 permitted money, the Commentary, even in its decapitated state, exacted of the reformed canons an absolute repudiation of property. On this score, it is significant that from the early part of the twelfth century the universal rule for canons consisted of the Commentary of St. Augustine and particular customs, which together comprised a true law for apostolic life. These Augustinian customs, which deserve to be called the living Rule of St. Augustine, included details of apostolic significance. For example, the customs of Marbach which imposed upon the canons the use of stockings without feet, "as being the kind worn by the apostles."(31) Warrant for this practice was based on an ingenious interpretation of New Testament texts. With the same regard for the scrupulous imitation of the apostolic life, the Waldenses were later compelled to wear only sandals in their following of the same text.

These practices carried this spirit of imitation even farther, for it was carefully established, often in the very words of the prologue, that the canonical life was "an abasement even to the need and poverty of Christ."(32) It should be observed that this call to complete personal poverty was not accompanied by any authorization of common wealth. Fired by the zeal of the reformers, the canons in their community life sought to be poor, as poor as possible, like Christ and the apostles.(33) The revenues which they were to retain assured only their food and clothing, and that in the proportion determined by the Rule.(34) Everything over and above was to be distributed to the poor.(35)

DEVIATION FROM THE REFORM

Finally there was provision in their customs for the life of pastoral preaching. Study and the scholastic training requisite to preaching were therein treated to a degree unknown in monastic legislation.(36) The exercise of the apostolic ministry necessitated frequent missions outside the community, an exigence that was regulated by certain original statutes.(37) The pastoral work gave birth to new classes of religious: *forenses, stationarii, in obedientiis commorantes*.(38) The customs supposed in the canonical life some elements utterly foreign to monastic practice before the eleventh century. These elements fostered the apostolic life. These laws which were classed as Augustinian customs were indeed worthy of St. Augustine.

As time went on, the canonical reform developed in new ways. The clerical ideas of Peter Damian immediately inspired the great wave of the first fifty years. Later in a number of cities and towns apostolic houses arose in which common poverty and pastoral preaching were practiced according to the mode of the apostolic life. Often these groups were composed of diocesan clerics, or members of the episcopal chapters, who thus became associated in community life in the places where they had the care of souls. No other purpose actuated their adoption of the reform than the desire to motivate their clerical life and fulfill the duties of their office more perfectly. Well did they merit the eulogy of the historian, who saw in them "the classic pastors of souls in the Middle Ages."(39) Had they been more numerous they might really have solved the clerical crisis of the age.

In the course of the twelfth century, however, and perhaps even as early as the foundation of St. Victor (1110), the canonical order was greatly modified by a very strong Benedictine influence, particularly from Cîteaux. The monastic ideal of personal sanctification was again embraced as a principal end. The new religious houses, in powerful congregations, were established in the country or on the outskirts of the communes. In these houses not only diocesan clerics gathered in the interests of self-reform, but also newly "converted" men entering religious life.

We can easily see how under such circumstances this new type of canon would have little concern for the imperatively important work of spreading the Gospel among people in the cities. His vision was no longer clearly focused on the ideal of the apostolic life preached by Peter Damian. The great canonical congregation, which grew more and more prominent with the passing of the twelfth century, differed from the episcopal or parish chapters first reformed, since in the following of the two sacred texts which served as the charter of the apostolic life the new groups concentrated on what was proposed the Acts of the Apostles, neglecting to some degree the exhortation of St. Luke. Their observance stressed the common life rather than the apostolate with poverty.

The trend was the very reverse in another movement, to which the Rule of St. Augustine also gave direction, a movement infinitely more intricate to trace than the canonical reform, but not less important. Its varied nature finds characterization only in a rather vague expression "the apostolic movement." This movement has been the subject of a scholarly study.⁽⁴⁰⁾

THE APOSTOLIC MOVEMENT

The ideas and aspirations for clerical reform were not proposed simply and quietly by discreet workmen, nor were they confined merely to ecclesiastical circles; rather were they deliberately publicized from the roofs and housetops. Italian reformers, like Peter Damian, made incessant appeals in the churches, sounding vigorous calls for correction and renewal. Men stirred to this appeal; in their hearts they compared the ideal proposed to the clergy with the practice of it habitual among them. It was to be expected that their sense of Christian fitness, though simple and even brutal, would know how to react.⁽⁴¹⁾ That is what happened. And the movement had a force that did not fear to fan the flame.

The reason was that in the face of the weakness of princes and prelates, often among the most contaminated by the pest of simony, this popular censure at times became the sole support of the reforming popes and their collaborators.⁽⁴²⁾ By obliging the laity through positive commands to refuse to hear Mass and receive the sacraments from priests guilty of concubinage and simony,⁽⁴³⁾ by appealing directly to the people and by requiring their own representatives to depose from office and even by force to evict from the churches the sacred ministers who did not submit to the apostolic decrees,⁽⁴⁴⁾ the Gregorian popes, during the second half of the eleventh century, at times made bold use of this popular arm. This was notable in Germany, Flanders, the Papal States,⁽⁴⁵⁾ and particularly in Lombardy, and also in northern Italy.⁽⁴⁶⁾ In the movement there in the middle of the eleventh century common people, soldiers, minor clerics of the Patarines, brave because supported by the Church, entered the struggle with such great zeal that it became urgent at times to moderate it.⁽⁴⁷⁾ The popular revolt against unworthy clerics burst forth on this occasion also without being incited.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Political passions, aroused by the communal insurrections, often needed only a slight pretext to plunge into the struggle.

This tide of popular indignation, whipped to greater vigor by the tenacious resistance encountered in the clergy, could not sweep on without causing a profound psychological change in the medieval man of rough and elemental spirit. It was the forerunner of other revolutions. Further, the idea of a renewal

of the primitive Christian life in the name of which the reform was carried on, and especially the incisive power of the program for the apostolic life seemed calculated to stir their very heralds out of their settled equilibrium.

In fact, the canonical reform itself (when accepted by the clergy) was far from exhausting the import of this ideal and of satisfying its demands.

The description of the disciples "sent two by two to preach from city to city" entailed a program that could hardly be realized in the sedentary life of the canon. Moreover, this ideal was not held out to the clergy only. They constituted but one of the elements of the apostolic life. Indeed, according to the testimony of the very ones who had propagated it, this apostolic life was the program of a Church, the plan of the primitive Church: "the multitude of believers," said the Acts of the Apostles. It was not the concern of clerics alone. The laity also had a share in that program. Why should it not be tried again?

THE PROGRAM OF A CHURCH

If, bound as they seemed to be to their customs and to their wealth, ordinary ministers were unwilling to embrace this ideal, why should not pious men, wandering clerics, soldiers, rich merchants, or converted nobles, laymen and women, form a more apostolic community without them, apart from the traditional ranks. To realize anew the life of the primitive Church, to abandon money, learning, honors, all that a new and rising civilization was ready to put into the hands of Christians still untainted by all these temporal appeals: what a glorious religious program!

When precisely did they begin, these Christians who were stirred by the desire to imitate the apostles and revive the primitive Church, and how did they proceed to realize their design? It is difficult to say. But the last years of the eleventh century saw an apostolic movement take shape and crystallize about a few individuals. Had it not already been realized in the numberless groups of the "poor of Christ" who, toward the close of the eleventh century, flocked over the countryside to hear the preaching of Robert of Arbrissel?(49) This type of interest increased on a large scale in the following years, and the apostolic preacher described by St. Luke as traveling on foot, without money, and announcing the gospel, found successively winning imitators in Bernard of Thiron, Vitalis of Savigny, and Norbert of Xanten.

THE MULTITUDE OF BELIEVERS

The "multitude of believers" of the Acts of the Apostles drew around the company of these new apostles to complete the living picture of the primitive Church. An itinerant preacher was not always needed to precipitate a reproduction of this primitive communism. Some years before Robert's appearance, groups of laymen initiated a type of life in common, not at all in the traditional mold of monasticism. In 1191, upon examination, Urban II approved of the formation of communities of this kind, "the more worthy of being perpetuated as the form of the primitive Church is impressed upon them."(50) Bernold of Constance has preserved the context of this bull; a vast concourse of men, women, peasant girls, married folks, throughout the Church and especially in Germany, offered themselves to the monks, the canons, and their parish priests, to lead in poverty and labor a common life imitative of the early Church.(51) Several years earlier, with the authorization of Gregory VII St. Stephen of Muret had established a community of poor, even of mendicant poor, to whom he proposed the fundamental law of "the Gospel the poverty of Christ," "the institutions of the apostles and the canons."(52) That proved, actually, to be the rule of the new life embraced by the poor of Muret, the future "good men" of Grandmont.(53) Finally, deeper than any of these visible signs of the movement, there ran the undercurrent of the apostolic and evangelical idea in the lives of numberless souls,

resulting in the formation of other "multitudes of believers," of "good men," "perfect," and "masters," who sought to emancipate themselves from the customs of the contemporary Church to lead a life conformed in the most literal details, rites, garb, symbols and names, to that pictured in the primitive Church and the life of the apostles.(54) The "apostolic movement" arose, an inorganic social reality, revolutionary and even anarchical, but somehow profoundly one in the motivating idea that animated it: the *vita apostolica*, imitation of the primitive Church. Its passion for reform, its opposition to the clergy of the age, its scorn for the sacraments of unworthy priests,(55) its proselytizing activities, its contention for imitation of the apostles as the sole basis of the right to preach, its desire of absolute poverty for clergy and laity alike, finally, its very geographical position in Lombardy and southern France, everything about this movement proclaimed its affinity to the popular and canonical currents of the Gregorian reform. Personalities as representative as those of Arnold of Brescia and his successors constituted the living transition.(56)

In these companies the ideal of the apostolic life had a significance quite different from that proposed in the canonical reform, which concerned clerics who voluntarily became members of a regular community in the very scene of their apostolic duties in order to embrace a holier state, to develop their sacerdotal powers, and, as imitators of the apostles through their common life, to exercise their ministry more fully. The apostolic life seemed an idea inseparable from the clerical life.

LAY DOMINANCE

In the bands of the "apostolic movement," on the contrary, there was lay dominance; priests who happened to be in such companies, by that very fact stepped out of the ordinary circles of clerical life. The itinerant preacher alone, the instigator of the band or its spontaneous spokesman, enjoyed a plenitude in a ministry that was even much wider in scope than that open to the canons regular. But this preacher was not always a cleric and was himself but one of the typical elements of the enterprise, one of the personages of the renewed primitive Church. The apostolic life, according to the proponents of the apostolic movement, was an ideal of the whole Church, of the Christian life, whereby each one, independent of any distinction of clergy and laity, might claim a place in his own degree among the apostles or believers.

Our purpose does not require us to trace more fully the destinies of this movement which has recently been the subject of a remarkable study.(57) It need only be said that it did not raise up the leaders indispensable to its success, and, under the suspicion of nearly all the clergy to whom its anticlericalism gave alarm, it ended by falling into schism or drifting in the wake of heresies, like Catharism, which seemed to promise stability in a counter-Church, as containing features apparently much closer to the primitive Church.(58)

One division of the movement, however, which early in the twelfth century came under the direction of certain itinerant preachers commissioned by the popes, oriented itself, probably also with the support of the same popes,(59) toward a more stable institution. Along its own line of evolution the Catholic apostolic movement soon witnessed the appearance of new societies or religious companies: the houses of Fontevrault and of Prémontré, the Abbeys of Savigny and of Chaussey with their daughter communities, very remarkable orders specifically different from the old monastic type. The foundations of Robert of Arbrissel and his companions, of St. Norbert and his spiritual sons, produced double convents with curious organization: in two distinct groups, men and women of the apostolic community were simultaneously established(60) near a particular church where they had common assembly while their leader and founder continued his official itinerant apostolate.(61)

Then it was that, for the second time in the complex history of the apostolic life, the Rule of St. Augustine returned to play its part. It was used in Robert of Arbrissel's community and in that of St. Norbert. There it directed the life of the imitators of the primitive Church, marking the birth of a second canonical movement, a second Augustinian apostolic institution. This new branch differed from the first as much in its origin as in its way of understanding the apostolic ideal.

Although for the reformed clerics entrance into the Augustinian order and the life of poverty which it implied was embraced as the special means to the end of imitating the life of the apostles, it did not have this significance for the groups organized in "apostolic movements." For them the practice of the common life and poverty was antecedent to their affiliation to any regular Augustinian foundation. The constitution of a juridical organization seemed to add nothing to their imitation of the primitive Church. For them regular life was intended, not as a help to religious progress, but as a means toward social stabilization, and for the Church a kind of recuperative remedy to the degree in which this stabilization saved these vagabond companies from becoming anarchical or even heretical. The great success of the apostolic movement, its strong Christian vigor maintained in spite of its restless evolution, gave great value to its recuperative force.

The achievement might have become incomparable if it had furnished a solid institutional support for the itinerant preachers and provided for their perpetuation. But its weakness lay in its undefined, and difficult, almost contradictory, aspects. Certain elements, like that of an itinerant apostolate for the preacher and absolute poverty for the community, were hardly compatible with regular stability or life in solitary places. An equilibrium could be struck only by the sacrifice of some one of these elements. The event proved this. These new Augustinians, particularly the Premonstratensians, retreated in their spirit toward a conformity with other monastic orders, Cîteaux especially. (62) With their capitulation, the apostolic movement with its ideal of the life of the primitive Church lost the assurance of an established and permanent place in the Catholic social structure. In losing the refuge of the Augustinian institution, the movement at the same time lost safety in the bosom of the Church.

GRAVE DIFFICULTIES

This evolution was not without immense consequences. The apostolic movement, the force of which did not abate among the laity, receded farther and farther from the direction of the Church, and soon went violently against it. The aspirations of the spiritual masses toward the common life and poverty found a means of realization in the rapid development of hospitaller and military institutes, (63) where the Rule of St. Augustine once more exercised a leading part. (64) But this desire for proselytism and the pastoral ministry no longer found a satisfying outlet. For various reasons, the itinerant preachers now caused disquiet or aroused anxiety in the Church, and no longer received from the popes the support that had been given to their predecessors. The history of the Waldenses is well known: pious evangelical Christians and eager proselytes who, almost in spite of themselves, lapsed into schism.

Thus, at the close of the twelfth century, the evolution of the *vita apostolica* had not at all fulfilled the promise of its opening years either for the canons or for the numerous bands created by the apostolic movement. The Church found herself facing terrible problems.

With Innocent III all would change.

THE ORDER OF PREACHERS

With his finger on the pulse of a whole century, Innocent III from the beginning of his pontificate took his stand in the line of the Gregorian popes and renewed their efforts to authorize and stabilize in the

Catholic social order a life of imitation of the apostles.(65) His undertakings in favor of the Humiliati of Lombardy, the Poor Catholics and the first followers of Francis, showed the extent to which the revival force was at work. Faithful to the ideal of a Christian life founded on the way of the Gospel, the apostolic movement again stirred in the Church, realized a new birth, and grew in her bosom with increasing zeal for conversions. Repeating at the same time the history of the preceding century, it established a series of original religious foundations, on the order of the ancient double monasteries where the "predicant" groups(66) of men or women, generally with the encouragement of the Pope, were established in homogeneous communities of more definite organization. Such were the three branches of the Order of the Humiliati,(67) the fraternities of Penance, the companies of the Poor Catholics,(68) and the Poor Clares who, with the Order of Penance and the Order of Friars Minor formed the three Orders of St. Francis. The apostolic movement fertilized anew the Catholic world and made it fruitful.

Would those in holy orders remain quiescent before the challenge? Would not the canonical reform revive with new vigor, in virtue of this ideal of imitation of the apostles, the ideal which had created it of old with all its promise for good? Would the *ordo clericorum* allow itself to be dispossessed of its prerogative as the *ordo praedicatorum* by these movements of lay origin?

CHALLENGE TO THE CLERICS

Just as the bishops convoked by Innocent in the Lateran Council were preparing for a discussion of the reform acknowledged as indispensable for the clergy and the apostolate, Dominic arrived in Rome from Narbonne. He came to propose to the head of the Church the institution of an order that would be the Order of Preachers.

Dominic was a priest. He was of the regular clergy, and an episcopal cleric. From his youth he had been nurtured on the best canonical apostolic spirituality, because he found the fullness of the reform in vigor at the chapter of Osma, which he entered upon completion of his clerical studies. He himself participated in the effort to renew the common life (1199),(69) and there is proof that the ideal of imitating the apostles was presented to him from the first under the most dynamic form, because the prior of the reform, Diego de Acebes, was himself animated with such an extraordinary spirit of zeal that, when he became the head of a diocese, he offered his resignation to the Pope in order to consecrate himself to the conversion of the pagans.(70) Dominic was then his subprior and joined with him in his endeavor.

From that time on, Dominic cultivated the spirit of the apostolic life with new intensity. With other priests he shared in the papal mission against the heretics in Narbonne. He taught according to the evangelical program of St. Luke: "Going and preaching according to the example of the Master, on foot, without gold or silver, in all things imitating the way of the apostles." Expressly designated by Innocent, this was the method of conquest which all the missionaries of Languedoc had to practice.

Thereafter Dominic had the title and carried on the clerical duties of a preacher delegated to the Province of Narbonne.(71) Moreover, early in the year 1213, during the absence of the Bishop of Carcassonne, Dominic was named vicar-general *in spiritualibus*.(72) During these few years the episcopal office itself seemed about to claim him; he was threatened several times, and probably even canonically elected, at dates somewhat uncertain.(73) But he did not desire ecclesiastical dignities. In 1214 he became pastor of Fanjeaux, thus entering into the administration of the Diocese of Toulouse.(74) In 1215 he was appointed head of a small band of diocesan preachers by his Bishop, Foulques, who organized in his diocese the papal preaching(75) formerly inaugurated in Narbonne.

IN THE TRADITION OF HISTORY

Installed in a house at Toulouse, the apostolic society then desired to strengthen its unity by a religious profession, to increase its spiritual treasury by the austerity of a common life, and especially to perpetuate its work in an institution. Thus the way was prepared for the foundation of the Preachers, a project which Dominic laid before the Pope.

Apparently these preliminary steps in the foundation of the Order of St. Dominic followed a traditional line. Does not the story read exactly like that for the foundations of regular episcopal clerics at the close of the eleventh century? Opposed in character to the apostolic movement which followed its inspiration independent of any consideration for law, the new clerical association possessed, even from the first, a juridical cast that was almost classic. These preachers were priests,⁽⁷⁶⁾ owing obedience to the bishop of the diocese, who legally conferred on them the office of preaching. For their maintenance, the bishop provided a third part of the tithes of the diocese, the other two parts being destined for the episcopal canons and for himself. In a very different position from that of itinerants, these preachers were installed in the city in a house which served as their headquarters.

Their number, doubtless, was very unusual: only individual delegated preachers were heard of previous to the thirteenth century. But after 1204 the great preaching missions organized by Innocent III created a precedent; not a precedent only, but a kind of magnet, since the little society of Toulouse was the direct outcome of one of these mission bands.

Furthermore, was not this new group of priests who aided the bishop in his office as pastor a replica *in spiritualibus* of the college of canons who at this period assisted him in his work as administrator of the diocese *in temporalibus*? The little association at the house of Peter Seila grew into a convent of canons regular, and in its membership, its juridical status, its position in the diocese, and even in the source of its revenue, it became a counterpart of the episcopal chapter of St. Stephen.⁽⁷⁷⁾

It is not surprising, therefore, in 1216, to see Dominic and his first brethren, with the advice of Innocent III, choose as the Rule of their Order the Commentary of St. Augustine. Had they not adopted this decapitated text in their legislation -- and they might indeed have failed to consider it but for canon 13 of the Lateran Council⁽⁷⁸⁾ -- this order of priests would, nevertheless, have appeared as an authentic and pure resurgence of the great Augustinian current.

In the clerical order as well as among the lay groups of the "Predicant" movement, the apostolic life swept on in a mighty flow in the pontificate of Innocent III, renewing the ideal of the reformers of the eleventh century and continuing the history of the influence of St. Augustine.

A NEW INSTITUTION

But in the same period, while holding to the line of this visible continuity and taking its classic shape, the apostolic ideal as expressed in the institution of the Friars Preachers far outdistanced its first goals in every direction. The nature of the order conceived and realized by St. Dominic, its freedom from parochial administration, its stamp of universality,⁽⁷⁹⁾ and particularly its apostolic spirit of boundless zeal and evangelical poverty, made this last offshoot of the Augustinian institution a force that profoundly affected the apostolic order and the Catholic hierarchy. A final goal had been reached.

A contemporary writer described this achievement in a remarkable picture which sketches this evolution. A great preacher, Jacques de Vitry, in a sermon to the canons regular, thus traced the history of the apostolic order:

This stream, [\(80\)](#) that is, regular life, which watered all of Egypt, or the whole universe, rising in the place of delight, namely, the primitive Church, among the faithful who had but one heart and one soul and called nothing they possessed their own, [\(81\)](#) flowed thence from this place of pleasure, and reached even to the blessed Augustine. He himself began to live according to the Rule instituted by the holy apostles.

This stream produced of itself seven tributaries, or seven congregations of canons which possess the same Rule and the same basis but have different statutes. The Canons of Prémontré form one of these; the Convent of Grandmont, another; the Order of St. Victor, the third; the Order of Ardlaise, the fourth; the Order of Val-des-Écoliers, the fifth; the Order of Val-des-Choux, the sixth; the Order of Friars Preachers, the seventh. . . .

The stream from which these tributaries flowed is the Order of White Canons who wear linen and furs, use wine and meat, as they say that Blessed Augustine and his clerics did. Augustine made of his followers men white and pure within; without, black, and dead to the world; this was the symbolism of the habits with their black capes and their white linen garments. . . .

Therefore, in this blessed and holy way of life, the White Canons, who were the first among the canons, dwelt a long time. . . .

Many, in proposing to follow a yet more salutary counsel, imposed upon themselves more severe statutes while keeping to the foundation of the Rule. That is why they took it upon themselves to abstain from meat and preferred to use garments of wool or horsehair, scorning and rejecting linen shirts, linen and feather mattresses; this was done by the seven congregations already mentioned. . . .

Moreover, these canons regular were not content with being distinguished from the White Canons in their food and clothing; for, in these last times, the Congregation of the Friars Preachers, holy and pleasing to God, have ceaselessly waged war everywhere against the devil by freeing themselves from the burden of temporal possessions. Necessary, indeed, it is for combatants to be rid of all encumbrance; that is why Abraham selected three hundred servants free from all care to fight against the five kings. [\(82\)](#) Our combat is against the five senses.

In fact, Noemi, [\(83\)](#) that is, the splendor of the religious life, having dwelt long in the land of Moab, namely, among the black monks and white canons, returned to Bethlehem, or the house of bread, to the house of the Friars Preachers which sustains the whole world on the bread of the word. Thus Isaias announced: I will take away all thy tin. And I will restore thy judges as they were before, and make thy counselors as of old; that is, as in the days of the primitive Church and of the apostles. For in them the first state of the primitive Church traced its image, when all temporal goods were considered as dung. They rejected the tin of hypocrisy, which counterfeits silver, with those who wear a religious habit and an appearance of piety, but do not possess it in truth.

To walk more freely to battle, these athletes of Christ, considering the cares, worries, and other troubles that proceed from riches and earthly possessions, naked have followed Christ naked, embracing joyous poverty and working for a treasure which does not fail.

DESCRIPTION BY A CONTEMPORARY

There would be no purpose in lingering over the details [\(84\)](#) of this text. Its notes resound through the history of apostolic life, recalling the echo of St. Peter Damian's words, and from afar, those of the Bishop of Hippo. The four characteristics of the Order of Preachers which the sermon brings to light,

are those signaled in the course of the first years of its history in the most reliable documents, the bulls of Pope Honorius III. This Order is canonical.⁽⁸⁵⁾ It is universal and nourishes the entire world on the bread of the word.⁽⁸⁶⁾ It is absolutely poor, having rejected possessions in order to be freer.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Finally it constitutes an army of soldiers of the faith who combat evil in all its domains.⁽⁸⁸⁾ Another statement, also from Jacques de Vitry, tells the whole story: "They unite the *ordo praedicatorum* to the *ordo canonicorum*."

This is a revealing declaration. Peter Damian had thought that the *ordo praedicatorum* and the *ordo canonicorum* ought by right to become identified. A century and a half later, according to Jacques de Vitry, the one was united to the other. The fact is that the canons of the thirteenth century were far from having realized the hopes which the reformers had once placed in them. What is more significant, the Order of Preachers had conceived a preaching mission of such vast proportions that the canonical life of the period could no longer embrace it without bursting its bounds. And Jacques de Vitry truly appreciated that the leaven of this expansion was the total poverty of the Gospel along with ardent and universal preaching of the word of God, that is, the plenitude of the apostolic life.

In working this leaven into the temper of the canonical order, Dominic completely renewed it. He infused into it the spirited and fiery zeal which until then had burned only in the free but anarchical forms of the apostolic movement. He stabilized apostolic life in a solidly constituted order; he restored it as an exclusively clerical ideal and with it rejuvenated the Catholic hierarchy.

SUMMIT OF THE APOSTOLIC INSTITUTION

In that hour the clerical institution inaugurated by St. Augustine reached the full development of its own nature. In his own words Augustine had epitomized its character in the *Disciplina: Apostolicam vitam optamus vivere*.⁽⁸⁹⁾ It was but natural, by a curious recovery, that in commenting on the Rule of the Preachers, Humbert of Romans should ferret out this text, so long suppressed from the Rule of St. Augustine.⁽⁹⁰⁾ Speaking of St. Dominic, Gregory IX declared: "He was a man fashioned on the apostolic rule."⁽⁹¹⁾ Jordan of Saxony called him "an evangelical man."⁽⁹²⁾

The Order founded by St. Dominic not only retained and amplified observances essential to the imitation of the apostles, with life in common, radical suppression of property, austerity and piety, but even more fully than Augustine, it recovered the historical orientation of this apostolic life, by equipping itself with a conquering activity. It raised this life to its maximum power of conquest by assuming, independent of any parochial work, the office of preaching. To this end all else was subordinated, the whole Rule with all its observances, and study in particular. Through the teaching of sacred doctrine and the giving of Christian instruction to all ranks of society, it strove to realize the evangelization of the whole world.

On the legislative plane, Jacques de Vitry likewise testifies that the Order of Preachers attained the summit of the Augustinian institution. Beginning with the eleventh century, all the orders that proved the new fecundity of the Augustinian concept supplemented the Commentary, substituting for the lost *Disciplina* more and more rigorous customs which constituted their true rule. Dominic followed the same lead, and his Customs are the crowning of this evolution.

This legislative work may seem slight when compared with all that is owing to the Founder of the Order of Preachers: the conception of the idea of the Order, the concentration of all the energies of the apostolic life in a regular community, the practical execution of the idea, the gathering of the first friars, their education and the conquering zeal he communicated to them, the psychological upheaval created in clerical circles resulting in an extraordinary flow of scholars into his own monasteries, the

power of his personal sanctity. These seem infinitely more captivating and more worthy of attention than a legislative work.

Yet, if a person has clear vision, he will see that nothing reveals better the genius and the supernatural inspiration of this great saint. One remark should suffice: for a hundred and fifty years all far-seeing souls were crying out for an Order of Preachers; the institution was tragically urgent; all energies were strained toward it; all companies of apostles seemed bent upon it; still, the idea with all its contradictory claims was not incarnated in an institution. Dominic constructed his Order and embraced the ideal in a Rule perfectly modeled; immediately and everywhere similar projects found a stabilizing force and reformed their life on this pattern. The great movement of the mendicant orders began to take its definite and fruitful form.

This final development of the institution of St. Augustine represented its complete expansion and its ultimate goal. Once the Order of Preachers was established, all foundations of apostolic orders, that is, of all new religious orders, depended in reality on the legislative type of the Preachers, even when they adopted as their Rule the Commentary of St. Augustine.

The reform of the clergy accomplished by the Rule of St. Augustine was thenceforth rendered inseparable from the influence of the law of St. Dominic. It was realized by that very law, the heir of the lost *Disciplina*. Hence a study of the evolution and the universal success of the apostolic institution in the thirteenth century would be futile if confined to the destinies of the decapitated Augustinian Commentary. It would be necessary and it would be sufficient to know the history and the spread of the Constitutions of the Preachers, or, as contemporaries styled it, the Rule of St. Dominic, in which the Commentary itself very nearly disappeared.

The first thing to do is to discover the law as it came from the hands of its institutor, St. Dominic, and to study its primitive history. Thus by internal evidence can be verified the testimony borne from without by Jacques de Vitry. Then it will be easier to understand the consequences of the evolution under consideration.

NOTES

1 A. Felice, *La réforme grégorienne*, I, 36.

2 "In the year of our Lord, 1059 . . . the illustrious Hildebrand, with the authority of the archdeacon of the Apostolic See, said: 'Some in clerical orders, inflamed with the fire of perfect charity through the Holy Spirit, in this Roman city and in the provinces and in parishes close or adjacent, have now for some length of time been living the common life, according to the practice of the primitive Church; they distributed their goods to the poor or left them to relatives, or donated them to the Church of Christ, and professed that they would receive nothing in their own light.'" Here there is reference to what was practiced prior to 1059; Hildebrand wished to prevent any relaxation on the part of clerics who had embraced the common life. Therefore he required the revision of the canonical Rule of Aachen, the prescriptions of which on the *peculium* were scandalous, as likewise on the maintenance provided in portions suitable for cyclopes and sailors rather than for canons and monks. Therefore he required that their way be reformed and "that they make profession according to the custom adopted by clerics everywhere in the city of Rome: to live the common life of the primitive Church." Hildebrand was named archdeacon only a few months after the synod, between August and October (Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1191).

3 This opusculum (XXIV) is entitled *Contra clericos regulares proprietarios*. Peter Damian expressed the idea exactly on one occasion: "We do not say this in regard to all clerics but particularly in reference to those who belong to the canonical order and live in congregation" (*PL*, CXLV, 482). He was concerned, it seems, only with the canonical order, that is, as far as it was possible to define the term or the institution which was still in process of evolution; it included that principal division of the clergy who lived under the presidency of the bishop at a mother church and on its revenues. The conciliar canons (notably those of Aachen in 816) had promulgated rules of life for them.

4 Peter Damian, *op. cit.*; *PL*, CXLV, 485 ff.

5 *Ibid.*, 487 f.

6 Cf. *ibid.*, 489. Sacerdotal ordination is here designated by the significant expression, "to confer the office of preaching."

7 *Ibid.*, 490.

8 Cf. *Ibid.*

9 This comparison was traditional, no doubt, but it does not appear in the voluminous patristic florilegium. compiled on the life of clerics as a prologue to the Canonical Rule of Aachen any more than it appears in the Gospel texts on the apostolic life. Beginning with the eleventh century, the great use made of these texts And of this comparison to exalt the preaching character of apostolic life enhances its value.

Note this text of Peter Damian: "For what is meant by the seventy men (Judg. 9:5) but the great number of preachers of the Church? About these the Evangelist Luke speaks: The Lord appointed seventy (sic) and sent them two and two before 'His face into every city and place whither He Himself was to come' (Luke 10:1). This *praedicatorum ordo* is prefigured in those about whom the Lord said to Moses: Gather unto me seventy men. . . ." (Num. 11: 16 ff.). Cf. *PL*, CXLV, 389. Likewise the twelve fountains and the seventy palm trees (*ibid.*). Here, then, the *ordo sacerdotum* is the *ordo praedicatorum*.

10 Opusculum 27, *De communi vita clericorum ad clericos fanensis ecclesiae*, *PL*, CXLVI 508 f. The tract is stirring because of the reflection it gives of the spiritual unrest agitating some of those to whom it was addressed, men attracted by the reform yet still hesitant. It opens with the text of the Acts of the Apostles which recalls the form of the primitive Church and the apostolic institution; a call "to gather with the apostles in the cenacle," then: "Indeed a little salt seasons many things, and the whole multitude of the Christian people is taught and instructed by a small number of clerics."

11 Opusculum 28, *Apologeticus monachorum adversus clericos*, *PL*, CXLV, 511-18. "We wonder, dearest brethren, if you are worthy to hear how and why you attempted to separate us from the society and unity of the universal Church, since it is evident that it was founded, governed, and freed from varying species of error by monks and not by canons. Truly the apostles, founders and rulers of the Church, lived in our way, not in yours, as Luke the Evangelist shows in the Acts of the Apostles" (Acts 4:32).

Peter Damian here claims only the right of administering the sacraments. But this claim was promptly enlarged upon. It was the pastoral ministry and preaching which the monks sought, on the same basis as canons. On this head polemical treatises were abundant in the early twelfth century. Rupert of Deutz, *Altercatio monachi et clerici quod liceat monacho praedicare*, *PL*, 170, 537 ff.; Rudbertus, *Questio utrum monachis liceat praedicare* (ed. Endres, p. 145); Honorius of Autun, *Quod*

monachis liceat praedicare (ed. Endres, pp. 147 ff.); by an anonymous canon of St. Victor (after 1121), *De vita vere apostolica*, PL, CLXX, 611 ff.; Hugh of Rouen, *Dialogorum lib. VI*, PL, CXCII, 1219.

The monastic world of the time was agitated by a vigorous call to the apostolate, which the great success of Cîteaux, reactionary on this point, might obscure. Cf. Hauck, IV, 335 f. These aspirations were still strong in 1256 and even penetrated Cîteaux, as may be judged from the *Dialogue d'un moine clunysien et d'un moine cistercien*, written at that time. In general, however, the monks recognized that preaching called for the clerical status. It was characteristic of the heretics or schismatics, Cathari and Waldenses, to associate the preaching office exclusively with the imitation of the apostles; -- the preacher might even be a woman.

12 Cf. Luke 9:3 f.; 10: 1-7; Matt. 10:9-11; Mark 6:8-10. This program is not entirely unified; one permits the staff, the other forbids it; one permits shoes, the other would not have them. In general, here is the substance of it: they are to go two by two (the rule of a companion); without silver or gold; on foot; gaining their bread from those to whom they preach (mendicancy); content with what is provided (therefore, no kinds of food are forbidden during apostolic journeys). Many added, go barefoot; some wished only a single tunic; some required that no bread, not even a sack, be carried.

13 Acts 4:32.

14 Sermon, *De vita et moribus clericorum suorum*, PL, XXXVIII, 1574 f.

15 Cf. Celano, *Vita* (1), pp. 24 f. After hearing this text, which he had some priests translate into the vernacular for him, Peter Waldo of Lyons, a wealthy convert, conceived his idea of a movement for preaching by mendicants (cf. Bourbon, *Anecdotes historiques*, no. 342). With this text as a basis for his program, St. Dominic's bishop proposed to the Praedicatio in Narbonne the spirit of mendicant preaching, which was transmitted to the Order of Preachers (cf. Cernai, no. 21).

16 The idea of the apostolic life and the influence of the text of the Acts of the Apostles were not new. They can be traced to the very origin of Christian monasticism. It seems, however, that St. Augustine was the first to impose on clerics an absolute common life. From his time the idea was cherished continually. The Council of Aachen prepared, as an introduction to the Rule of the canons, a collection of texts including most of the scriptural and patristic passages used by the reformers of the eleventh century. Found there *in extenso* were the two sermons of St. Augustine on the life of his clerics. The canonical Rule of 816 (*Institutionis forma canonicorum*) had full assurance that it stood for the *Apostolica instituta* (Mansi, XIV, 226, 242).

It was characteristic of the Gregorian reformers that they carried out this idea with unprecedented vigor, especially in regard to poverty and in a revival of the proselytizing power inherent in the life of the apostles. On this last point stood their great originality. Up to that time the common life had been the sole aim. It was Peter Damian who put the emphasis on preaching. The texts from Luke, chapter 10 (and parallels), were not included in the Aachen collection.

17 On the origin, nature, and motives of the workers in these various apostolic movements, cf. Grundmann, pp. 8, 34ff., 157-68. It is noteworthy that the lay apostles, even though they attacked the traditional forms of Christian society, were not poor vagabonds aligned against those in power, but often they were nobles, wealthy men, clerics converted or awakened to new fervor; they were even educated men disgusted with learning, who opposed the contemporary condition of society.

18 The influence of the reformers was exercised not merely by their sermons: Peter Damian wrote much, and his many short works had a large circulation. Cf. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, III, 75.

19 Synod of Aachen (816). This council (can. 120) assigned to each canon: food, clothing, and a share of the alms (Mansi, XIV, 231). This third provision opened the door to the *peculium*, the cause of all the evil (cf. can. 122; *ibid.*, p. 232).

20 On March 12, 1051, Leo IX proposed to the canons of St. Martin of Lucca, "renewed in chastity," the whole ideal of the perfect common life: "Those who desire chastity and the regular discharge of holy offices at the altar . . . ought to receive the food and vesture of canons lest, while engaged in seeking the necessaries of life, they incur the fault of vagrancy. . . . If the Lord God . . . has delivered your church from priests with wives . . . the chaste from the unchaste, the ecclesiastical goods may be restored, which were dissipated by those living in luxury; and these resources may be applied for the common use of those living canonically." Jaffé, no. 4254; *PL*, CXLIII, 671; Mansi, XIX, 691 f. It is to be noted that the Pope speaks only of *victus et vestitus*; there is no question of *peculium*.

21 Hildebrand rose up against the possession of what this regulation permits. Peter Damian considered the question in more detail in his op. 24. *PL*, CXLV, 484. The text of the Aachen canon (120), as given by Mansi (XIV, 231), is evidently faulty.

22 Synod of Rome (April 20, 1063); Mansi, XIX, 1023 ff.

23 For the expression *religiosi clerici*, see Hertling in *Zeitschrift für kathol. Theol.*, LIV (1930), 350.

24 Mansi, XIX, 873, 898, 908.

25 "We have given thanks because you have proposed to renew the probable life of the holy Fathers, and you have, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, vowed to revive the institutes of apostolic doctrine customary in the first ages of the Holy Church but almost extinct with the passing of time." Privilege to the Friars of St. Paul of Narbonne on March 19, 1093 (*PL*, CLI, 360; Jaffé, no. 5482); cf. the bull of March 14, 1095, to the Canons of Magalon (Jaffé, no. 5550); of September 19, 1095, to the Friars of St. Ruf (Jaffé, no. 5579).

The conclusion of the bull (Jaffé, no. 5482) contains a summary of the history of canonical life. There are two lives in the Church, the high life and the low. The first lies in the monastic and canonical way. "Urban, pope and martyr, instituted the canonical life; Augustine regulated it by his laws; Jerome instructed it by his letters. Therefore it should not be thought any less meritorious, under the inspiration and direction of the Spirit of the Lord, to reinaugurate this primitive life of the Church than with persevering aid of the same Holy Spirit to guard the flourishing religious life of the monks" (*PL*, CLI, 360).

It is remarkable that this historical survey, in which the views of Peter Damian are apparent, recognizes the life of the primitive Church only in the canonical, and not in the monastic life. This little historical account had great success. It may be found separate from the original Privilege (*PL*, CLI, 535). It constituted an official decree in the mind of the canons and appeared as such in the Bull of Foundation of Prémontré (cf. Hugo, *Sacri et canonici ordinis Praemonstratensis annales*, Vol. I (documents), p. 8. It occurred frequently in polemics or apologies of the canons (cf. Hauck. IV, 360).

26 The monks could not be deterred from recognizing in their common life an imitation of the primitive communism, a circumstance not without historical truth. To the different texts cited, we add William of St. Thierry, *Liber de natura et dignitate amoris* (chap. 9; *PL*, CLXXXIV, 395). William

was then abbot of Cluny. In certain cases Urban II recognized even in the monastic life not only the apostolic common life, but the apostolic ministry. That indeed was the desire of certain monks, but not the customary view of the popes.

The official position here referred to had a great significance; it showed what importance the canonical reformers attached to the apostolate. It was the apostolate that made the canon as it had made the apostle. But it was not proper to the monk.

27 As might be expected, imitation of the apostles was the main theme in their writings, at times being incorporated even in the title of the work; e.g., *De vita vere apostolica*.

28 L. Herding ("Augustinusregel und Augustinerorden," *Zeitsch. für kath. Theol.*, LIV [1930], 350) thinks that the revision of the canons of Aachen, as found in Mansi (XIV, 283 ff.), was called forth by the canon of 1059 (1063).

29 Dom G. Morin, "Règlements inédits du pape Grégoire VII pour les chanoines réguliers," *Rev. Bénéd.*, XVIII (1901), 177-83, where this Rule is published.

30 Urban II became pope in 1088, three years after the death of Gregory VII. On January 11, 1089, the Rule of St. Augustine reappeared for the first time unmistakably with the Canons of St. Jean des Vignes (cf. Herding, *Reg.*, p. 356; P. Schroeder, p. 299; *PL*, CLI, 295; Jaffé, no. 5391).

31 "In regard to shoes (*caligae*), we follow the custom of the other canons, because in this matter we are directed by no new custom but by the ancient practice of the apostles themselves. For we know that the apostles went about barefoot (Matt. 10:10). We read also what the angel said to Peter in prison: 'Gird thyself and put on thy sandals' (Acts 12:8). If, therefore, Peter wore sandals and yet went about barefoot (Luke 10:4), it follows that they might have a modified form of shoe" (chap. 99; Martène, *Rit.*, III, 317). The passage is not in the edition of Amort. According to Du Cange, the *caligae* were a form of leggings. This text seems rather to indicate socks.

32 Let anyone embracing the canonical profession lay aside his own garments and be vested in those of the monastery so that despoiled of his secular garb, he may understand that he has descended to the poverty and want of Christ." "Therefore, with all meekness the poverty of the dwelling, the austerity of the place, etc., be set before him (Martène *Rit.*, III, 306). These are the first words of the Rule. The *regula Portuensis* opens with a long discussion of evangelical and apostolic poverty which seems drawn from the tracts of Peter Damian (Amort., pp. 341-45) This discourse may be found developed still further in the Rule of Aachen CIV, 289-91).

33 Peter Damian urged clerics to a complete detachment from material goods. If Gregorian reformers, in their quest of apostolic poverty, did not go so far as the mendicant apostles of the following century, it is not that they had any other ideal: but they did not think it possible to realize the ideal fully. If it was desirable that clerics should have food and clothing assured them, this was in order that the need of procuring them should not constitute a reason for vagabondage, a vice that was precisely one most keenly deplored in proprietary clerics. Cf. Peter Damian, op. 27, *PL*, V, 507.

34 Peter Damian, op. 24; *PL*, CXLV, 484 f.

35 In guaranteeing the possessions of the canons of Beuron (December 25, 1097), Urban II says: "Let everything be preserved entire, that it may be for your service and that of your successors and for the use of the poor" (*PL*, CLI, 499; Jaffé, no. 5692). The formula occurs frequently in the twelfth century. Tithes were assigned to the bishop, the canons, the poor, and for the maintenance of churches. What

was over and above had to be given to the poor: "Since whatever clerics have belongs to the poor . . . there must be special care that from the tithes and offerings they lay aside means of support as much as they will and can for convents and hospitals" (c. 68, C. XVI, q. 1). See examples in Jaffé, nos. 5288, 5427. One of the most celebrated of these was the gift of half of a third part of the tithes by the Bishop and canons of Toulouse to the first companions of St. Dominic in 1215.

Peter Damian also made use of a text contained in the *Regula canonicorum*: "Let them receive food and drink and clothing, and with these let them be content lest, taking more, they seem to oppress the poor, not without sin, and let them not take that upon which the poor depend for sustenance" (*PL*, CXLV, 484).

36 See in Denifle (*Archiv*, 1, 185 ff.) the learned notes in his prologue to the edition of the first Constitutions of the Order of Preachers. He cites texts from the Customs of Marbach, St. Victor, St. Denys of Reims, Porto. See also, in the modified Rule of Aachen, the enumeration of objects which the friars were tempted to appropriate: *codices, tabulas, graphicum*, the only ones mentioned (*Mansi*, XIV, 229).

37 See chaps. 23, 25, 27, of the *Regula Portuensis* (*Amort*, pp. 352 f.); chaps. 102, 103, of the Customs of Marbach (*Martène, Rit.*, III, 317); chap. 4 of the Customs of St. Denys of Reims (*ibid.*, p. 298); chaps. 59, 60 of St. Victor (*ibid.*, p. 279).

38 Customs of St. Denys of Reims, chap. *De foraneis (canonici forenses)*. *Martène, Rit.*, III, 301; St. Victor, chap. 61, *De his qui ad obedientias conversantur (ibid.*, 280). On this institution of the *forenses*, see *Schreiber*, II, 46; I, 124 ff.).

39 *Schreiber Kurie und Kloster im XII Jahrh.*, II, 45.

40 Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegung im Mittelalter. . . , Historische Studien* (1935), p. 267.

41 Everything is repeated in the history of the apostolic life. When, after a grave scandal, St. Augustine wished to consolidate in his clergy the ideal of the apostolic life which he had imposed upon them, he did not turn to the clergy but to the people. This attempt to bring pressure through popular indignation occasioned the two celebrated sermons (355 and 356), *De vita et moribus clericorum suorum (PL*, XXXVIII, 1568-80) which, like a mighty echo, have transmitted to posterity the clerical ideal of the holy Bishop.

42 Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne*, I, 157, gives contradictory opinions of historians about Gregory VII's part in the popular outbursts against simoniacal and incontinent clerics. Did the Pope permit them or provoke them? Fliche thinks Gregory was satisfied simply to enjoin upon the laity disobedience to disobedient pastors, and upon princes an opposition, even by force, to the services of unworthy clerics.

But the fact remains that, when the civil or ecclesiastical powers placed an obstacle in the way of reform, Gregory did not hesitate to proceed further and rely on the party in revolt, as in the case of the Patarines. This was the attitude of his predecessors, and notably that of Alexander II, who was pope in the time of Peter Damian.

43 A synod of Rome in 1059 forbade concubinary clerics to exercise their office and decreed "that no one may hear the Mass of such a priest" (*Mansi*, XX, 907). The Roman synods of 1074 and 1075 renewed the same prescription in order that fear of the people and their censure might oblige the cleric to correct his life (*Hefele-Leclercq*, V, 90). The prohibition was repeated by Urban II, Paschal II, and even Innocent II (Second Lateran Council, can. 7; *Hefele-Leclercq*, V, 726).

44 See in Mansi (XX, 422) the commentary by Bernold of Constance on canon 4 the Synods of 1074-75, "that the people may not accept the ministrations of clerics whom they perceive to be living in opposition to the sacred canons, and to the evangelical and apostolic institutions."

45 In 1057 at Rome, popular meetings against concubinary and simoniacal clerics (Jaffé, after no. 4375; Peter Damian, *PL*, CXLV, 409). The first episodes of the Patarines belong to this time. In 1067, Alexander II aroused the people and clerics of Cremona (Jaffé, no. 4637). In 1074, Gregory VII ordered the laity of Germany not to obey bishops who permitted their clerics to marry (Jaffé, no. 4902). At the time the Pope threatened Philip I of France with a revocation of the obedience his subjects if he continued to promote simony and other crimes (Jaffé, nos. 4807, 4855, 4878). He had recourse to this measure also against Henry IV in 1076. In 1075, he directed Rudolph of Swabia and Berthold of Carinthia to prevent "even by force" unworthy clerics from celebrating (Jaffé, no. 4922); the same recommendation to the Count and Countess of Flanders J (Jaffé, nos. 5011, 5012). In 1079, he commanded all the faithful of Teutonia and Italy to refuse the ministrations of incontinent clerics (Jaffé, no. 5109).

46 On the Patarines, see Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1127ff., 1191-98, 1249ff. The movement arose in Milan, but subsequently spread to Cremona, Brescia, Asti, Lodi, Ravenna. All Lombardy was agitated by it. Alexander II and Gregory VII relied on it while trying to prevent its excesses.

47 In 1057, Stephen IX tried to calm the Patarines (Jaffé, no. 4378), whence the successive missions of Hildebrand; then, under Nicholas II, the missions of Peter (Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1131 ff., 1191 ff.). In 1059, the Synod of Rome added canons: "Let not any of the lay order judge clerics" (Mansi, XIX, 898, 909). a sketch of anticlericalism in Florence, see Peter Damian, *De sacramentis per administrandis* (*PL*, CXLV, 529).

48 Note, for example, in Felice (11, 253), the part played by the crowd in the deposition of Archbishop Manasses of Reims; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 255-58, for the bishops of Thérouanne. Moreover, as always, the popular outbreaks worked quite as much in the opposite direction.

49 Baudry, *Vita Roberti*; *PL*, CLXII, 105,3, Walter, *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*, I, 125.

50 "We have learned about those who are agitating against the custom of the cenobitical groups, in which you receive under obedience laymen who renounce the world and devote themselves and their possessions to the common life. However, we approve of this way of life and this custom, as we have seen them to be laudable. Considering them the more worthy of being perpetuated as the form of the primitive Church is impressed upon them, we call them holy and Catholic, and by this letter confirm them by apostolic authority" (Urban II; *PL*, CLI, 336; Jaffé, no. 5456).

51 We quote extensively from this text. "In those times [about 1091] in the Teutonic kingdom, the common life flourished in many places, not only among clerics and monks living religiously together, but even among laymen who devoutly offered themselves and their goods to the same common life. Although in their garb they appeared to be neither clerics nor monks, they were considered not at all unequal to them in merit. Renouncing the world, these men gave themselves and their possessions to regulations of clerics as well as to monks living regularly, that they might be privileged to serve them and to live in common under their obedience. Wherefore, incited by the envy of the devil, certain other men, jealous of the honorable life of these same brethren, gnawed with wicked teeth at their life, although seeing that they were living in common in the way of the primitive Church."

"Not only an innumerable multitude of men but also of women devoted themselves in those times to a life of this kind that they might live in common in obedience to clerics or monks, and most faithfully

discharge for them the weight of the daily service of auxiliaries. On these farms also, many girls from country places renounced marriage and the world to live in obedience to a priest, But married people were not less zealous in living religiously, cultivating obedience to religious men. Moreover, zeal of this kind flourished with most vigor in Germany" (*Chronicon, Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptorum*, V, 453; *PL*, CXLVIII, 1407).

Among these lay associations, that of the Lay Brothers of Hirsau was in the first rank; there were also, no doubt, cloistered women in the double convents of Prémontré and many others. The place of the institution of lay brothers as related to the apostolic life would form a highly interesting study in itself.

52 "To those inquiring what is your profession or rule or order, you may say: the first and principal Christian rule, the Gospel, in truth, because it is the source of all rules and principles; ... nor dare you say you are not subject to apostolic and canonical institutions and desirous of following in some way the footsteps of the holy Fathers" (St. Stephen of Muret, *Sermo de unitate diversarum regularum*; Martène, *Rit.*, IV, 308). "For if the Son of God coming into the world knew of a better way to ascend to heaven than through poverty, He would have chosen it and walked therein" (St. Stephen, *Sentences: ibid.*, 318). The rule holds these promises. It is the first of the mendicant rules. The friars possess only the lands attached to their convent.

53 Heimbucher, I, 416.

54 It would be interesting to set the details of customs and of vocabulary peculiar to the apostolic movement (Catholic, schismatic, or heretical) in the evangelical context from which they sprang. Perhaps the term "believers" (*credentes*) is too readily applied to the faithful Cathari from the fact that they preached a new faith, distinct from the Catholic, and on this point there is a rejection of the statement of the chroniclers, almost all of whom give the name *credentes* to the Waldenses who were not heretics. Does not the text of the Acts account for this title? Likewise, is not the title *perfectus* for evangelical vocations derived from "If you wish to be perfect . . ." (Matt. 19:20)? According to St. Augustine, the names borne by the two classes of Manichaeans were not those mentioned, but *auditores* and *electi* (*De moribus manichaeorum*; *PL*, XXXII, 1357, 1368-78).

55 The Patarines were accused of insulting the sacraments of married or simoniacal priests. Arnulf (*Gesta archiepiscoporum mediolanensium*; *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptorum*, VIII, 18) puts into their mouth the words *canina stercora* to designate the sacrifice of such priests. Sigebert of Gembloux, in his *Chronicon* (*Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptorum*, VI, 362), even asserts, among other things, that the laity, aroused by the prohibition against being present at the Mass of a married priest, went so far as to trample Hosts under foot and to spill the precious blood consecrated by these priests. The attitude of the clergy could only aggravate things. In 1077 the Bishop of Cambrai had a layman burned who had committed no other crime than that of refusing to receive Communion from the hands of a bishop or priest guilty of simony or immorality (*Chron. S. Andreae*; *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptorum*, VII, 540; Jaffé, no. 5030).

56 On the relations of Arnold with the Patarines and the canonical movement, see Hausrath, *Arnold von Brescia* (1891), pp. 8, 18. For the relations of the Lombard heretics with Arnold at the close of the twelfth century, see Breyer in *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XII (1891), p. 392. Cf. Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 1931.

57 Grundmann, pp. 13-38. He very correctly remarks that in that age a spiritual "movement" could not endure long as an abstraction, but tended to become an institution: a regular order or a sect.

58 *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 26. Guiraud (*L'Inquisition*, I, 173-96) has very skillfully noted the analogies in the Cathari's worship and primitive Christian rites. Further, it is certain that the metaphysics of Catharist dualism had all that was necessary to satisfy minds at once inquisitive and simple.

59 Grundmann, pp. 43 ff.

60 *Ibid.*, pp. 47-50.

61 *Ibid.*, p. 46. This apostolate was limited to the person of the founder and disappeared with him.

62 Heijman (*Untersuchungen . . . Anal. Praem.* IV [1928], 367-69) has listed the slight differences which had arisen between Cîteaux and Prémontré at the end of the twelfth century on the question of the pastoral ministry. They may be significant, but they are very slight. It is surprising that the central branch had to wait until 1188 for the right to delegate residents to subordinate churches. The oldest extant statutes of Prémontré even forbade the possession of this type of church, "to which the care of souls belongs, unless it is an abbey" (R. van Waefelghem, *Les premiers status de l'O. de Prem.*; *Analect. de l'O. de Pr.*, IX [1913], 45). Consequently it is not surprising to find in the important work, *De ordine, habitu et professione canonicorum praemonstratensium* (PL, CXCVIII, 439-610), addressed by Adam Scotus to the Premonstratensians at the close of the twelfth century, no mention of the ministry of souls. Moreover, this religious was on the point of becoming a Carthusian (*Anal. Praem.*, IX [1933], 209-31).

But, in the Order of Prémontré, two branches did not submit to the centralizing tendency and monastic impulse of Prémontré from the time of Blessed Hugh Fosse: the branch of Magdeburg and the Norbertines of southern Germany.

63 All the characteristics of the apostolic movement are traceable in the foundation of the military Order of St. James of the Sword. The Canons of St. Eligius had converted a certain number of noble knights. The converters and the converted decided to put all their goods in common. The canons were to become chaplains for the knights who remained in the married state. Peter Ferdinand, their leader, went to Alexander III and obtained a Rule, a supplement of the Rule of St. Augustine. A privilege of July 5, 1175, confirmed their foundation. Therein occurs this description:

"Among those things which in the order of your profession it has been decreed you should observe, the first is that you ought to live in all humility and concord without property under obedience to one master. Consider the example of those faithful who, converted to the Christian faith by the preaching of the apostles, sold all and laid the price of it at their feet. To each was given what was needful, and not any of those who possessed anything called it his own, but all things were common to them" (Jaffé, no. 12504; PL, CC, 1026).

This order of married men was certainly one of the most curious known in the Church; it can be understood only from within the apostolic movement.

The hospitaller movement also frequently made provision for those in the married state. It was one of the great efforts of the popes and their representatives in the thirteenth century to oblige all hospitaller houses of any importance to take the vow of chastity and embrace the regular life (Le Grand, *Statuts d'Hôtels-Dieu et de léproseries*, 1901).

64 The Rule universal among hospitallers was that of St. Augustine (cf. Le Grand, *op. cit.*).

65 Grundmann, pp. 70-135.

66 We say "predicant" rather than "clerical." Clerics did not constitute the essential active element of the apostolic movements, though they may have been numbered therein: as with the Poor Catholics

and the companions of St. Francis. These communities evolved or were destined eventually to evolve toward the clerical order. The first Order of the Humiliati was instituted as a canonical order. Tiraboschi, II, 141.

67 *Ibid.*, pp. 128-48: privileges of an institution of the three branches. Cf. especially . 144.

68 The principal division of the Poor Catholics did not, strictly speaking, form a religious order. The only thing they had in common was their way of life, the *conversatio*. More on the order of itinerant preachers or schoolmasters, they formed, a company rather than a community. Nevertheless, their *propositum conversationis*, granted by Innocent III, made provision for a religious life for the men and women whom their preaching influenced: "If any men of the world wish to abide in our counsel, we advise that some who are suitable should be selected to exhort and dispute against the heretics, while others dwell together in houses, living religiously and according to rule, dispensing their goods in justice and mercy, laboring with their hands, and paying the tithes, first fruits and offerings due to the Church." PL 215, 1513 C. *Vide* PL., 216, 601-2, the very curious project of the religious house which they propose to construct in 1212 in the Diocese of Elne for their converts; there they would have clerics, laymen, and women, It illustrates the type of the multiple monasteries in which the apostolic communities became stabilized.

69 Laurent, no. 1.

70 Cernai, no. 20.

71 Laurent, nos. 4, 11.

72 "Indeed the man of God tarried during one Lent in the house of the Bishop at Carcassonne, devoting himself to preaching while he was also vicar of the Bishop *in spiritualibus*, having been appointed by the latter for the time of his absence in France, (Constantine, no. 55). The information comes from Stephen of Metz who met Dominic on this occasion. There is no reason to question it. Dominic was associated with Guy of Cernai, bishop of Carcassonne, who had participated in the *Praedicatio* in Narbonne. Guy, in fact, at the close of 1212 took his leave to go to France; he returned to his diocese after the octave of Easter, 1213 (Cernai, no. 299), which fell on March 30.

The office of *vices gerens in spiritualibus*, conferred by a bishop for the period of his absence (*remote agens*), was common in that age (cf. E. Fournier, *Les origines de vicaire général*, 1922, pp. 37 f., 91 f., 98).

73 According to the witnesses at the process of canonization, he had been canonically elected to the bishopric of Carcassonne (*Processus* [Bologna], no. 28; *Processus* [Toulouse], nos. 3, 5, 18; Constantine, no. 62). This might have occurred either in 1208 or after 1215-16 (Eubel, I, 203). The fact that Dominic declined on account of "the new foundation of preachers and nuns at Prouille" (*Processus* [Toulouse], no. 3; Altaner, p. 30) would point to the year 1208, because in 1215 Prouille was capable of thriving alone. On the other hand, in 1208 there could be no consideration of the Preachers.

We have observed that the veteran members of the *Praedicatio* in Narbonne began to be promoted to bishoprics only after 1211. It seems that the election of Dominic could not have been prior to that date, which was itself connected with the crusade. Therefore we favor 1215 or 1216.

74 Dominic was called *Capellanus Fanjeaux* in a charter of May 25, 1214 (Laurent, nos. 54 f.) and in a charter of the same year without designated month or date, but of later origin than the first (*ibid.*, no. 58). The term *capellanus* in Languedoc at that time meant the pastor. See Du Cange, s.v. *Capellanus*; *Processus* (Toulouse), no. 19; Laurent, no. 134.

75 Laurent, no. 60.

76 The only document which refers to the little Toulouse community of 1215 is charter no. 60. It does not specify that the preachers instituted by Foulques were priests. Therein precisely is evidence that they were. The law was most stringent on that point. Foulques would not have permitted an infringement of this law without mention of the fact, especially in the country of the Albigenses. From the first, moreover, the Order of Preachers was strictly clerical. The only seculars included were lay brothers.

77 Early in the thirteenth century the canons of St. Stephen lived a mitigated common life in the same house (*Gal. Christ.*, XIII, instr. XLI, c. 27 and 28). In 1216, there are evidences of an attempt to embrace the full regular life (*ibid.*, 77).

78 It is remarkable that in the first years of the thirteenth century, interest in the decapitated Commentary of St. Augustine began to wane. In the twelfth century it possessed the influence necessary to impose upon the canons the complete renunciation of the *peculium*. In the thirteenth century, this problem no longer existed: thenceforth the decision to be a canon regular meant the giving up of private property.

St. Dominic had no call for the Rule of St. Augustine; for that reason, perhaps, he had not decided beforehand with his brethren to adopt it (Jordan, no. 42). On the other hand, perhaps he would not have excluded it from his consideration, in his fidelity to canonical traditions.

After 1215, however, the case was different, and the Rule of St. Augustine was welcome in compliance with canon 13 of the Lateran Council.

79 At least from 1217.

80 Cf. Gen. 2: 10.

81 Cf. Acts 4:32.

82 Gen. 14:14. Compare with the seventy men of Moses, Num. 11:16, referred to by Peter Damian.

83 Ruth 1:6.

84 Our preacher was not a critical historian for the early periods of religious orders. Perhaps the need of a sevenfold enumeration influenced him to include in his list some orders not Augustinian. The Order of Val-des-Choux followed the Rule of St. Benedict. Cf. W. do Gray Birch, *Ordinale conventus valliscaulium* 1900; *Anecd.*, Martène, IV, 1651 to 1670; especially Jacques de Vitry, *Historia occidentalis*, chap. 18 (pp. 307-9).

Now it is known why Jacques introduced the Order of Grandmont into this history. This Order, however, followed neither the Rule of St. Augustine nor, as Jacques records (*op. cit.*, pp. 313-15), that of Cîteaux; it had its own Rule, but so imperfect a Rule that it needed continual revisions.

85 Privilege of foundation on December 22, 1216; Laurent, no. 74.

86 "Incessantly they sow their grain, that is, the word of preaching which is the bread of souls, over many waters, meaning many peoples." Bull of December 8, 1219; *ibid.*, no. 103.

87 "The load of worldly goods having been cast off, they traverse the road of this world more speedily . . . and they go in the abjection of voluntary poverty." Bull of December 8, 1219; *ibid.*, no. 103.

88 "Knowing that the brethren of your Order will be the champions of the faith and the true rights of the world." Bull of December 22, 1216; Laurent, no. 75. "As invincible athletes of Christ, armed with the shield of faith and the helmet of salvation, not fearing those who can kill the body, you will magnanimously use the word of God, which is more penetrating than any two-edged sword, against the enemies of the faith." Bull of January 21, 1217; *ibid.*, no. 77. Cf. this short statement of St. Dominic in giving the habit: "I wish to give you arms, with which throughout your life you ought to fight against the devil." *Processus* (Bologna), no. 36.

89 *Disciplina monasterii*, no. 4.

90 "Truly the Blessed Augustine formulated his [Rule] on a model of the apostolic life, as is clear from what is said and read about him, because he began to live according to the rule constituted by the holy apostles, and in one of his sermons he himself said: 'We wish to live the apostolic life.'" *Prol. in exp. regulae B. Aug.* Cf. Humbert, *De vita regulari*, I, 45.

91 Jordan, no. 125.

92 *Ibid.*, no. 104. In his Constitutions, Dominic requires his friars to conduct themselves on their apostolic journeys "as evangelical men" (Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 223).

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

SECTION TWO

The Augustinian Rule of St. Dominic Introduction

FOR a long time scholars took for granted that the Rule of St. Augustine was a late work. After the eleventh century they thought that they could find in Epistle 211 a legal text, from which the Rule was derived. Soon this notion became widely accepted. A better knowledge of the history of the manuscript would have refuted this hypothesis, but it did not lack some historical warrant. The second half of the eleventh, the twelfth, and the thirteenth centuries marked the flourishing period of the Augustinian institution.

When the Rule of St. Benedict, after a decisive and glorious influence on Christendom through several centuries, began to slacken in its fecundity in spite of its later reforms, the Rule of St. Augustine saw its influence suddenly increase with the canonical institutions of which we have spoken. The radical transformation which was reshaping the whole social order of Europe in that epoch had its repercussion also in the domain of religious life. The center of civilization was shifting. It was formerly bound up with the feudal order, in which, after the fall of the Roman Empire in the West, the Benedictine foundation, by means of a rule and customs remarkably adapted to the rudimentary state of civilization, had succeeded in preserving all the essential values of life, from the economic to the spiritual. Now that center was passing to towns and communes which were rising here, there, everywhere. The flow of economic life was easier; men became less crude, more cultured. The bourgeois and the traders grew rich. A class, a mentality, a law, and institutions unknown to earlier centuries came into being. Crises occurred which the Church had not yet learned to handle.

This new world had new religious needs: greater spirituality, guidance, a stronger sacramental life, the practice of prayer and asceticism in lay fraternities. Already a reaction had set in against the newly acquired wealth, and ardent desires for a return to the simplicity of the Gospel awakened in the hearts of many. In every domain the emergencies which the Church had to meet took an original turn. At the same time the changing civilization embraced elements unknown to the earlier ages of Christendom. Soon the Church had to engage in more and more frequent struggles against a host of forces: Jews, Mussulman invaders, pagan doctrines, new or revived heresies, political revolutions, social upheavals, and the unenlightened pietism of a laity provoked to anticlericalism by the economic compromises and vices of some of the clergy. All these conditions had to be met by the Church through her clergy. The old monastic order, chiefly concerned with the spiritual perfection of its own members and hindered by institutions formerly so precious, seemed unequal to the pace of the new social order and no longer able to meet the demands made on it, particularly in the cities. The Church needed a reformed and learned priesthood, a militia of regular clergy free to undertake multiple labors. For this clerical reform it was imperative to employ a legislation adaptable to contemporary conditions and contemporary law.

As life in the towns developed a new culture and departed from feudal customs, it developed the urbanity which gave birth to the Rule of St. Augustine. This venerable text, therefore, with its genuine spiritual value and its authority, was endowed with a unique potency for adaptation in the new social order. It was but necessary to substitute for the detailed prescriptions of the *Disciplina*, laws more appropriate to particular situations. Thus revised, the Rule of St. Augustine renewed the work of clerical reform, for which it had formerly been used by the Bishop of Hippo. The Church, and especially the popes, soon regarded it as an instrument for molding clerical lives to serve the new and daily more urgent needs of Christendom. Throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Church,

by means of this Rule, sought to create an army of priest whose life would be decidedly more active, while yet retaining the spiritual and contemplative bases of the regular life, the reform of which was being simultaneously pursued.

The flexibility of the Rule of St. Augustine made possible its use for purposes other than the clerical reform. Other needs of the age, other attempts at radically different forms of religious life, discovered in the Rule an invaluable standard whereby the new aspirations of the lay world might be actuated.

By the program which it represented, by the significance given to it at the time, the Rule, or rather the institution, of St. Augustine was still more fundamentally the bond of a holy ideal, of a powerful religious "movement" which rose and swept on to development in the late eleventh century. This movement for the "apostolic life" is perhaps the principal key, not only to the canonical changes, and the heretical, schismatic, or orthodox trends of the laity in the twelfth century, but even to the tendencies which led to the foundation of the mendicant orders in the thirteenth century. Because of its basic connection with the movement and its adoption by this same movement, the institution of St. Augustine subsequently enjoyed a rapid and magnificent expansion.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RULE

That expansion gives great importance to this study about the later destiny of the institution in the twelfth century: it is a grand page in Church history. The development and expansion that we are about to sketch is not a mere extension; it is specially a vital progress. The Augustinian Rule more and more consciously became suited for the task imposed upon it by the needs of the Church and the demands of the apostolic movement. We will follow the trend of this progress.

To give a true understanding of the renaissance of the Rule, this study of the Augustinian legislation has to give conspicuous attention to the statutes, customs, or constitutions, which replaced the *Disciplina* and formed what became the living Rule of St. Augustine. It is not surprising that this consideration develops, by a necessary transition, into an almost exclusive study of the destiny of one of these rules, that of the Friars Preachers, the capital importance of which will soon become evident. The fact that the following pages are devoted mostly to this rule should not be interpreted as the author's complacency in the institutions of the Order to which he belongs. The exposition itself will doubtless prove that the intrinsic nature of the subject called for the extensive treatment given it.

The outline for this section was determined by the character of the subject under consideration. A short historical review of the part played by the Augustinian institution in the movement for the restoration of the apostolic life in the twelfth century quite naturally led to investigation of the origin of St. Dominic's legislation. This research opened the way for a sketch to describe the extension and influence of the law of the Preachers, the true heir in the thirteenth century of the apostolic institution, which the decapitated text of St. Augustine was no longer able to direct except in name.

CHAPTER XXIII

The Rule of St. Augustine, Teacher of the Apostolic Life

REFORM OF THE CHURCH

From the time of his conversion, about 1035, Peter Damian concentrated all his thought on the reform of the Church. During the pontificate of Leo IX his influence grew. Other apostles imitated him. Then came the persistent efforts of Hildebrand, subdeacon and later archdeacon of the Roman Church. However diverse their ways, all pursued a single end: the purification of the Church by liberating the

clergy from the trammels of the world and the flesh, which, little by little, had enslaved them. From the beginning of the century, the Church waged a vigorous war against clerical marriage and the vice of concubinage as well as against simony, of which almost the whole Church, from pope to lowliest priest, had at some time felt the contamination. Peter Damian and his disciples made their appeals to the Churches of Italy, sounding the call to reform in ardent exhortation. Elevated to the pontifical throne, Hildebrand vigorously launched the investiture struggle for the release of the sacred hierarchy from domination by the lay power. The clergy here and there saw a gradual breaking in the network of temporal chains which had nearly everywhere proved a hindrance to their spiritual mission.

But along with the negative work of liberation, and indeed in order to render it possible, another work, and that positive, was indispensable. To win over the clergy to the reform, and to induce them to break the bonds which they themselves had forged, a new spirit, a new mode of life, a vital ideal had to be invoked. It did not have to be fashioned, nor was delay required to search it out; the reformers carried it in their souls. The campaign against simony and Nicolaitanism was begun in the name of the restoration of the ancient discipline.⁽¹⁾ The zeal of the reformers and the challenge of their fiery words became an appeal which no society, particularly no Christian society, could resist: it was a call to return to the primary sources, to the spirit of the early councils, and beyond that to the life of the primitive Church. The program proposed to the clergy was clearly conceived: it was the imitation of the life of the apostles.

RETURN TO THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

In the synod of 1059, the mighty Hildebrand had recalled this ideal and defended it with all the authority of his official power.⁽²⁾ A few years later Peter Damian, in a letter to the newly elected Alexander II earnestly recommending a point of capital importance for the reform of the clergy, gave full expression to his views.⁽³⁾ The life for which he appealed was that which St. Augustine had exacted of his clerics. Jerome described it in his celebrated letters to Nepotianus and to Heliodorus. It was the life of the apostles and of the primitive Church, the life which had been taught to them, proposed to them, and bequeathed to them by Jesus Christ.

Evidently the rule of the canons followed from the norm of the apostolic life; and while any member of a spiritual society follows the discipline of his own order, he in a certain way imitates the child of the infant Church. Let us, therefore, regard the form which the Church, newly clothed in the faith under the apostles, maintained as the way of life. "The multitudes of the believers," as St. Luke says (Acts 4:32), "had but one heart and one soul; neither did any one say that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but all things were common unto them." . . . Or will clerics ask for what Christ did not permit to His apostles? For when He sent them to preach, as Mark says, "He commanded that they should take nothing for the way but a staff only; no scrip, no bread, nor money in their purse." . . . Any cleric, therefore, who attempts to enjoy the revenues of property, will not be able to keep to the course of the apostles.⁽⁴⁾

A cleric should possess nothing as his own. "The possession of goods has the effect of making clerics independent of the rule of their bishop, and they bend their necks to secular power in the shameful dishonor of degrading surrender. . . . And it is certain that such a one, having violated his order for love of money, is unworthy of any ecclesiastical dignity."⁽⁵⁾ The possession of property thus peoples the clerical order with incompetents. But especially, by suppressing imitation of the apostolic life, it removes the very foundations of the spiritual office inherited by the clergy from the apostles, the office of preaching.⁽⁶⁾ Immediately after the verse in the Acts of the Apostles describing the common life, we are told that the apostles with great power gave testimony to the resurrection of Jesus Christ and that a great grace was in each of them.

"What does the writer of the sacred history aim at. . . . unless he wishes to show clearly that only those are fit for the office of preaching who possess none of the wealth of the world; and because they have nothing for themselves, possess all things in common?"(7) Freed from the encumbrance of terrestrial goods and like light-armed soldiers (*expediti*), these clerics will serve in the army of the Lord on the field of battle, strong in the armament of their virtues.(8)

POVERTY AND PREACHING

For Peter Damian, poverty in common and preaching were the very essence of the life of the apostles and of the primitive Church, which he exhorted the clergy to imitate. Poverty and preaching have an inseparable affinity. If poverty is practiced, there will be results from preaching. In one of his letters to some clerics, urging them to adopt the community life, we read:

Whereas the bishops hold their primacy from the apostles, priests constitute in the Church the order of the seventy disciples. . . . Now, when the Lord sent the seventy disciples two by two before Him,(9) he admonished them that He who would teach others must himself live without reproach. From the outset He proposed as a principle of prime importance that they scorn pecuniary reward, despise the inclinations of avarice, and possess nothing as their own. "Carry neither purse nor scrip nor shoes." According to St. Mark, He also forbade them to have bread or money in their purse, or to wear two coats, requiring them to walk shod with sandals, carrying only a staff. Why was this done? . . . Why do we read this text in church, if not to put into practice what we read? Those who exercise the office of apostles throughout the ages must of course follow the example of the apostles. God forbid, then, that His preachers possess the goods of this world in order that the men whom He has raised up to extinguish the fire of concupiscence in the hearts of their hearers may protect themselves from the plague of ambition and avarice which infests others.(10)

For Peter Damian the *ordo clericorum* (clergy) was identified in ideal with the *ordo canonicorum* (clergy living in community), and this body with the *ordo praedicatorum*. The bond of identity, the soul which inspired, made lawful, and gave unity to these diverse offices, could be none other than the *vita apostolica*, the *conversatio primitivae ecclesiae*. Every cleric who lived this life, even though he was only a monk, was a minister as well as one ordained for preaching. Here Peter makes the first assault in a clash of arms between monks and canons, which lasted more than a century. Laymen and heretics in the following century had their own ideas about the matter: Did not imitation of the apostles in itself confer the right to preach and exercise the pastoral ministry?(11)

This apostolic life, however, was no arbitrary fabrication of variable character. On the contrary, it was a most thoroughly determined reality, described in definite detail by the passages in the New Testament cited by Peter Damian: the texts in which Jesus defines the apostolic spirit which the apostles and disciples should have;(12) the text of the Acts which depicts the common life of the primitive Church.(13) These half-dozen verses set forth in concrete and striking details the ideal of the common life and of preaching in poverty.

TWO EPISODES

Every Christian might know that ideal and meditate upon it. In simple faith the medieval soul could feel increasing in himself the desire to realize it in himself and to see it truly realized in the clergy. Did he not hear the priest read the Epistle and Gospel in the church on Sundays? Peter Damian rightly recalled this fact. In an age when the liturgical life was the one and true nourishment of faith, this public reading was not without efficacy. We may recall two striking scenes previous to the eleventh century which show the power of these two texts when heard in church, two scenes that are likewise two dates in the history that we intend to describe.

The scene is in Africa. St. Augustine desired to justify to his people the common life which he exacted of his clerics. He assembled the congregation in the church. There they stood. He sat in their midst. Then the Deacon Lazarus came forward and read the text from the Acts of the Apostles. When he finished, Augustine took the book. "Now I wish to read; it gives me greater joy to read these words to you than to speak any of my own." And he read the text again; then he added: "That is the way we should like to live; pray for us that we may do so."[\(14\)](#)

Eight centuries later, in a little village of Umbria, the son of a rich merchant, who had received the grace of conversion three years earlier, was living as a hermit near a little church. One day at Mass he heard the account of the mission of the disciples read from the Gospel. He pondered the text; the thought of it overwhelmed him. He was St. Francis, who then began to preach penance.[\(15\)](#)

Two centuries had already passed since the preaching of Peter Darnian and his followers had called to the attention of the clergy and of the laity the meaning of these two texts, vibrant with energy for a renaissance and even a revolution, Indeed it was a revolution that began. From the barbarous ages the inspiration of St. Augustine was revived and amplified. Its spirit of zeal for the conquest of souls was accentuated in imitation of the apostles, thus completely renewing the *vita apostolica*.[\(16\)](#)

For several centuries after Peter Damian's time the ideal of the apostolic life was realized with prodigious success. In widely different circles this concept became an effective force. It gave birth to unforeseen institutions, and it stimulated a revival of ecclesiastical law. Out of it developed orthodox as well as heretical movements. It provoked reform, unrest, shocks, and revolutions. The correction of the clergy, the canonical movement, the itinerant preaching of the twelfth century, the rise of double monasteries, and the founding of the mendicant orders; the violent anticlerical heresies, the Albigensian war, and the Inquisition, were but the principal entries on the balance sheet. In short, the ideal of the apostolic life was one of the most powerful stimulating forces of Christian civilization in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and opened the way to important developments.

The concept was adaptable to varied designs. Yet the *vita apostolica* remained the motivating spring of all these currents and, in spite of all their divergent tendencies, was the source of their profound affinity.

UNITY OF THE MOVEMENT

This unity of spirit is explicable only in view of the source just traced. These currents and revolutions did not find accord on a political or social level, nor even on an administrative or intellectual plane. Religion formed their basis of harmony, and that not on a visible range of orthodoxy, schism, or heresy, but in the invisible depths of Christian evangelical inspiration.[\(17\)](#) There alone they attained oneness: oneness of origin in the New Testament counsels noted above; oneness of motivation, by earnest and ceaseless meditation, for a fuller execution of the sacred program; finally, oneness of orientation for the reform of the Church.[\(18\)](#)

In this history, which touches on so many points, only certain aspects need be treated here, namely, those fundamental ones in which the Rule of St. Augustine appears, for it had a part in these changes. The restoration of the apostolic life was to be made in the name of St. Augustine and according to the example he had set. His sermons were on the lips of all the reformers in the eleventh century. The *Disciplina monasterii* of Augustine gave the password for bringing the Rule again upon the scene: *Apostolicam enim vitam optamus vivere*. The Commentary opened with the description of the common life as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, fundamental charter of life in the primitive Church. "The first purpose for which you have been brought together is that you dwell in unity in the house, and that

you have but one soul and one heart in God. And call not anything your own, but let all things be common. . . . For thus you read in the Acts of the Apostles."

In the first movement which rose out of this current for the renewal of the apostolic life, namely, the canonical reform, the Rule of St. Augustine was revived. This Rule became so firmly rooted in the reform that for several centuries thereafter the canonical institution and the Augustinian institution were thought of as one.

THE CANONICAL REFORM

To effect a reform of the clergy, it was necessary to begin with the canons. That division of the sacred ministry which lived a mitigated common life in fidelity to the "canons" at a mother church, or with the bishop in his episcopal house, was easier to reach than others.

In substance, the program of the Gregorian reformers purposed to correct the ecclesiastical order as regarded marriage, incontinency and simony; to urge renouncement of the peculium and the apportioning of alms as permitted by the canonical rule for two centuries past;(19) to foster zeal among the canons for the perfect common life; and finally, little by little, to influence the whole clerical order. The abuses under attack were so deeply rooted among the clergy that this program would never have even partially succeeded had it not been for the powerful psychological reform effected through the inspiring appeal of the *vita apostolica*.

After ten years of work at isolated reforms(20) Hildebrand in 1059, at the Synod of Rome, uttered a virulent denunciation of the old canonical rule and the distribution of money;(21) he reviewed the new, yet ancient design of the reform program. A canon, then and there drawn up and reiterated four years later by another synod,(22) proposed a new life to all chaste clerics, that very life which Peter Damian was then propagating through his preaching and his writing, the common life, the apostolic life itself.

We command the clerics who, in obedience to our predecessor, have cherished chastity to dwell close to the church for which they were ordained, as it becomes those zealous for religion,(23) and to eat and sleep under one roof and possess in common all that comes to them from this church; we exhort them to do all in their power to develop the apostolic life, that is, the common life, that having become perfect they may merit to dwell in heaven with those who now receive the hundredfold reward.(24) The ideal of reform which this official text proposed to all clerics was that to be upheld by all the great pontiffs at the close of the eleventh century; Alexander II, Gregory VII, and Urban II, strove to promote it by every possible means.

It is not within our scope to describe how, toward the close of the century, this program was carried out with exclusive application to the canons, and, later on, to one division of the canons. It need only be remarked that in the early part of the twelfth century the canonical reform swept on to a grand expansion while yet sustaining the fullness of the initial ideal. Forty years after the Synod of Rome, Urban II again sketched the lines of the program in a formula, the force of which is now comprehensible: "to revive the practices taught by the apostles and carried out in the early days of the Church ."(25) It is noteworthy that the popes of this period in their official decrees recognized the apostolic life, or the *conversatio primitivae Ecclesiae*, as the ideal explicitly proper to the canons.(26)

The reformed canons embraced with their whole soul the fullness of this heritage as proclaimed in the words of Peter Damian. The movement stimulated the writing of numerous polemic and apologetic works which vigorously and insistently treated this elemental duality in their clerical life: common poverty and pastoral preaching. The canons sought to reserve this privilege to themselves.(27)

What is of still greater importance is that the canons were intent on stabilizing their apostolic life through the adoption of a rule. Having attempted to correct the old *Institutionis formw canonicorum* of Aachen,(28) and having made trial of a Rule given by Gregory VII,(29) the canons finally chose the apostolic Rule of St. Augustine, adaptable as it was to the role awaiting it in the last quarter of the eleventh century.(30) From then on it was regarded as the basic law of the canonical institution.

CANONICAL CUSTOMS

According to the degree in which it was practiced in the first decades, the *Disciplina* conferred upon canonical life a note of remarkable austerity. Though the original articles of the Rule were abandoned in the early twelfth century, the Commentary continued in use and exerted a deeper influence than that possible by a mere symbol or standard. Whereas the Rule of 816 permitted money, the Commentary, even in its decapitated state, exacted of the reformed canons an absolute repudiation of property. On this score, it is significant that from the early part of the twelfth century the universal rule for canons consisted of the Commentary of St. Augustine and particular customs, which together comprised a true law for apostolic life. These Augustinian customs, which deserve to be called the living Rule of St. Augustine, included details of apostolic significance. For example, the customs of Marbach which imposed upon the canons the use of stockings without feet, "as being the kind worn by the apostles."(31) Warrant for this practice was based on an ingenious interpretation of New Testament texts. With the same regard for the scrupulous imitation of the apostolic life, the Waldenses were later compelled to wear only sandals in their following of the same text.

These practices carried this spirit of imitation even farther, for it was carefully established, often in the very words of the prologue, that the canonical life was "an abasement even to the need and poverty of Christ."(32) It should be observed that this call to complete personal poverty was not accompanied by any authorization of common wealth. Fired by the zeal of the reformers, the canons in their community life sought to be poor, as poor as possible, like Christ and the apostles.(33) The revenues which they were to retain assured only their food and clothing, and that in the proportion determined by the Rule.(34) Everything over and above was to be distributed to the poor.(35)

DEVIATION FROM THE REFORM

Finally there was provision in their customs for the life of pastoral preaching. Study and the scholastic training requisite to preaching were therein treated to a degree unknown in monastic legislation.(36) The exercise of the apostolic ministry necessitated frequent missions outside the community, an exigence that was regulated by certain original statutes.(37) The pastoral work gave birth to new classes of religious: *forenses, stationarii, in obedientiis commorantes*.(38) The customs supposed in the canonical life some elements utterly foreign to monastic practice before the eleventh century. These elements fostered the apostolic life. These laws which were classed as Augustinian customs were indeed worthy of St. Augustine.

As time went on, the canonical reform developed in new ways. The clerical ideas of Peter Damian immediately inspired the great wave of the first fifty years. Later in a number of cities and towns apostolic houses arose in which common poverty and pastoral preaching were practiced according to the mode of the apostolic life. Often these groups were composed of diocesan clerics, or members of the episcopal chapters, who thus became associated in community life in the places where they had the care of souls. No other purpose actuated their adoption of the reform than the desire to motivate their clerical life and fulfill the duties of their office more perfectly. Well did they merit the eulogy of the historian, who saw in them "the classic pastors of souls in the Middle Ages."(39) Had they been more numerous they might really have solved the clerical crisis of the age.

In the course of the twelfth century, however, and perhaps even as early as the foundation of St. Victor (1110), the canonical order was greatly modified by a very strong Benedictine influence, particularly from Cîteaux. The monastic ideal of personal sanctification was again embraced as a principal end. The new religious houses, in powerful congregations, were established in the country or on the outskirts of the communes. In these houses not only diocesan clerics gathered in the interests of self-reform, but also newly "converted" men entering religious life.

We can easily see how under such circumstances this new type of canon would have little concern for the imperatively important work of spreading the Gospel among people in the cities. His vision was no longer clearly focused on the ideal of the apostolic life preached by Peter Damian. The great canonical congregation, which grew more and more prominent with the passing of the twelfth century, differed from the episcopal or parish chapters first reformed, since in the following of the two sacred texts which served as the charter of the apostolic life the new groups concentrated on what was proposed the Acts of the Apostles, neglecting to some degree the exhortation of St. Luke. Their observance stressed the common life rather than the apostolate with poverty.

The trend was the very reverse in another movement, to which the Rule of St. Augustine also gave direction, a movement infinitely more intricate to trace than the canonical reform, but not less important. Its varied nature finds characterization only in a rather vague expression "the apostolic movement." This movement has been the subject of a scholarly study.⁽⁴⁰⁾

THE APOSTOLIC MOVEMENT

The ideas and aspirations for clerical reform were not proposed simply and quietly by discreet workmen, nor were they confined merely to ecclesiastical circles; rather were they deliberately publicized from the roofs and housetops. Italian reformers, like Peter Damian, made incessant appeals in the churches, sounding vigorous calls for correction and renewal. Men stirred to this appeal; in their hearts they compared the ideal proposed to the clergy with the practice of it habitual among them. It was to be expected that their sense of Christian fitness, though simple and even brutal, would know how to react.⁽⁴¹⁾ That is what happened. And the movement had a force that did not fear to fan the flame.

The reason was that in the face of the weakness of princes and prelates, often among the most contaminated by the pest of simony, this popular censure at times became the sole support of the reforming popes and their collaborators.⁽⁴²⁾ By obliging the laity through positive commands to refuse to hear Mass and receive the sacraments from priests guilty of concubinage and simony,⁽⁴³⁾ by appealing directly to the people and by requiring their own representatives to depose from office and even by force to evict from the churches the sacred ministers who did not submit to the apostolic decrees,⁽⁴⁴⁾ the Gregorian popes, during the second half of the eleventh century, at times made bold use of this popular arm. This was notable in Germany, Flanders, the Papal States,⁽⁴⁵⁾ and particularly in Lombardy, and also in northern Italy.⁽⁴⁶⁾ In the movement there in the middle of the eleventh century common people, soldiers, minor clerics of the Patarines, brave because supported by the Church, entered the struggle with such great zeal that it became urgent at times to moderate it.⁽⁴⁷⁾ The popular revolt against unworthy clerics burst forth on this occasion also without being incited.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Political passions, aroused by the communal insurrections, often needed only a slight pretext to plunge into the struggle.

This tide of popular indignation, whipped to greater vigor by the tenacious resistance encountered in the clergy, could not sweep on without causing a profound psychological change in the medieval man of rough and elemental spirit. It was the forerunner of other revolutions. Further, the idea of a renewal

of the primitive Christian life in the name of which the reform was carried on, and especially the incisive power of the program for the apostolic life seemed calculated to stir their very heralds out of their settled equilibrium.

In fact, the canonical reform itself (when accepted by the clergy) was far from exhausting the import of this ideal and of satisfying its demands.

The description of the disciples "sent two by two to preach from city to city" entailed a program that could hardly be realized in the sedentary life of the canon. Moreover, this ideal was not held out to the clergy only. They constituted but one of the elements of the apostolic life. Indeed, according to the testimony of the very ones who had propagated it, this apostolic life was the program of a Church, the plan of the primitive Church: "the multitude of believers," said the Acts of the Apostles. It was not the concern of clerics alone. The laity also had a share in that program. Why should it not be tried again?

THE PROGRAM OF A CHURCH

If, bound as they seemed to be to their customs and to their wealth, ordinary ministers were unwilling to embrace this ideal, why should not pious men, wandering clerics, soldiers, rich merchants, or converted nobles, laymen and women, form a more apostolic community without them, apart from the traditional ranks. To realize anew the life of the primitive Church, to abandon money, learning, honors, all that a new and rising civilization was ready to put into the hands of Christians still untainted by all these temporal appeals: what a glorious religious program!

When precisely did they begin, these Christians who were stirred by the desire to imitate the apostles and revive the primitive Church, and how did they proceed to realize their design? It is difficult to say. But the last years of the eleventh century saw an apostolic movement take shape and crystallize about a few individuals. Had it not already been realized in the numberless groups of the "poor of Christ" who, toward the close of the eleventh century, flocked over the countryside to hear the preaching of Robert of Arbrissel?(49) This type of interest increased on a large scale in the following years, and the apostolic preacher described by St. Luke as traveling on foot, without money, and announcing the gospel, found successively winning imitators in Bernard of Thiron, Vitalis of Savigny, and Norbert of Xanten.

THE MULTITUDE OF BELIEVERS

The "multitude of believers" of the Acts of the Apostles drew around the company of these new apostles to complete the living picture of the primitive Church. An itinerant preacher was not always needed to precipitate a reproduction of this primitive communism. Some years before Robert's appearance, groups of laymen initiated a type of life in common, not at all in the traditional mold of monasticism. In 1191, upon examination, Urban II approved of the formation of communities of this kind, "the more worthy of being perpetuated as the form of the primitive Church is impressed upon them."(50) Bernold of Constance has preserved the context of this bull; a vast concourse of men, women, peasant girls, married folks, throughout the Church and especially in Germany, offered themselves to the monks, the canons, and their parish priests, to lead in poverty and labor a common life imitative of the early Church.(51) Several years earlier, with the authorization of Gregory VII St. Stephen of Muret had established a community of poor, even of mendicant poor, to whom he proposed the fundamental law of "the Gospel the poverty of Christ," "the institutions of the apostles and the canons."(52) That proved, actually, to be the rule of the new life embraced by the poor of Muret, the future "good men" of Grandmont.(53) Finally, deeper than any of these visible signs of the movement, there ran the undercurrent of the apostolic and evangelical idea in the lives of numberless souls,

resulting in the formation of other "multitudes of believers," of "good men," "perfect," and "masters," who sought to emancipate themselves from the customs of the contemporary Church to lead a life conformed in the most literal details, rites, garb, symbols and names, to that pictured in the primitive Church and the life of the apostles.(54) The "apostolic movement" arose, an inorganic social reality, revolutionary and even anarchical, but somehow profoundly one in the motivating idea that animated it: the *vita apostolica*, imitation of the primitive Church. Its passion for reform, its opposition to the clergy of the age, its scorn for the sacraments of unworthy priests,(55) its proselytizing activities, its contention for imitation of the apostles as the sole basis of the right to preach, its desire of absolute poverty for clergy and laity alike, finally, its very geographical position in Lombardy and southern France, everything about this movement proclaimed its affinity to the popular and canonical currents of the Gregorian reform. Personalities as representative as those of Arnold of Brescia and his successors constituted the living transition.(56)

In these companies the ideal of the apostolic life had a significance quite different from that proposed in the canonical reform, which concerned clerics who voluntarily became members of a regular community in the very scene of their apostolic duties in order to embrace a holier state, to develop their sacerdotal powers, and, as imitators of the apostles through their common life, to exercise their ministry more fully. The apostolic life seemed an idea inseparable from the clerical life.

LAY DOMINANCE

In the bands of the "apostolic movement," on the contrary, there was lay dominance; priests who happened to be in such companies, by that very fact stepped out of the ordinary circles of clerical life. The itinerant preacher alone, the instigator of the band or its spontaneous spokesman, enjoyed a plenitude in a ministry that was even much wider in scope than that open to the canons regular. But this preacher was not always a cleric and was himself but one of the typical elements of the enterprise, one of the personages of the renewed primitive Church. The apostolic life, according to the proponents of the apostolic movement, was an ideal of the whole Church, of the Christian life, whereby each one, independent of any distinction of clergy and laity, might claim a place in his own degree among the apostles or believers.

Our purpose does not require us to trace more fully the destinies of this movement which has recently been the subject of a remarkable study.(57) It need only be said that it did not raise up the leaders indispensable to its success, and, under the suspicion of nearly all the clergy to whom its anticlericalism gave alarm, it ended by falling into schism or drifting in the wake of heresies, like Catharism, which seemed to promise stability in a counter-Church, as containing features apparently much closer to the primitive Church.(58)

One division of the movement, however, which early in the twelfth century came under the direction of certain itinerant preachers commissioned by the popes, oriented itself, probably also with the support of the same popes,(59) toward a more stable institution. Along its own line of evolution the Catholic apostolic movement soon witnessed the appearance of new societies or religious companies: the houses of Fontevrault and of Prémontré, the Abbeys of Savigny and of Chaussey with their daughter communities, very remarkable orders specifically different from the old monastic type. The foundations of Robert of Arbrissel and his companions, of St. Norbert and his spiritual sons, produced double convents with curious organization: in two distinct groups, men and women of the apostolic community were simultaneously established(60) near a particular church where they had common assembly while their leader and founder continued his official itinerant apostolate.(61)

Then it was that, for the second time in the complex history of the apostolic life, the Rule of St. Augustine returned to play its part. It was used in Robert of Arbrissel's community and in that of St. Norbert. There it directed the life of the imitators of the primitive Church, marking the birth of a second canonical movement, a second Augustinian apostolic institution. This new branch differed from the first as much in its origin as in its way of understanding the apostolic ideal.

Although for the reformed clerics entrance into the Augustinian order and the life of poverty which it implied was embraced as the special means to the end of imitating the life of the apostles, it did not have this significance for the groups organized in "apostolic movements." For them the practice of the common life and poverty was antecedent to their affiliation to any regular Augustinian foundation. The constitution of a juridical organization seemed to add nothing to their imitation of the primitive Church. For them regular life was intended, not as a help to religious progress, but as a means toward social stabilization, and for the Church a kind of recuperative remedy to the degree in which this stabilization saved these vagabond companies from becoming anarchical or even heretical. The great success of the apostolic movement, its strong Christian vigor maintained in spite of its restless evolution, gave great value to its recuperative force.

The achievement might have become incomparable if it had furnished a solid institutional support for the itinerant preachers and provided for their perpetuation. But its weakness lay in its undefined, and difficult, almost contradictory, aspects. Certain elements, like that of an itinerant apostolate for the preacher and absolute poverty for the community, were hardly compatible with regular stability or life in solitary places. An equilibrium could be struck only by the sacrifice of some one of these elements. The event proved this. These new Augustinians, particularly the Premonstratensians, retreated in their spirit toward a conformity with other monastic orders, Cîteaux especially. (62) With their capitulation, the apostolic movement with its ideal of the life of the primitive Church lost the assurance of an established and permanent place in the Catholic social structure. In losing the refuge of the Augustinian institution, the movement at the same time lost safety in the bosom of the Church.

GRAVE DIFFICULTIES

This evolution was not without immense consequences. The apostolic movement, the force of which did not abate among the laity, receded farther and farther from the direction of the Church, and soon went violently against it. The aspirations of the spiritual masses toward the common life and poverty found a means of realization in the rapid development of hospitaller and military institutes, (63) where the Rule of St. Augustine once more exercised a leading part. (64) But this desire for proselytism and the pastoral ministry no longer found a satisfying outlet. For various reasons, the itinerant preachers now caused disquiet or aroused anxiety in the Church, and no longer received from the popes the support that had been given to their predecessors. The history of the Waldenses is well known: pious evangelical Christians and eager proselytes who, almost in spite of themselves, lapsed into schism.

Thus, at the close of the twelfth century, the evolution of the *vita apostolica* had not at all fulfilled the promise of its opening years either for the canons or for the numerous bands created by the apostolic movement. The Church found herself facing terrible problems.

With Innocent III all would change.

THE ORDER OF PREACHERS

With his finger on the pulse of a whole century, Innocent III from the beginning of his pontificate took his stand in the line of the Gregorian popes and renewed their efforts to authorize and stabilize in the

Catholic social order a life of imitation of the apostles.(65) His undertakings in favor of the Humiliati of Lombardy, the Poor Catholics and the first followers of Francis, showed the extent to which the revival force was at work. Faithful to the ideal of a Christian life founded on the way of the Gospel, the apostolic movement again stirred in the Church, realized a new birth, and grew in her bosom with increasing zeal for conversions. Repeating at the same time the history of the preceding century, it established a series of original religious foundations, on the order of the ancient double monasteries where the "predicant" groups(66) of men or women, generally with the encouragement of the Pope, were established in homogeneous communities of more definite organization. Such were the three branches of the Order of the Humiliati,(67) the fraternities of Penance, the companies of the Poor Catholics,(68) and the Poor Clares who, with the Order of Penance and the Order of Friars Minor formed the three Orders of St. Francis. The apostolic movement fertilized anew the Catholic world and made it fruitful.

Would those in holy orders remain quiescent before the challenge? Would not the canonical reform revive with new vigor, in virtue of this ideal of imitation of the apostles, the ideal which had created it of old with all its promise for good? Would the *ordo clericorum* allow itself to be dispossessed of its prerogative as the *ordo praedicatorum* by these movements of lay origin?

CHALLENGE TO THE CLERICS

Just as the bishops convoked by Innocent in the Lateran Council were preparing for a discussion of the reform acknowledged as indispensable for the clergy and the apostolate, Dominic arrived in Rome from Narbonne. He came to propose to the head of the Church the institution of an order that would be the Order of Preachers.

Dominic was a priest. He was of the regular clergy, and an episcopal cleric. From his youth he had been nurtured on the best canonical apostolic spirituality, because he found the fullness of the reform in vigor at the chapter of Osma, which he entered upon completion of his clerical studies. He himself participated in the effort to renew the common life (1199),(69) and there is proof that the ideal of imitating the apostles was presented to him from the first under the most dynamic form, because the prior of the reform, Diego de Acebes, was himself animated with such an extraordinary spirit of zeal that, when he became the head of a diocese, he offered his resignation to the Pope in order to consecrate himself to the conversion of the pagans.(70) Dominic was then his subprior and joined with him in his endeavor.

From that time on, Dominic cultivated the spirit of the apostolic life with new intensity. With other priests he shared in the papal mission against the heretics in Narbonne. He taught according to the evangelical program of St. Luke: "Going and preaching according to the example of the Master, on foot, without gold or silver, in all things imitating the way of the apostles." Expressly designated by Innocent, this was the method of conquest which all the missionaries of Languedoc had to practice.

Thereafter Dominic had the title and carried on the clerical duties of a preacher delegated to the Province of Narbonne.(71) Moreover, early in the year 1213, during the absence of the Bishop of Carcassonne, Dominic was named vicar-general *in spiritualibus*.(72) During these few years the episcopal office itself seemed about to claim him; he was threatened several times, and probably even canonically elected, at dates somewhat uncertain.(73) But he did not desire ecclesiastical dignities. In 1214 he became pastor of Fanjeaux, thus entering into the administration of the Diocese of Toulouse.(74) In 1215 he was appointed head of a small band of diocesan preachers by his Bishop, Foulques, who organized in his diocese the papal preaching(75) formerly inaugurated in Narbonne.

IN THE TRADITION OF HISTORY

Installed in a house at Toulouse, the apostolic society then desired to strengthen its unity by a religious profession, to increase its spiritual treasury by the austerity of a common life, and especially to perpetuate its work in an institution. Thus the way was prepared for the foundation of the Preachers, a project which Dominic laid before the Pope.

Apparently these preliminary steps in the foundation of the Order of St. Dominic followed a traditional line. Does not the story read exactly like that for the foundations of regular episcopal clerics at the close of the eleventh century? Opposed in character to the apostolic movement which followed its inspiration independent of any consideration for law, the new clerical association possessed, even from the first, a juridical cast that was almost classic. These preachers were priests,⁽⁷⁶⁾ owing obedience to the bishop of the diocese, who legally conferred on them the office of preaching. For their maintenance, the bishop provided a third part of the tithes of the diocese, the other two parts being destined for the episcopal canons and for himself. In a very different position from that of itinerants, these preachers were installed in the city in a house which served as their headquarters.

Their number, doubtless, was very unusual: only individual delegated preachers were heard of previous to the thirteenth century. But after 1204 the great preaching missions organized by Innocent III created a precedent; not a precedent only, but a kind of magnet, since the little society of Toulouse was the direct outcome of one of these mission bands.

Furthermore, was not this new group of priests who aided the bishop in his office as pastor a replica *in spiritualibus* of the college of canons who at this period assisted him in his work as administrator of the diocese *in temporalibus*? The little association at the house of Peter Seila grew into a convent of canons regular, and in its membership, its juridical status, its position in the diocese, and even in the source of its revenue, it became a counterpart of the episcopal chapter of St. Stephen.⁽⁷⁷⁾

It is not surprising, therefore, in 1216, to see Dominic and his first brethren, with the advice of Innocent III, choose as the Rule of their Order the Commentary of St. Augustine. Had they not adopted this decapitated text in their legislation -- and they might indeed have failed to consider it but for canon 13 of the Lateran Council⁽⁷⁸⁾ -- this order of priests would, nevertheless, have appeared as an authentic and pure resurgence of the great Augustinian current.

In the clerical order as well as among the lay groups of the "Predicant" movement, the apostolic life swept on in a mighty flow in the pontificate of Innocent III, renewing the ideal of the reformers of the eleventh century and continuing the history of the influence of St. Augustine.

A NEW INSTITUTION

But in the same period, while holding to the line of this visible continuity and taking its classic shape, the apostolic ideal as expressed in the institution of the Friars Preachers far outdistanced its first goals in every direction. The nature of the order conceived and realized by St. Dominic, its freedom from parochial administration, its stamp of universality,⁽⁷⁹⁾ and particularly its apostolic spirit of boundless zeal and evangelical poverty, made this last offshoot of the Augustinian institution a force that profoundly affected the apostolic order and the Catholic hierarchy. A final goal had been reached.

A contemporary writer described this achievement in a remarkable picture which sketches this evolution. A great preacher, Jacques de Vitry, in a sermon to the canons regular, thus traced the history of the apostolic order:

This stream, [\(80\)](#) that is, regular life, which watered all of Egypt, or the whole universe, rising in the place of delight, namely, the primitive Church, among the faithful who had but one heart and one soul and called nothing they possessed their own, [\(81\)](#) flowed thence from this place of pleasure, and reached even to the blessed Augustine. He himself began to live according to the Rule instituted by the holy apostles.

This stream produced of itself seven tributaries, or seven congregations of canons which possess the same Rule and the same basis but have different statutes. The Canons of Prémontré form one of these; the Convent of Grandmont, another; the Order of St. Victor, the third; the Order of Ardlaise, the fourth; the Order of Val-des-Écoliers, the fifth; the Order of Val-des-Choux, the sixth; the Order of Friars Preachers, the seventh. . . .

The stream from which these tributaries flowed is the Order of White Canons who wear linen and furs, use wine and meat, as they say that Blessed Augustine and his clerics did. Augustine made of his followers men white and pure within; without, black, and dead to the world; this was the symbolism of the habits with their black capes and their white linen garments. . . .

Therefore, in this blessed and holy way of life, the White Canons, who were the first among the canons, dwelt a long time. . . .

Many, in proposing to follow a yet more salutary counsel, imposed upon themselves more severe statutes while keeping to the foundation of the Rule. That is why they took it upon themselves to abstain from meat and preferred to use garments of wool or horsehair, scorning and rejecting linen shirts, linen and feather mattresses; this was done by the seven congregations already mentioned. . . .

Moreover, these canons regular were not content with being distinguished from the White Canons in their food and clothing; for, in these last times, the Congregation of the Friars Preachers, holy and pleasing to God, have ceaselessly waged war everywhere against the devil by freeing themselves from the burden of temporal possessions. Necessary, indeed, it is for combatants to be rid of all encumbrance; that is why Abraham selected three hundred servants free from all care to fight against the five kings. [\(82\)](#) Our combat is against the five senses.

In fact, Noemi, [\(83\)](#) that is, the splendor of the religious life, having dwelt long in the land of Moab, namely, among the black monks and white canons, returned to Bethlehem, or the house of bread, to the house of the Friars Preachers which sustains the whole world on the bread of the word. Thus Isaias announced: I will take away all thy tin. And I will restore thy judges as they were before, and make thy counselors as of old; that is, as in the days of the primitive Church and of the apostles. For in them the first state of the primitive Church traced its image, when all temporal goods were considered as dung. They rejected the tin of hypocrisy, which counterfeits silver, with those who wear a religious habit and an appearance of piety, but do not possess it in truth.

To walk more freely to battle, these athletes of Christ, considering the cares, worries, and other troubles that proceed from riches and earthly possessions, naked have followed Christ naked, embracing joyous poverty and working for a treasure which does not fail.

DESCRIPTION BY A CONTEMPORARY

There would be no purpose in lingering over the details [\(84\)](#) of this text. Its notes resound through the history of apostolic life, recalling the echo of St. Peter Damian's words, and from afar, those of the Bishop of Hippo. The four characteristics of the Order of Preachers which the sermon brings to light,

are those signaled in the course of the first years of its history in the most reliable documents, the bulls of Pope Honorius III. This Order is canonical.⁽⁸⁵⁾ It is universal and nourishes the entire world on the bread of the word.⁽⁸⁶⁾ It is absolutely poor, having rejected possessions in order to be freer.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Finally it constitutes an army of soldiers of the faith who combat evil in all its domains.⁽⁸⁸⁾ Another statement, also from Jacques de Vitry, tells the whole story: "They unite the *ordo praedicatorum* to the *ordo canonicorum*."

This is a revealing declaration. Peter Damian had thought that the *ordo praedicatorum* and the *ordo canonicorum* ought by right to become identified. A century and a half later, according to Jacques de Vitry, the one was united to the other. The fact is that the canons of the thirteenth century were far from having realized the hopes which the reformers had once placed in them. What is more significant, the Order of Preachers had conceived a preaching mission of such vast proportions that the canonical life of the period could no longer embrace it without bursting its bounds. And Jacques de Vitry truly appreciated that the leaven of this expansion was the total poverty of the Gospel along with ardent and universal preaching of the word of God, that is, the plenitude of the apostolic life.

In working this leaven into the temper of the canonical order, Dominic completely renewed it. He infused into it the spirited and fiery zeal which until then had burned only in the free but anarchical forms of the apostolic movement. He stabilized apostolic life in a solidly constituted order; he restored it as an exclusively clerical ideal and with it rejuvenated the Catholic hierarchy.

SUMMIT OF THE APOSTOLIC INSTITUTION

In that hour the clerical institution inaugurated by St. Augustine reached the full development of its own nature. In his own words Augustine had epitomized its character in the *Disciplina: Apostolicam vitam optamus vivere*.⁽⁸⁹⁾ It was but natural, by a curious recovery, that in commenting on the Rule of the Preachers, Humbert of Romans should ferret out this text, so long suppressed from the Rule of St. Augustine.⁽⁹⁰⁾ Speaking of St. Dominic, Gregory IX declared: "He was a man fashioned on the apostolic rule."⁽⁹¹⁾ Jordan of Saxony called him "an evangelical man."⁽⁹²⁾

The Order founded by St. Dominic not only retained and amplified observances essential to the imitation of the apostles, with life in common, radical suppression of property, austerity and piety, but even more fully than Augustine, it recovered the historical orientation of this apostolic life, by equipping itself with a conquering activity. It raised this life to its maximum power of conquest by assuming, independent of any parochial work, the office of preaching. To this end all else was subordinated, the whole Rule with all its observances, and study in particular. Through the teaching of sacred doctrine and the giving of Christian instruction to all ranks of society, it strove to realize the evangelization of the whole world.

On the legislative plane, Jacques de Vitry likewise testifies that the Order of Preachers attained the summit of the Augustinian institution. Beginning with the eleventh century, all the orders that proved the new fecundity of the Augustinian concept supplemented the Commentary, substituting for the lost *Disciplina* more and more rigorous customs which constituted their true rule. Dominic followed the same lead, and his Customs are the crowning of this evolution.

This legislative work may seem slight when compared with all that is owing to the Founder of the Order of Preachers: the conception of the idea of the Order, the concentration of all the energies of the apostolic life in a regular community, the practical execution of the idea, the gathering of the first friars, their education and the conquering zeal he communicated to them, the psychological upheaval created in clerical circles resulting in an extraordinary flow of scholars into his own monasteries, the

power of his personal sanctity. These seem infinitely more captivating and more worthy of attention than a legislative work.

Yet, if a person has clear vision, he will see that nothing reveals better the genius and the supernatural inspiration of this great saint. One remark should suffice: for a hundred and fifty years all far-seeing souls were crying out for an Order of Preachers; the institution was tragically urgent; all energies were strained toward it; all companies of apostles seemed bent upon it; still, the idea with all its contradictory claims was not incarnated in an institution. Dominic constructed his Order and embraced the ideal in a Rule perfectly modeled; immediately and everywhere similar projects found a stabilizing force and reformed their life on this pattern. The great movement of the mendicant orders began to take its definite and fruitful form.

This final development of the institution of St. Augustine represented its complete expansion and its ultimate goal. Once the Order of Preachers was established, all foundations of apostolic orders, that is, of all new religious orders, depended in reality on the legislative type of the Preachers, even when they adopted as their Rule the Commentary of St. Augustine.

The reform of the clergy accomplished by the Rule of St. Augustine was thenceforth rendered inseparable from the influence of the law of St. Dominic. It was realized by that very law, the heir of the lost *Disciplina*. Hence a study of the evolution and the universal success of the apostolic institution in the thirteenth century would be futile if confined to the destinies of the decapitated Augustinian Commentary. It would be necessary and it would be sufficient to know the history and the spread of the Constitutions of the Preachers, or, as contemporaries styled it, the Rule of St. Dominic, in which the Commentary itself very nearly disappeared.

The first thing to do is to discover the law as it came from the hands of its institutor, St. Dominic, and to study its primitive history. Thus by internal evidence can be verified the testimony borne from without by Jacques de Vitry. Then it will be easier to understand the consequences of the evolution under consideration.

NOTES

1 A. Felice, *La réforme grégorienne*, I, 36.

2 "In the year of our Lord, 1059 . . . the illustrious Hildebrand, with the authority of the archdeacon of the Apostolic See, said: 'Some in clerical orders, inflamed with the fire of perfect charity through the Holy Spirit, in this Roman city and in the provinces and in parishes close or adjacent, have now for some length of time been living the common life, according to the practice of the primitive Church; they distributed their goods to the poor or left them to relatives, or donated them to the Church of Christ, and professed that they would receive nothing in their own light.'" Here there is reference to what was practiced prior to 1059; Hildebrand wished to prevent any relaxation on the part of clerics who had embraced the common life. Therefore he required the revision of the canonical Rule of Aachen, the prescriptions of which on the *peculium* were scandalous, as likewise on the maintenance provided in portions suitable for cyclopes and sailors rather than for canons and monks. Therefore he required that their way be reformed and "that they make profession according to the custom adopted by clerics everywhere in the city of Rome: to live the common life of the primitive Church." Hildebrand was named archdeacon only a few months after the synod, between August and October (Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1191).

3 This opusculum (XXIV) is entitled *Contra clericos regulares proprietarios*. Peter Damian expressed the idea exactly on one occasion: "We do not say this in regard to all clerics but particularly in reference to those who belong to the canonical order and live in congregation" (*PL*, CXLV, 482). He was concerned, it seems, only with the canonical order, that is, as far as it was possible to define the term or the institution which was still in process of evolution; it included that principal division of the clergy who lived under the presidency of the bishop at a mother church and on its revenues. The conciliar canons (notably those of Aachen in 816) had promulgated rules of life for them.

4 Peter Damian, *op. cit.*; *PL*, CXLV, 485 ff.

5 *Ibid.*, 487 f.

6 Cf. *ibid.*, 489. Sacerdotal ordination is here designated by the significant expression, "to confer the office of preaching."

7 *Ibid.*, 490.

8 Cf. *Ibid.*

9 This comparison was traditional, no doubt, but it does not appear in the voluminous patristic florilegium. compiled on the life of clerics as a prologue to the Canonical Rule of Aachen any more than it appears in the Gospel texts on the apostolic life. Beginning with the eleventh century, the great use made of these texts And of this comparison to exalt the preaching character of apostolic life enhances its value.

Note this text of Peter Damian: "For what is meant by the seventy men (Judg. 9:5) but the great number of preachers of the Church? About these the Evangelist Luke speaks: The Lord appointed seventy (sic) and sent them two and two before 'His face into every city and place whither He Himself was to come' (Luke 10:1). This *praedicatorum ordo* is prefigured in those about whom the Lord said to Moses: Gather unto me seventy men. . . ." (Num. 11: 16 ff.). Cf. *PL*, CXLV, 389. Likewise the twelve fountains and the seventy palm trees (*ibid.*). Here, then, the *ordo sacerdotum* is the *ordo praedicatorum*.

10 Opusculum 27, *De communi vita clericorum ad clericos fanensis ecclesiae*, *PL*, CXLVI 508 f. The tract is stirring because of the reflection it gives of the spiritual unrest agitating some of those to whom it was addressed, men attracted by the reform yet still hesitant. It opens with the text of the Acts of the Apostles which recalls the form of the primitive Church and the apostolic institution; a call "to gather with the apostles in the cenacle," then: "Indeed a little salt seasons many things, and the whole multitude of the Christian people is taught and instructed by a small number of clerics."

11 Opusculum 28, *Apologeticus monachorum adversus clericos*, *PL*, CXLV, 511-18. "We wonder, dearest brethren, if you are worthy to hear how and why you attempted to separate us from the society and unity of the universal Church, since it is evident that it was founded, governed, and freed from varying species of error by monks and not by canons. Truly the apostles, founders and rulers of the Church, lived in our way, not in yours, as Luke the Evangelist shows in the Acts of the Apostles" (Acts 4:32).

Peter Damian here claims only the right of administering the sacraments. But this claim was promptly enlarged upon. It was the pastoral ministry and preaching which the monks sought, on the same basis as canons. On this head polemical treatises were abundant in the early twelfth century. Rupert of Deutz, *Altercatio monachi et clerici quod liceat monacho praedicare*, *PL*, 170, 537 ff.; Rudbertus, *Questio utrum monachis liceat praedicare* (ed. Endres, p. 145); Honorius of Autun, *Quod*

monachis liceat praedicare (ed. Endres, pp. 147 ff.); by an anonymous canon of St. Victor (after 1121), *De vita vere apostolica*, PL, CLXX, 611 ff.; Hugh of Rouen, *Dialogorum lib. VI*, PL, CXCII, 1219.

The monastic world of the time was agitated by a vigorous call to the apostolate, which the great success of Cîteaux, reactionary on this point, might obscure. Cf. Hauck, IV, 335 f. These aspirations were still strong in 1256 and even penetrated Cîteaux, as may be judged from the *Dialogue d'un moine clunysien et d'un moine cistercien*, written at that time. In general, however, the monks recognized that preaching called for the clerical status. It was characteristic of the heretics or schismatics, Cathari and Waldenses, to associate the preaching office exclusively with the imitation of the apostles; -- the preacher might even be a woman.

12 Cf. Luke 9:3 f.; 10: 1-7; Matt. 10:9-11; Mark 6:8-10. This program is not entirely unified; one permits the staff, the other forbids it; one permits shoes, the other would not have them. In general, here is the substance of it: they are to go two by two (the rule of a companion); without silver or gold; on foot; gaining their bread from those to whom they preach (mendicancy); content with what is provided (therefore, no kinds of food are forbidden during apostolic journeys). Many added, go barefoot; some wished only a single tunic; some required that no bread, not even a sack, be carried.

13 Acts 4:32.

14 Sermon, *De vita et moribus clericorum suorum*, PL, XXXVIII, 1574 f.

15 Cf. Celano, *Vita* (1), pp. 24 f. After hearing this text, which he had some priests translate into the vernacular for him, Peter Waldo of Lyons, a wealthy convert, conceived his idea of a movement for preaching by mendicants (cf. Bourbon, *Anecdotes historiques*, no. 342). With this text as a basis for his program, St. Dominic's bishop proposed to the Praedicatio in Narbonne the spirit of mendicant preaching, which was transmitted to the Order of Preachers (cf. Cernai, no. 21).

16 The idea of the apostolic life and the influence of the text of the Acts of the Apostles were not new. They can be traced to the very origin of Christian monasticism. It seems, however, that St. Augustine was the first to impose on clerics an absolute common life. From his time the idea was cherished continually. The Council of Aachen prepared, as an introduction to the Rule of the canons, a collection of texts including most of the scriptural and patristic passages used by the reformers of the eleventh century. Found there *in extenso* were the two sermons of St. Augustine on the life of his clerics. The canonical Rule of 816 (*Institutionis forma canonicorum*) had full assurance that it stood for the *Apostolica instituta* (Mansi, XIV, 226, 242).

It was characteristic of the Gregorian reformers that they carried out this idea with unprecedented vigor, especially in regard to poverty and in a revival of the proselytizing power inherent in the life of the apostles. On this last point stood their great originality. Up to that time the common life had been the sole aim. It was Peter Damian who put the emphasis on preaching. The texts from Luke, chapter 10 (and parallels), were not included in the Aachen collection.

17 On the origin, nature, and motives of the workers in these various apostolic movements, cf. Grundmann, pp. 8, 34ff., 157-68. It is noteworthy that the lay apostles, even though they attacked the traditional forms of Christian society, were not poor vagabonds aligned against those in power, but often they were nobles, wealthy men, clerics converted or awakened to new fervor; they were even educated men disgusted with learning, who opposed the contemporary condition of society.

18 The influence of the reformers was exercised not merely by their sermons: Peter Damian wrote much, and his many short works had a large circulation. Cf. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, III, 75.

19 Synod of Aachen (816). This council (can. 120) assigned to each canon: food, clothing, and a share of the alms (Mansi, XIV, 231). This third provision opened the door to the *peculium*, the cause of all the evil (cf. can. 122; *ibid.*, p. 232).

20 On March 12, 1051, Leo IX proposed to the canons of St. Martin of Lucca, "renewed in chastity," the whole ideal of the perfect common life: "Those who desire chastity and the regular discharge of holy offices at the altar . . . ought to receive the food and vesture of canons lest, while engaged in seeking the necessaries of life, they incur the fault of vagrancy. . . . If the Lord God . . . has delivered your church from priests with wives . . . the chaste from the unchaste, the ecclesiastical goods may be restored, which were dissipated by those living in luxury; and these resources may be applied for the common use of those living canonically." Jaffé, no. 4254; *PL*, CXLIII, 671; Mansi, XIX, 691 f. It is to be noted that the Pope speaks only of *victus et vestitus*; there is no question of *peculium*.

21 Hildebrand rose up against the possession of what this regulation permits. Peter Damian considered the question in more detail in his op. 24. *PL*, CXLV, 484. The text of the Aachen canon (120), as given by Mansi (XIV, 231), is evidently faulty.

22 Synod of Rome (April 20, 1063); Mansi, XIX, 1023 ff.

23 For the expression *religiosi clerici*, see Hertling in *Zeitschrift für kathol. Theol.*, LIV (1930), 350.

24 Mansi, XIX, 873, 898, 908.

25 "We have given thanks because you have proposed to renew the probable life of the holy Fathers, and you have, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, vowed to revive the institutes of apostolic doctrine customary in the first ages of the Holy Church but almost extinct with the passing of time." Privilege to the Friars of St. Paul of Narbonne on March 19, 1093 (*PL*, CLI, 360; Jaffé, no. 5482); cf. the bull of March 14, 1095, to the Canons of Magalon (Jaffé, no. 5550); of September 19, 1095, to the Friars of St. Ruf (Jaffé, no. 5579).

The conclusion of the bull (Jaffé, no. 5482) contains a summary of the history of canonical life. There are two lives in the Church, the high life and the low. The first lies in the monastic and canonical way. "Urban, pope and martyr, instituted the canonical life; Augustine regulated it by his laws; Jerome instructed it by his letters. Therefore it should not be thought any less meritorious, under the inspiration and direction of the Spirit of the Lord, to reinaugurate this primitive life of the Church than with persevering aid of the same Holy Spirit to guard the flourishing religious life of the monks" (*PL*, CLI, 360).

It is remarkable that this historical survey, in which the views of Peter Damian are apparent, recognizes the life of the primitive Church only in the canonical, and not in the monastic life. This little historical account had great success. It may be found separate from the original Privilege (*PL*, CLI, 535). It constituted an official decree in the mind of the canons and appeared as such in the Bull of Foundation of Prémontré (cf. Hugo, *Sacri et canonici ordinis Praemonstratensis annales*, Vol. I (documents), p. 8. It occurred frequently in polemics or apologies of the canons (cf. Hauck. IV, 360).

26 The monks could not be deterred from recognizing in their common life an imitation of the primitive communism, a circumstance not without historical truth. To the different texts cited, we add William of St. Thierry, *Liber de natura et dignitate amoris* (chap. 9; *PL*, CLXXXIV, 395). William

was then abbot of Cluny. In certain cases Urban II recognized even in the monastic life not only the apostolic common life, but the apostolic ministry. That indeed was the desire of certain monks, but not the customary view of the popes.

The official position here referred to had a great significance; it showed what importance the canonical reformers attached to the apostolate. It was the apostolate that made the canon as it had made the apostle. But it was not proper to the monk.

27 As might be expected, imitation of the apostles was the main theme in their writings, at times being incorporated even in the title of the work; e.g., *De vita vere apostolica*.

28 L. Herding ("Augustinusregel und Augustinerorden," *Zeitsch. für kath. Theol.*, LIV [1930], 350) thinks that the revision of the canons of Aachen, as found in Mansi (XIV, 283 ff.), was called forth by the canon of 1059 (1063).

29 Dom G. Morin, "Règlements inédits du pape Grégoire VII pour les chanoines réguliers," *Rev. Bénéd.*, XVIII (1901), 177-83, where this Rule is published.

30 Urban II became pope in 1088, three years after the death of Gregory VII. On January 11, 1089, the Rule of St. Augustine reappeared for the first time unmistakably with the Canons of St. Jean des Vignes (cf. Herding, *Reg.*, p. 356; P. Schroeder, p. 299; *PL*, CLI, 295; Jaffé, no. 5391).

31 "In regard to shoes (*caligae*), we follow the custom of the other canons, because in this matter we are directed by no new custom but by the ancient practice of the apostles themselves. For we know that the apostles went about barefoot (Matt. 10:10). We read also what the angel said to Peter in prison: 'Gird thyself and put on thy sandals' (Acts 12:8). If, therefore, Peter wore sandals and yet went about barefoot (Luke 10:4), it follows that they might have a modified form of shoe" (chap. 99; Martène, *Rit.*, III, 317). The passage is not in the edition of Amort. According to Du Cange, the *caligae* were a form of leggings. This text seems rather to indicate socks.

32 Let anyone embracing the canonical profession lay aside his own garments and be vested in those of the monastery so that despoiled of his secular garb, he may understand that he has descended to the poverty and want of Christ." "Therefore, with all meekness the poverty of the dwelling, the austerity of the place, etc., be set before him (Martène *Rit.*, III, 306). These are the first words of the Rule. The *regula Portuensis* opens with a long discussion of evangelical and apostolic poverty which seems drawn from the tracts of Peter Damian (Amort., pp. 341-45) This discourse may be found developed still further in the Rule of Aachen CIV, 289-91).

33 Peter Damian urged clerics to a complete detachment from material goods. If Gregorian reformers, in their quest of apostolic poverty, did not go so far as the mendicant apostles of the following century, it is not that they had any other ideal: but they did not think it possible to realize the ideal fully. If it was desirable that clerics should have food and clothing assured them, this was in order that the need of procuring them should not constitute a reason for vagabondage, a vice that was precisely one most keenly deplored in proprietary clerics. Cf. Peter Damian, op. 27, *PL*, V, 507.

34 Peter Damian, op. 24; *PL*, CXLV, 484 f.

35 In guaranteeing the possessions of the canons of Beuron (December 25, 1097), Urban II says: "Let everything be preserved entire, that it may be for your service and that of your successors and for the use of the poor" (*PL*, CLI, 499; Jaffé, no. 5692). The formula occurs frequently in the twelfth century. Tithes were assigned to the bishop, the canons, the poor, and for the maintenance of churches. What

was over and above had to be given to the poor: "Since whatever clerics have belongs to the poor . . . there must be special care that from the tithes and offerings they lay aside means of support as much as they will and can for convents and hospitals" (c. 68, C. XVI, q. 1). See examples in Jaffé, nos. 5288, 5427. One of the most celebrated of these was the gift of half of a third part of the tithes by the Bishop and canons of Toulouse to the first companions of St. Dominic in 1215.

Peter Damian also made use of a text contained in the *Regula canonicorum*: "Let them receive food and drink and clothing, and with these let them be content lest, taking more, they seem to oppress the poor, not without sin, and let them not take that upon which the poor depend for sustenance" (*PL*, CXLV, 484).

36 See in Denifle (*Archiv*, 1, 185 ff.) the learned notes in his prologue to the edition of the first Constitutions of the Order of Preachers. He cites texts from the Customs of Marbach, St. Victor, St. Denys of Reims, Porto. See also, in the modified Rule of Aachen, the enumeration of objects which the friars were tempted to appropriate: *codices, tabulas, graphicum*, the only ones mentioned (*Mansi*, XIV, 229).

37 See chaps. 23, 25, 27, of the *Regula Portuensis* (*Amort*, pp. 352 f.); chaps. 102, 103, of the Customs of Marbach (*Martène, Rit.*, III, 317); chap. 4 of the Customs of St. Denys of Reims (*ibid.*, p. 298); chaps. 59, 60 of St. Victor (*ibid.*, p. 279).

38 Customs of St. Denys of Reims, chap. *De foraneis (canonici forenses)*. *Martène, Rit.*, III, 301; St. Victor, chap. 61, *De his qui ad obedientias conversantur (ibid.*, 280). On this institution of the *forenses*, see *Schreiber*, II, 46; I, 124 ff.).

39 *Schreiber Kurie und Kloster im XII Jahrh.*, II, 45.

40 Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegung im Mittelalter. . . , Historische Studien* (1935), p. 267.

41 Everything is repeated in the history of the apostolic life. When, after a grave scandal, St. Augustine wished to consolidate in his clergy the ideal of the apostolic life which he had imposed upon them, he did not turn to the clergy but to the people. This attempt to bring pressure through popular indignation occasioned the two celebrated sermons (355 and 356), *De vita et moribus clericorum suorum (PL*, XXXVIII, 1568-80) which, like a mighty echo, have transmitted to posterity the clerical ideal of the holy Bishop.

42 Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne*, I, 157, gives contradictory opinions of historians about Gregory VII's part in the popular outbursts against simoniacal and incontinent clerics. Did the Pope permit them or provoke them? Fliche thinks Gregory was satisfied simply to enjoin upon the laity disobedience to disobedient pastors, and upon princes an opposition, even by force, to the services of unworthy clerics.

But the fact remains that, when the civil or ecclesiastical powers placed an obstacle in the way of reform, Gregory did not hesitate to proceed further and rely on the party in revolt, as in the case of the Patarines. This was the attitude of his predecessors, and notably that of Alexander II, who was pope in the time of Peter Damian.

43 A synod of Rome in 1059 forbade concubinary clerics to exercise their office and decreed "that no one may hear the Mass of such a priest" (*Mansi*, XX, 907). The Roman synods of 1074 and 1075 renewed the same prescription in order that fear of the people and their censure might oblige the cleric to correct his life (*Hefele-Leclercq*, V, 90). The prohibition was repeated by Urban II, Paschal II, and even Innocent II (Second Lateran Council, can. 7; *Hefele-Leclercq*, V, 726).

44 See in Mansi (XX, 422) the commentary by Bernold of Constance on canon 4 the Synods of 1074-75, "that the people may not accept the ministrations of clerics whom they perceive to be living in opposition to the sacred canons, and to the evangelical and apostolic institutions."

45 In 1057 at Rome, popular meetings against concubinary and simoniacal clerics (Jaffé, after no. 4375; Peter Damian, *PL*, CXLV, 409). The first episodes of the Patarines belong to this time. In 1067, Alexander II aroused the people and clerics of Cremona (Jaffé, no. 4637). In 1074, Gregory VII ordered the laity of Germany not to obey bishops who permitted their clerics to marry (Jaffé, no. 4902). At the time the Pope threatened Philip I of France with a revocation of the obedience his subjects if he continued to promote simony and other crimes (Jaffé, nos. 4807, 4855, 4878). He had recourse to this measure also against Henry IV in 1076. In 1075, he directed Rudolph of Swabia and Berthold of Carinthia to prevent "even by force" unworthy clerics from celebrating (Jaffé, no. 4922); the same recommendation to the Count and Countess of Flanders J (Jaffé, nos. 5011, 5012). In 1079, he commanded all the faithful of Teutonia and Italy to refuse the ministrations of incontinent clerics (Jaffé, no. 5109).

46 On the Patarines, see Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1127ff., 1191-98, 1249ff. The movement arose in Milan, but subsequently spread to Cremona, Brescia, Asti, Lodi, Ravenna. All Lombardy was agitated by it. Alexander II and Gregory VII relied on it while trying to prevent its excesses.

47 In 1057, Stephen IX tried to calm the Patarines (Jaffé, no. 4378), whence the successive missions of Hildebrand; then, under Nicholas II, the missions of Peter (Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1131 ff., 1191 ff.). In 1059, the Synod of Rome added canons: "Let not any of the lay order judge clerics" (Mansi, XIX, 898, 909). a sketch of anticlericalism in Florence, see Peter Damian, *De sacramentis per administrandis* (*PL*, CXLV, 529).

48 Note, for example, in Felice (11, 253), the part played by the crowd in the deposition of Archbishop Manasses of Reims; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 255-58, for the bishops of Thérouanne. Moreover, as always, the popular outbreaks worked quite as much in the opposite direction.

49 Baudry, *Vita Roberti*; *PL*, CLXII, 105,3, Walter, *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*, I, 125.

50 "We have learned about those who are agitating against the custom of the cenobitical groups, in which you receive under obedience laymen who renounce the world and devote themselves and their possessions to the common life. However, we approve of this way of life and this custom, as we have seen them to be laudable. Considering them the more worthy of being perpetuated as the form of the primitive Church is impressed upon them, we call them holy and Catholic, and by this letter confirm them by apostolic authority" (Urban II; *PL*, CLI, 336; Jaffé, no. 5456).

51 We quote extensively from this text. "In those times [about 1091] in the Teutonic kingdom, the common life flourished in many places, not only among clerics and monks living religiously together, but even among laymen who devoutly offered themselves and their goods to the same common life. Although in their garb they appeared to be neither clerics nor monks, they were considered not at all unequal to them in merit. Renouncing the world, these men gave themselves and their possessions to regulations of clerics as well as to monks living regularly, that they might be privileged to serve them and to live in common under their obedience. Wherefore, incited by the envy of the devil, certain other men, jealous of the honorable life of these same brethren, gnawed with wicked teeth at their life, although seeing that they were living in common in the way of the primitive Church."

"Not only an innumerable multitude of men but also of women devoted themselves in those times to a life of this kind that they might live in common in obedience to clerics or monks, and most faithfully

discharge for them the weight of the daily service of auxiliaries. On these farms also, many girls from country places renounced marriage and the world to live in obedience to a priest, But married people were not less zealous in living religiously, cultivating obedience to religious men. Moreover, zeal of this kind flourished with most vigor in Germany" (*Chronicon, Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptorum*, V, 453; *PL*, CXLVIII, 1407).

Among these lay associations, that of the Lay Brothers of Hirsau was in the first rank; there were also, no doubt, cloistered women in the double convents of Prémontré and many others. The place of the institution of lay brothers as related to the apostolic life would form a highly interesting study in itself.

52 "To those inquiring what is your profession or rule or order, you may say: the first and principal Christian rule, the Gospel, in truth, because it is the source of all rules and principles; ... nor dare you say you are not subject to apostolic and canonical institutions and desirous of following in some way the footsteps of the holy Fathers" (St. Stephen of Muret, *Sermo de unitate diversarum regularum*; Martène, *Rit.*, IV, 308). "For if the Son of God coming into the world knew of a better way to ascend to heaven than through poverty, He would have chosen it and walked therein" (St. Stephen, *Sentences: ibid.*, 318). The rule holds these promises. It is the first of the mendicant rules. The friars possess only the lands attached to their convent.

53 Heimbucher, I, 416.

54 It would be interesting to set the details of customs and of vocabulary peculiar to the apostolic movement (Catholic, schismatic, or heretical) in the evangelical context from which they sprang. Perhaps the term "believers" (*credentes*) is too readily applied to the faithful Cathari from the fact that they preached a new faith, distinct from the Catholic, and on this point there is a rejection of the statement of the chroniclers, almost all of whom give the name *credentes* to the Waldenses who were not heretics. Does not the text of the Acts account for this title? Likewise, is not the title *perfectus* for evangelical vocations derived from "If you wish to be perfect . . ." (Matt. 19:20)? According to St. Augustine, the names borne by the two classes of Manichaeans were not those mentioned, but *auditores* and *electi* (*De moribus manichaeorum*; *PL*, XXXII, 1357, 1368-78).

55 The Patarines were accused of insulting the sacraments of married or simoniacal priests. Arnulf (*Gesta archiepiscoporum mediolanensium*; *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptorum*, VIII, 18) puts into their mouth the words *canina stercora* to designate the sacrifice of such priests. Sigebert of Gembloux, in his *Chronicon* (*Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptorum*, VI, 362), even asserts, among other things, that the laity, aroused by the prohibition against being present at the Mass of a married priest, went so far as to trample Hosts under foot and to spill the precious blood consecrated by these priests. The attitude of the clergy could only aggravate things. In 1077 the Bishop of Cambrai had a layman burned who had committed no other crime than that of refusing to receive Communion from the hands of a bishop or priest guilty of simony or immorality (*Chron. S. Andreae*; *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptorum*, VII, 540; Jaffé, no. 5030).

56 On the relations of Arnold with the Patarines and the canonical movement, see Hausrath, *Arnold von Brescia* (1891), pp. 8, 18. For the relations of the Lombard heretics with Arnold at the close of the twelfth century, see Breyer in *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XII (1891), p. 392. Cf. Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 1931.

57 Grundmann, pp. 13-38. He very correctly remarks that in that age a spiritual "movement" could not endure long as an abstraction, but tended to become an institution: a regular order or a sect.

58 *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 26. Guiraud (*L'Inquisition*, I, 173-96) has very skillfully noted the analogies in the Cathari's worship and primitive Christian rites. Further, it is certain that the metaphysics of Catharist dualism had all that was necessary to satisfy minds at once inquisitive and simple.

59 Grundmann, pp. 43 ff.

60 *Ibid.*, pp. 47-50.

61 *Ibid.*, p. 46. This apostolate was limited to the person of the founder and disappeared with him.

62 Heijman (*Untersuchungen . . . Anal. Praem.* IV [1928], 367-69) has listed the slight differences which had arisen between Cîteaux and Prémontré at the end of the twelfth century on the question of the pastoral ministry. They may be significant, but they are very slight. It is surprising that the central branch had to wait until 1188 for the right to delegate residents to subordinate churches. The oldest extant statutes of Prémontré even forbade the possession of this type of church, "to which the care of souls belongs, unless it is an abbey" (R. van Waefelghem, *Les premiers status de l'O. de Prem.*; *Analect. de l'O. de Pr.*, IX [1913], 45). Consequently it is not surprising to find in the important work, *De ordine, habitu et professione canonicorum praemonstratensium* (PL, CXCVIII, 439-610), addressed by Adam Scotus to the Premonstratensians at the close of the twelfth century, no mention of the ministry of souls. Moreover, this religious was on the point of becoming a Carthusian (*Anal. Praem.*, IX [1933], 209-31).

But, in the Order of Prémontré, two branches did not submit to the centralizing tendency and monastic impulse of Prémontré from the time of Blessed Hugh Fosse: the branch of Magdeburg and the Norbertines of southern Germany.

63 All the characteristics of the apostolic movement are traceable in the foundation of the military Order of St. James of the Sword. The Canons of St. Eligius had converted a certain number of noble knights. The converters and the converted decided to put all their goods in common. The canons were to become chaplains for the knights who remained in the married state. Peter Ferdinand, their leader, went to Alexander III and obtained a Rule, a supplement of the Rule of St. Augustine. A privilege of July 5, 1175, confirmed their foundation. Therein occurs this description:

"Among those things which in the order of your profession it has been decreed you should observe, the first is that you ought to live in all humility and concord without property under obedience to one master. Consider the example of those faithful who, converted to the Christian faith by the preaching of the apostles, sold all and laid the price of it at their feet. To each was given what was needful, and not any of those who possessed anything called it his own, but all things were common to them" (Jaffé, no. 12504; PL, CC, 1026).

This order of married men was certainly one of the most curious known in the Church; it can be understood only from within the apostolic movement.

The hospitaller movement also frequently made provision for those in the married state. It was one of the great efforts of the popes and their representatives in the thirteenth century to oblige all hospitaller houses of any importance to take the vow of chastity and embrace the regular life (Le Grand, *Statuts d'Hôtels-Dieu et de léproseries*, 1901).

64 The Rule universal among hospitallers was that of St. Augustine (cf. Le Grand, *op. cit.*).

65 Grundmann, pp. 70-135.

66 We say "predicant" rather than "clerical." Clerics did not constitute the essential active element of the apostolic movements, though they may have been numbered therein: as with the Poor Catholics

and the companions of St. Francis. These communities evolved or were destined eventually to evolve toward the clerical order. The first Order of the Humiliati was instituted as a canonical order. Tiraboschi, II, 141.

67 *Ibid.*, pp. 128-48: privileges of an institution of the three branches. Cf. especially . 144.

68 The principal division of the Poor Catholics did not, strictly speaking, form a religious order. The only thing they had in common was their way of life, the *conversatio*. More on the order of itinerant preachers or schoolmasters, they formed, a company rather than a community. Nevertheless, their *propositum conversationis*, granted by Innocent III, made provision for a religious life for the men and women whom their preaching influenced: "If any men of the world wish to abide in our counsel, we advise that some who are suitable should be selected to exhort and dispute against the heretics, while others dwell together in houses, living religiously and according to rule, dispensing their goods in justice and mercy, laboring with their hands, and paying the tithes, first fruits and offerings due to the Church." PL 215, 1513 C. *Vide* PL., 216, 601-2, the very curious project of the religious house which they propose to construct in 1212 in the Diocese of Elne for their converts; there they would have clerics, laymen, and women, It illustrates the type of the multiple monasteries in which the apostolic communities became stabilized.

69 Laurent, no. 1.

70 Cernai, no. 20.

71 Laurent, nos. 4, 11.

72 "Indeed the man of God tarried during one Lent in the house of the Bishop at Carcassonne, devoting himself to preaching while he was also vicar of the Bishop *in spiritualibus*, having been appointed by the latter for the time of his absence in France, (Constantine, no. 55). The information comes from Stephen of Metz who met Dominic on this occasion. There is no reason to question it. Dominic was associated with Guy of Cernai, bishop of Carcassonne, who had participated in the *Praedicatio* in Narbonne. Guy, in fact, at the close of 1212 took his leave to go to France; he returned to his diocese after the octave of Easter, 1213 (Cernai, no. 299), which fell on March 30.

The office of *vices gerens in spiritualibus*, conferred by a bishop for the period of his absence (*remote agens*), was common in that age (cf. E. Fournier, *Les origines de vicaire général*, 1922, pp. 37 f., 91 f., 98).

73 According to the witnesses at the process of canonization, he had been canonically elected to the bishopric of Carcassonne (*Processus* [Bologna], no. 28; *Processus* [Toulouse], nos. 3, 5, 18; Constantine, no. 62). This might have occurred either in 1208 or after 1215-16 (Eubel, I, 203). The fact that Dominic declined on account of "the new foundation of preachers and nuns at Prouille" (*Processus* [Toulouse], no. 3; Altaner, p. 30) would point to the year 1208, because in 1215 Prouille was capable of thriving alone. On the other hand, in 1208 there could be no consideration of the Preachers.

We have observed that the veteran members of the *Praedicatio* in Narbonne began to be promoted to bishoprics only after 1211. It seems that the election of Dominic could not have been prior to that date, which was itself connected with the crusade. Therefore we favor 1215 or 1216.

74 Dominic was called *Capellanus Fanjeaux* in a charter of May 25, 1214 (Laurent, nos. 54 f.) and in a charter of the same year without designated month or date, but of later origin than the first (*ibid.*, no. 58). The term *capellanus* in Languedoc at that time meant the pastor. See Du Cange, s.v. *Capellanus*; *Processus* (Toulouse), no. 19; Laurent, no. 134.

75 Laurent, no. 60.

76 The only document which refers to the little Toulouse community of 1215 is charter no. 60. It does not specify that the preachers instituted by Foulques were priests. Therein precisely is evidence that they were. The law was most stringent on that point. Foulques would not have permitted an infringement of this law without mention of the fact, especially in the country of the Albigenses. From the first, moreover, the Order of Preachers was strictly clerical. The only seculars included were lay brothers.

77 Early in the thirteenth century the canons of St. Stephen lived a mitigated common life in the same house (*Gal. Christ.*, XIII, instr. XLI, c. 27 and 28). In 1216, there are evidences of an attempt to embrace the full regular life (*ibid.*, 77).

78 It is remarkable that in the first years of the thirteenth century, interest in the decapitated Commentary of St. Augustine began to wane. In the twelfth century it possessed the influence necessary to impose upon the canons the complete renunciation of the *peculium*. In the thirteenth century, this problem no longer existed: thenceforth the decision to be a canon regular meant the giving up of private property.

St. Dominic had no call for the Rule of St. Augustine; for that reason, perhaps, he had not decided beforehand with his brethren to adopt it (Jordan, no. 42). On the other hand, perhaps he would not have excluded it from his consideration, in his fidelity to canonical traditions.

After 1215, however, the case was different, and the Rule of St. Augustine was welcome in compliance with canon 13 of the Lateran Council.

79 At least from 1217.

80 Cf. Gen. 2: 10.

81 Cf. Acts 4:32.

82 Gen. 14:14. Compare with the seventy men of Moses, Num. 11:16, referred to by Peter Damian.

83 Ruth 1:6.

84 Our preacher was not a critical historian for the early periods of religious orders. Perhaps the need of a sevenfold enumeration influenced him to include in his list some orders not Augustinian. The Order of Val-des-Choux followed the Rule of St. Benedict. Cf. W. do Gray Birch, *Ordinale conventus valliscaulium* 1900; *Anecd.*, Martène, IV, 1651 to 1670; especially Jacques de Vitry, *Historia occidentalis*, chap. 18 (pp. 307-9).

Now it is known why Jacques introduced the Order of Grandmont into this history. This Order, however, followed neither the Rule of St. Augustine nor, as Jacques records (*op. cit.*, pp. 313-15), that of Cîteaux; it had its own Rule, but so imperfect a Rule that it needed continual revisions.

85 Privilege of foundation on December 22, 1216; Laurent, no. 74.

86 "Incessantly they sow their grain, that is, the word of preaching which is the bread of souls, over many waters, meaning many peoples." Bull of December 8, 1219; *ibid.*, no. 103.

87 "The load of worldly goods having been cast off, they traverse the road of this world more speedily . . . and they go in the abjection of voluntary poverty." Bull of December 8, 1219; *ibid.*, no. 103.

88 "Knowing that the brethren of your Order will be the champions of the faith and the true rights of the world." Bull of December 22, 1216; Laurent, no. 75. "As invincible athletes of Christ, armed with the shield of faith and the helmet of salvation, not fearing those who can kill the body, you will magnanimously use the word of God, which is more penetrating than any two-edged sword, against the enemies of the faith." Bull of January 21, 1217; *ibid.*, no. 77. Cf. this short statement of St. Dominic in giving the habit: "I wish to give you arms, with which throughout your life you ought to fight against the devil." *Processus* (Bologna), no. 36.

89 *Disciplina monasterii*, no. 4.

90 "Truly the Blessed Augustine formulated his [Rule] on a model of the apostolic life, as is clear from what is said and read about him, because he began to live according to the rule constituted by the holy apostles, and in one of his sermons he himself said: 'We wish to live the apostolic life.'" *Prol. in exp. regulae B. Aug.* Cf. Humbert, *De vita regulari*, I, 45.

91 Jordan, no. 125.

92 *Ibid.*, no. 104. In his Constitutions, Dominic requires his friars to conduct themselves on their apostolic journeys "as evangelical men" (Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 223).

CONTENTS

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XXIV The Legislation of the Preachers THE RODEZ TEXT

ANY attempt to study the primitive legislation of the Order of Preachers encounters a serious obstacle at the start: this legislation is still unknown. It is extant, nevertheless, and the problem of finding it is not insoluble. For nearly half a century all the elements of a solution have been available. It is our purpose to consider them.

Two texts contain an ancient form of the legislation of the Preachers. One is in the prototype manuscript of the Dominican liturgy which Humbert of Romans, fifth master general of the Order, succeeded in having approved by the general chapter of 1259. It is the official edition of the Constitutions as they existed at that date; it shows the text that St. Raymond arranged in 1241, supplemented by the articles of the general chapters from 1241 to 1259. By eliminating these additions from the chapters it is possible to have access to the text edited by St. Raymond.[\(1\)](#)

The other text presents an earlier stage of Dominican legislation. It has been preserved in only one manuscript, formerly in the convent of Rodez (hence the name given it), and today in the general archives of the Order in Rome. Father Denifle edited it for the first time.[\(2\)](#)

Thanks to this latter text, there is some likelihood of identifying the primitive Institutions of the Preachers. Furthermore it opens with these words: "These are the first Constitutions of the Order of Friars Preachers." What are these first Constitutions?

By a strange confusion, somewhat comparable to that which obscured recognition of the Rule of St. Augustine, the Constitutions of the Rodez manuscript appeared as the somewhat late work of the chapter *Generalissimum* of 1228. If such be the fact, the first legislation came into being as late as twelve years after the birth of the Order and seven years after the death of the Founder![\(3\)](#)

The mistake of a master historian, in the case of a remarkable study, gave rise to this error. Supplementing the edition of the Rodez text with a long commentary in order to emphasize, with his characteristic erudition, particulars and details of the legislative text about to be given to the public, Father Henry Denifle was led to assign to it a more or less approximate date. This chronological note was only of slight import in the work. The question was not approached in a critical manner, and the statement did not have the force which certain later writers ascribed to it in their reports, without pursuing a new investigation.[\(4\)](#)

A few protests were raised against the error when it was discovered.[\(5\)](#) This important problem related to the origin of the Order of Friars Preachers must be examined again, because an erroneous solution gives a false historical perspective.

A MISTAKE

First, let us show that Denifle did not at all establish the date of the first edition of the Constitutions of the Preachers as 1228. Our investigation will throw light on the exact date and the special circumstances in which the Constitutions were elaborated. We shall at the same time become acquainted with this legislation itself.

Father Denifle says:

The Constitutions of 1228 are not the oldest of the Order in the sense that there would not have been others earlier. Such an assumption would be erroneous. Froger de Peña, in his deposition for the process of canonization, declared that Dominic had a certain regulation introduced into the "*Rule of the Preachers.*" Similar declarations occur frequently. But before 1228 the Constitutions had not any determined order; they were still very incomplete, and, even if they had been compiled, it is hardly credible that there would have been many copies for circulation.⁽⁶⁾

This surprising declaration is not proved, nor is it referred to again by the author, either in the work under consideration or in his later writings. A comparison which he makes- between the history of the Franciscan and that of the Dominican legislations is the only precise argument seeming to justify or rather to illustrate these few sentences. But certainly a comparison with the history of the Friars Minor can contribute nothing. That they waited until 1260 before having a text drawn up, thanks to St. Bonaventure, does not prove that the Preachers did not possess true Constitutions before 1228. The beginnings of the two Orders are too different to permit reasoning by analogy.

Moreover, it appears that Father Denifle was especially impressed by the historical introduction at the beginning of his manuscript. This introduction, indeed, gives the chapter of 1228 a role of first Place, thus opening the way to a false interpretation. If the text is examined a little more carefully, it will be found to give no justification for the conclusion we are contesting. This introduction is most solemn:

"In the year of our Lord 1228 there assembled at Paris at St. Jacques twelve provincial priors, along with Jordan of Saxony, Master of our Order, each with two definitors. . . ."⁽⁷⁾

THE PROLOGUE OF 1228

The style is in marked contrast to the brevity characteristic of the clear-cut juridical texts that follow. Since it was one of the only two chapters *Generalissima* recorded in Dominican history, the assembly of 1228 marked an important date. Gregory IX (1227-41) had just been elected Pope. As Cardinal Ugolino, nephew of Innocent III, he had for twenty years shown concern for the projects and experiences of St. Dominic and was particularly interested in the legislation of the Preachers. But Humbert of Romans tells us that until 1228 the annual general chapters could at will add to or subtract from the legislation of the Order. In the years just before 1228, apparently one chapter was abrogating what a preceding chapter had legislated.⁽⁸⁾ The result was confusion. The first rectification over, the time had come to stabilize the law.

Therefore it was decided that an exceptional number of definitors should be gathered at Paris. The work of this assembly should henceforth be considered definitive. If later anything needed to be changed, such change could be made only by a procedure requiring approval by three successive chapters (an act which was then put in force and stands to this day). Furthermore, care was taken to exclude from these variations a number of points which only another chapter *Generalissimum* would have power to modify. Certain prescriptions were to remain so unchangeable and inviolable that their observance might not in any way lapse.

That is what the historic prologue states about the intentions of the chapter of 1228. Its hopes, as we may judge, were not devoid of a certain naïveté; its aim, however, was clear and precise. The chapter fulfilled the mission confided to it, in view of which it had received extraordinary powers. Its enactment of laws of stabilization contributed greatly to the permanence of the statutes of the Preachers. But did it accomplish anything more? Should we be impressed by its importance to the extent of attributing to it the composition, the organization, the very promulgation of this law? Further

reading in the historical introduction will show that there is no warrant for such a conclusion; in fact, this text gives us exact information about the work of the capitular fathers.

The power which they received to "constitute, abrogate, change, add, modify," they used only very modestly to "publish *some* constitutions" (*constitutiones quasdam... ediderunt*), and that is all. They do not say that they changed anything or suppressed or arranged in order. On the contrary, they state that they took great care not to upset the previous order of the Constitutions. In fact, they say expressly "that they took care to insert a few additions in their respective places among the other articles" (*Quas in locis suis inter constitutiones alias inserere procurarunt*).

What more decisive testimony could be invoked than this explicit declaration of the capitular fathers of 1228?

Previous to that date, the major part of the Constitutions had, therefore, been committed to writing; it followed a determined order; this order was not at that time modified; the text was merely enriched by a few new elements.

Hence the Rodez text cannot be considered the original work of the chapter *Generalissimum* of 1228. The historical introduction to the manuscript is only one of a few additions made to the primitive text at that time. The manuscript contains several other additions of earlier or later date. Father Denifle himself, in the notes of his edition, acknowledged that nearly twenty passages of the text were additions, corrections, or suppressions expressly imposed by the chapter of 1236, as can be verified by consulting the Acts of that year. One paragraph must be dated 1240 or 1241; in fact, there are eight textual corrections dating from 1240.⁽⁹⁾ This evidence, which might be a cause of some embarrassment to the eminent critic, is surprising only if his hypothesis has been accepted. It is in perfect accord with the title of the manuscript: "These are the first Constitutions of the Order of Friars Preachers, which were in use in the time of Jordan of Saxony, immediate successor of the Blessed Dominic, from which Brother Raymond of Peñafort, third master of the Order, arranged and organized other Constitutions that are now observed."⁽¹⁰⁾

THE LEGISLATION IN 1240

The Rodez manuscript transmits the Constitutions of the Order to us such as they existed in the time of Jordan of Saxony, that is, before St. Raymond arranged them. These Constitutions are called *primae*, not only because they are an earlier form of the legislation of the Preachers, but also because they remained substantially identical from the beginning in spite of additions or partial modification. The Rodez text presents the latest state of this first legislation, that of 1241. Moreover, it presents this legislation in second-rate shape; the scribe did not keep his manuscript thoroughly up to date.

If historians since the time of Father Denifle had not readily accepted this erroneous date of 1228, they would have opened a question about the origin and date of the earlier text, referred to in the historical prologue. Likewise they would easily have seen that the principal documents of primitive Dominican history, while attaching little or no constitutional importance at all to the annual general chapters from 1221 to 1227 (we have noted the testimony of Humbert of Romans), assign to the foundation of the Order by St. Dominic in 1216 and to the first general chapter called by the Patriarch in 1220, a chief part in this matter of legislation.

In fact, the first Constitutions of the Order were drawn up on these two dates. Afterward, in the chapter of 1228, they were supplemented by a number of articles and again at chapters from 1239 to 1241, when the text, corrected slightly and arranged by Raymond of Peñafort, was again solemnly approved

and confirmed. Pursuing the work of discrimination as begun by Father Denifle in the notes of his edition, we can align these additions and consequently identify within this text the first legislation of the Preachers and the very work of St. Dominic. That is the main purpose of this study. To clarify the procedure, we shall begin by stating our method of investigation and giving a summary of the conclusions we expect to establish.

St. Dominic drew up the first part of his Constitutions in 1216. This contains the Preachers' laws of observance which take the place of the *Disciplina monasterii* in the Augustinian legislation and form the true Rule of the Order of St. Dominic. These laws of observance were assembled in a booklet under the characteristic title, *Liber consuetudinum*, and constitute the first part of the Rodez text. These observances are often taken verbatim from the Customs of Prémontré. But St. Dominic made a large number of additions and corrections that profoundly transformed the spirit of this Rule and made it an original law, so that often in the documents of the time it is called the Rule of the Friars Preachers. This first part of the text has since been subject only to very rare additions.

In 1220 at the first chapter of the brethren under the direction of St. Dominic and the elected definitors, the second part of the law of the Preachers, the constitutional part, was drawn up. That part organizes the religious body. It determines the central organs and subordinate officers and regulates their duties. It establishes the social rule of the Order: preaching, studies, mendicant poverty. These Constitutions are contained in the second part of the Rodez text. They are genuinely original. In this second part of the manuscript later additions have been more numerous.

To give more force to our demonstration, we shall first make use of only two documents, which critics rightly regard as having exceptional value: the *Libellus de principiis ordinis praedicatorum* of Jordan of Saxony, and the Testimony of the Process of Canonization of St. Dominic. With the help of these documents we shall establish the existence of a primitive written law, composed of two distinct parts. We shall then show that it is precisely this law which is contained in the manuscript of Rodez.

THE CUSTOMS OF 1216

First of all, we must consider the testimony of Jordan of Saxony. In 1234 the second master general of the Order wrote, as an historian and not as a panegyrist, the *Libellus de principiis ordinis praedicatorum* to acquaint future friars with the origin and early history of the Order. The last editor of this work emphasized its exceptional documentary value and the truthfulness of the testimony.[\(11\)](#)

THE REPORT OF JORDAN OF SAXONY

Jordan was particularly competent in regard to the legislation. He was present at the chapter of 1220 when the work of the foundation was for the first time revised and completed. He presided at all the general chapters from 1222 until his death. Assuredly he had the right to declare, as he did on one occasion, that he knew perfectly the facts, constitutions, and intentions of the constituents of all the chapters of the Order.[\(12\)](#)

Two dates in the *Libellus* mark the stages in the legislation of the Preachers: 1216 and 1220.

Before 1215 the preachers who gathered with Dominic at Toulouse were not "subject to him by the bonds of a true religious obedience"; the Order of Preachers was not yet "instituted", they had simply been concerned with discussing its organization."[\(13\)](#)

In 1215 Dominic went in the company of Foulques, bishop of Toulouse, to the Lateran Council to ask the Pope for "confirmation of an order which would be called and would really be an Order of Preachers."[\(14\)](#) Having heard the appeal, Innocent III "exhorted Dominic to return to his brethren and, after fully deliberating with them, to choose by unanimous consent a rule already approved; the Bishop would then assign a church to them. Finally, Dominic would return to receive from the Pope the confirmation of the whole undertaking."[\(15\)](#)

What follows should be cited verbatim:

After the Council, therefore, they returned and made known to the brethren the words of the Pope. Without delay these future Preachers chose the Rule of the illustrious preacher Augustine. Moreover, they imposed upon themselves a certain number of customs more rigorous as regards eating, fasting, sleeping, and wearing wool. Likewise they proposed and decided to have no possessions in order that the office of preaching should not be impeded by solicitude for things of earth; and it was agreeable to them henceforth to have revenue only.[\(16\)](#)

Jordan of Saxony again mentions a legislative enactment in 1220 with reference to the chapter of Bologna:

In the year 1220, there was celebrated at Bologna the first general chapter of the Order. I was present at it, having been sent from Paris with three friars; for Master Dominic in his letter commanded that four friars be sent from the house in Paris to the chapter at Bologna. When I was sent, I had not yet spent two months in the Order.

At this same chapter it was decided with the common consent of the brethren that the general chapter should be celebrated one year at Bologna and the following year at Paris; moreover, it was specified that it would be held at Bologna that coming year. Likewise it was decided there that for the future our brethren would no longer have possessions or revenues, and that they would renounce those which they had acquired in the vicinity of Toulouse. Many other constitutions were drawn up there which are still observed today.[\(17\)](#)

Finally, Jordan makes a brief mention of the chapter of 1221.[\(18\)](#)

This short sketch of the primitive legislation is much more precise and complete than it appears at first. Let us review it now step by step.

THE CUSTOMS

Elsewhere we have studied what occurred at the audience in Rome in 1215. Dominic returned to Toulouse with the intention of having an approved rule chosen by the assembly of his brethren. From the first, the legislation of the Preachers was marked by a character which it would thereafter retain. Even today its most remarkable feature is that it represents not the personal work of a leader, but a common production, conceived and given vigor by the assembly of the Order. Dominic did not, any more than the Pope, impose anything by an absolute act of authority. He inspired and directed it. Thus it was that in 1216 the brethren chose the apostolic Rule of St. Augustine.

What we know now of this Rule shows that the friars could have made no other choice. Dominic's clerical projects had to merge into the great canonical movement, the contemporary model of clerical reform. But, by the same token, the nature of the traditional text which they agreed to follow left the way open for new Dominican legislation.

The Commentary of St. Augustine, deprived of its head by the disappearance of the *Disciplina monasterii*, required, from the very moment of its adoption, a legislative complement. Of itself it could bring to the new enterprise no precise determination which would orientate or hinder its original development. Dominic and his brethren, therefore, had full liberty to supplement the Rule with statutes selected and adapted to their purposes.[\(19\)](#)

Jordan called this legislation *consuetudines*; it was the traditional term, universal in the twelfth century. Practically the *consuetudines* regulated observance "in regard to food, the fasts, the dormitory, and clothing"; other details will be given later. It was to be expected that the first law of the Preachers would consider these points: men could not live a common life without a determined *ordo*, that is, for observance and the liturgy. This truth, accepted in all ages, was of primary significance with the religious legislators of the Middle Ages.

This law of observance was written; some formal examples will be quoted later. But we may here remark that, considering the development of law in the preceding century and the juridical temper of the period, educated men, like Dominic and his followers, would have been expected as a matter of course to give permanence in writing to the observance which they wished to practice along with the Rule, which itself was a written document. Moreover, a few months later Dominic would disperse his brethren to the four corners of Europe, commissioning them to found convents and in their turn to recruit new friars. To preserve the unity of the Order under such conditions, a written law would be a necessity.

The word *consuetudines* may be regarded as a technical term in the legal language of the age. It was not employed in its ordinary sense; it was a written law, thus defined by Évrard de Béthune early in the thirteenth century: *Consuetudo est jus scriptum more Statutum.*[\(20\)](#) Indeed it was in writing that from one foundation to another these customs were transmitted, according to the universal practice of textual plagiarism.

Moreover, we should not forget that this law concerned regular observance, the foundation of monastic life. The primitive institution of the Preachers found its mold therein. Dominic formed no empty plans. Only one prescription of constitutional intent is noted by Jordan as the expression of something to be desired; in the future they would not accept revenues or have possessions.[\(21\)](#) The law of 1216, therefore, contained the Commentary of St. Augustine and the Customs of the Preachers. The principal part of this ensemble that constituted a true Rule was not the Augustinian text but the Customs. Indeed, in the Customs the friars had their actual Rule. Nor should we be surprised to find this name applied to it in another document, describing in detail the daily life of the first Preachers between 1216 and 1220.

THE WITNESSES OF BOLOGNA

At the time Jordan was composing his *Libellus*, the process for the canonization of St. Dominic was opened in Bologna. Deposition was made by nine witnesses who had lived in intimate association with the saint, some of them from the foundation of the Order. Among those testifying were the priors of Bologna and Padua and a provincial of Lombardy, all three, priests and preachers, learned men who knew how to choose their words and avoid literary verbiage.[\(22\)](#) In these nine depositions, the words *regula*, *ordo*, *constitutio*, as applied to the legislation of St. Dominic, occur nearly thirty times. Used sixteen times is the word *Rule*: "his Rule," "the Rule of the Friars..... the Rule of the Order," "Rule of the Friars Preachers." There is nothing vague about the reference. The quality of the testimony would be a warrant for that; but the very use which the witnesses make of this word is characteristic. The witness said that Brother Dominic "observed the Rule strictly and perfectly himself, and exhorted the brethren and commanded them to observe the Rule perfectly, and he severely punished delinquents."

Such expressions occur in almost all the depositions. They give the idea of something juridical, an expressed and detailed positive law.(23) Several points of it are indicated: "For what concerned himself and others as to vesture, food, drink, fasts, and all other prescriptions, he observed in all its fullness the Rule and way of life of the Friars Preachers."(24)

It also included a schedule of silence, variable according to hours and degrees of obligation,(25) a code of faults and list of penances, a list extremely severe.

These penalties for the "transgressions" of the friars, which are likewise called their "imperfections," "their faults," and even their "sins,"(26) give evidence that the Rule had the sanction of authority. To suspend a point, even on a journey, it was necessary to have a dispensation from Dominic. Therein he was considerate for the friars but not for himself.

Finally, it was by a profession of obedience that the friars submitted to the yoke of this Rule.(27) Even the ritual of this profession was appointed: it was made "in the hands" of Dominic or his representative. This rite, still in practice with the Preachers, is notably different from that used by the Benedictines. The novice places his hands within the hands of the prelate, in a gesture of feudal homage symbolizing the promise of obedience.(28)

Three witnesses give evidence on six different occasions that this Rule was written,(29) a fact supported by the precision of its detail and Dominic's zeal for its observance. The testimony of the friars of Bologna, therefore, reads like an expressed *confirmatur* on what we were led to affirm from the nature of the primitive observances of St. Dominic and from their title of Customs.

DETAILS OF THE RULE

Between 1216 and 1220 this law spread into all the new convents. Proof of this fact is found in a little anecdote which Humbert of Romans reports as coming from a direct auditor: in the chapter of 1220, Dominic declared that *the rules* did not oblige under pain of sin; then he added "that, if any were to believe the contrary, he would himself without waste of time go through the cloisters to cut all the rules to pieces with his knife."(30)

This short account reflects the spirit of St. Dominic. It also reveals that as early as 1220 the Founder did not hesitate to call his law a Rule; nor did the Bologna witnesses who used the term, with remarkable insistence, in 1233. The term was used with perfect warrant. The actual Rule, in the traditional meaning of the word, was not the Commentary of St. Augustine; it was the law of observance composed by the Father of the Preachers. The terminology used by the witnesses showed the clarity of their penetration. Moreover, it will be evident farther on that they probably did not speak without forethought.

The witnesses for the process of canonization give the impression of having always lived according to the Rule of St. Dominic. Such would be the case, for they had all entered the Order after 1216. Furthermore, nothing in their testimony indicates in any way that this Rule of the Preachers, which they also spoke of as "the Rule" in an absolute sense, could be any other than the Rule which they knew and practiced in 1233. This point should be carefully noted.

Moreover, they picture St. Dominic engaged in organizing his Order (*instruere, ordinare*),(31) and completing his Rule; they mention several additions which they saw enacted;(32) their remarks even make it possible to assign as the time of their insertion the chapter of 1220. Here we can resume Jordan's narrative.

THE INSTITUTIONS OF 1220

In 1220 the time was ripe for St. Dominic to organize his followers into a great society, strongly centralized, thoroughly adapted by its spirit and its laws for the work given it by the papacy along with the glorious title of "Order of Preachers." In confirming the new society and taking it under his government in 1216, Honorius III had practically emancipated it from every other authority.[\(33\)](#) Favored by this encouragement, the dispersal of the friars in 1217 and the foundations in Paris and Bologna transformed the little canonical community of the Preachers of Toulouse into a world-wide Order.

The enterprise now advanced with giant strides. The most fruitful ideals of the period, embodied in the Order of St. Dominic, gave it at certain junctures an unexpected scope of development. Four years after its birth, it was able to plan a definitive organization in a general chapter.

DESCRIPTION OF WITNESSES

The following is a description by two witnesses of these first general assemblies.

At the time of the first chapter of the Friars Preachers in the city of Bologna, Brother Dominic declared to the brethren there: "I am only worthy to be deposed because I am useless and without vigor." And he humiliated himself in every way. Then, as the brethren did not wish to depose him, it was his wish that definitors be elected with power to legislate, regulate, and rule, as much over himself as over others and over the whole chapter as long as it would last.[\(34\)](#)

At this time (1220), the Blessed Brother Dominic, in dependence only on the pope, had plenary power, all right to manage, organize, and correct the whole Order of the Friars Preachers. It was that very year in which the first general chapter of the Order was being celebrated at Bologna.... It then pleased the Blessed Brother Dominic that the chapter should appoint definitors who in regard to the whole Order, the masters, and the definitors themselves would have full power to define, organize, pass laws, and punish, with all due reverence and respect for the master.[\(35\)](#)

This twofold testimony again tallies with Jordan's accounts which we have cited above. The three together permit us to gauge the legislative importance (our chief interest at present) of the chapter of 1220. They emphasize the juridical character of the full powers given to Dominic and to the definitors, and they refer again to the Pope. In 1216 the Order had received its law of observance; at this time it received its constitutional law. Echard aptly characterized the assembly of 1220 when he wrote: "This chapter can be called the chapter of the institution and promulgation of our laws and of the acceptance of our Constitutions."[\(36\)](#)

As in 1216, Dominic had this law established by an assembly of the brethren, that is, by their elected representatives: he had definitors chosen to whose power he became subject, keeping only a kind of directive influence. This arrangement was not the pure fruit of humility. A certain anecdote related by one of the witnesses reveals that on fundamental matters Dominic showed a regard for the opinions of the brethren. For example, upon their remonstrance, he abandoned his first idea of confiding the temporal affairs of the Order to a lay group that the clerics might be freer for study and preaching.[\(37\)](#)

The undertaking was immense. Jordan records in particular the institution of the general chapters and their regimentation; the establishment of absolute poverty; and the plan of renouncing common possessions as well as revenues previously acquired. The witnesses add other points in regard to poverty;[\(38\)](#) one of them tells of the organization of the government of the Order by the clerics. All

note with insistence the prescriptions referring more directly to the spirit and aim of the Order, the life of prayer and preaching: "to speak only of God or with God."[\(39\)](#) Finally, Jordan ends with an expression freighted with meaning: "Many other rules were formulated there which are still observed."

GENERAL CHAPTER OF 1220

To the original Customs there was added a second body of laws. The Rule of the Preachers, at the close of 1220, was therefore composed of two types of written texts. There was a law of precise and detailed observance dating from 1216, and a body of Constitutions of institutional import, drawn up in 1220.

Jordan's explicit statement and the implicit testimony of the Bologna witnesses give evidence that these observances and these primitive Constitutions were still in vigor in their time, that is, in 1233-34. At this point we unexpectedly find the answer to the problem raised at the beginning of this chapter about the connection between the primitive law and the Rodez text. Does not this manuscript contain the exact legislation in use between 1228 and 1240? Then it contains the integral primitive law of the Preachers with its observances and its Constitutions from 1216 to 1220.

Here we might interrupt our proof, and be content to refer to the Rodez text, edited by Denifle under an incorrect title, in order to reconstruct the primitive Rule and analyze its nature.

But this identification of the primitive law and the substance of the Rodez text, so important for the first history of the legislation of the Preachers, deserves further consideration. Besides, up to the present time, has not this solution escaped the notice of the historians of the Order? Hence it is fitting to substantiate it by certain other proofs, which will have the value of opening the way to more exact data on the primitive substance of the Rodez text.

THE PRIMITIVE TEXT

The primitive history of the Order attests the existence of a written law for the Preachers in 1216-20. Moreover, the historical introduction of the Rodez manuscript explains that the major part of the text in its characteristic order is from a date prior to 1228. It is only natural to suppose that the part referred to was the text in use from 1216 to 1220.

This hypothesis, concerning which the least that can be said is that there is a strong presumption in favor of it, would yield to certitude if the impossibility of the contradictory solution could be demonstrated.

If the text from a date prior to 1228 were not the text of 1216-20, it would mean that between 1221 and 1227 the first written text had been abrogated and a new one constituted. But such a proposition encounters a series of impossibilities.

First of all, what authority in the Order or in Christendom would have had sufficient influence to cause the rejection of a text composed under the direction of St. Dominic with the approbation of the Pope? What authority could have required the Order to accept a new law? What power could have reshaped the text of a law that had been lived in rigid practice by a religious society for several years? And who would have compiled the new Constitutions? The law of 1216-20 had been the joint work of St. Dominic and his friars, Those who had drawn up the text of 1220 through their elected definitors did not have to demolish their first edifice to rebuild another from it.

And when would they have accomplished this? We have noted above what Humbert of Romans thought of the chapters preceding the chapter of 1228. The Master of the Order placed the formulation of these observances at the very beginning of the Order.

Further, to what extent have historians followed the traces of this juridical revolution? Neither Jordan, the Bologna witnesses, nor the other chroniclers indicate anything in favor of the hypothesis. If, on the other hand, we consider the evidence available on the legislation from 1216 to 1220, and even Jordan's express declaration about the legislative continuity between 1220 and 1234, we would have to suppose in the historical sources a conspiracy of silence. Lastly, let us recall that the development of the history of the Preachers manifests none of those convulsive changes that prolonged the legislative uncertainties of the first years in the history of some other orders of that period even into centuries.

These considerations are enough to prove, almost by an appeal to the absurd, the literal continuity of the law of the Preachers from the year 1216. A comparison of the Rodez text itself with that of the law of 1216-20 will now afford a positive proof.

FORM OF THE RODEZ TEXT

In fact, this text presents the exact form which the history should lead us to expect. It is composed of a Prologue, of two parts called Distinctions, and of a short *regula conversorum*.

The Prologue, the scheme of division, and the first part are, to a large extent, taken literally from an edition of the Customs of the Premonstratensian Canons dating from the beginning of the thirteenth century.⁽⁴⁰⁾ The ensemble, necessarily including the *regula conversorum* which merely substituted some prescriptions for those in the first part inapplicable to the lay brothers,⁽⁴¹⁾ constitutes a genuine law of observance with regulations for the canonical Office, the refectory, the fasts, the food, the dormitory, the sick, the novices, silence the habit, shaving, lists of faults and penances. According to Prologue its title was *Liber consuetudinum*, Book of Customs. The titles *regula canonicorum* and *regula conversorum* were also used. All these terms suit the contents perfectly.⁽⁴²⁾

The Second Distinction is of an entirely different cast. It contains not a single word from the Premonstratensian text. It presents a rather large number of supplementary articles that are easily identified the very nature of the prescriptions or by the word *Statuimus*, which denotes the work of a general chapter. It settles with finality the constitution of the Order: general and provincial chapters, the master of the Order, provincial and conventual priors, studies and professors, preaching, absolute poverty.

From a literary standpoint the difference between the Distinctions is not less notable. The First Distinction comprises a series of short articles, each treating a particular point, with appropriate titles, the list of which is given in the Prologue; it belongs to the classic literary genre of books of customs. The Second Distinction, on the contrary, forms a single unified text, without titles and chapter divisions, in a notably different literary form. We should be inclined to compare it to the Charter of Charity of Cîteaux, a constitutional statute totally original in the history of religious legislation.

Noting the characteristics of these two Distinctions so markedly different that they could not have been drawn up at the same time, we can easily recognize in the first the Customs of 1216 described by Jordan of Saxony and the witnesses for the process of canonization, and in the second the constitutional law of 1220. Certain features in the text make possible a detailed identification.

The Dominican editor declares, as he copies a text of the Prologue Prémontré, that he will give in advance the chapter headings in each Distinction.(43) But the list which he gives is limited to the chapters of the First Distinction; there is no indication of chapters for the Second, either in this list or elsewhere. Can it not be accounted for by the fact that the Second Distinction did not yet exist when the Prologue was written?

Though a large number of prescriptions were borrowed from the Customs of Prémontré, the First Distinction is an original composition. In fact, it included a certain number of appropriate and important regulations that gave a new spirit to the Rule. Nothing is more characteristic of the new spirit in this law of observance than the dispensations it provided in the interests of study, and no longer merely for the needs of health. It would not be a mistake to regard dispensation as one of the most characteristic innovations of the *ordo* of the Preachers, an innovation that caused scandal in the religious circles of the age.

ELEMENTS OF 1216

Here and there throughout the Rule dispensation was provided for. But particular provisions did not satisfy the purpose of the Dominican lawmaker. He resumed the question ultimately, and in the Prologue itself he wrote the general law of dispensation, linking it to the final mission of the Order. Then was enacted that admirable little charter of Dominican life where, in the concise and juridical style of the period, the ideal according to which the Order of Preachers still lives was expressed with striking clearness.

Nevertheless, the prelate has the power of dispensing the brethren in his convent, when it seems expedient, especially in whatever may hinder study, preaching, or the welfare of souls, since our Order is known to have been instituted from the beginning especially for preaching and the salvation of souls, and our study ought to be directed principally, ardently, and supremely to the end that we may be useful to the soul of our neighbor.(44)

With a perspective strongly emphasizing its institutional import, we meet here the universal rule of dispensation. This provision rendered needless the particular dispensations already included in different sections of the text. They were retained, however, and remain as evidence of an earlier condition.

The general law of dispensation was, therefore, an addition to the Rule. Its antiquity in the Dominican legislation is clear from the fact that it speaks only of the prelate and of his convent; no reference is made to the provincial or the general. This omission surprised Humbert of Romans,(45) but it shows that when this law was enacted the Order still had only convents and no provinces. It dates then from 1220 at the latest. The inclusion of particular dispensations in the various chapters of the Customs would point to a time still earlier; such articles could date only from 1216.

ELEMENTS OF 1220

In the First Distinction, there is a chapter which in its final form must be not earlier than 1220 or 1221, because the title *magister ordinis* occurs there in the formula of profession.(46) But in the preceding chapter there is a totally different formula which speaks neither of the master nor of the prior of the Order, but only of the prelate: "Let them promise stability and the common life, and pronounce obedience to the prelate and his successors."(47)

This phrase, which is found in a text of the Dominican reviser, is in the traditional formula of canonical profession;(48) the formula of 1220-21 emerged from it by the suppression of the first two terms,

replacing them simply by a profession of obedience, a fact which explains its curious redundancy and its incorrect grammar.(49) The first form with its archaic character can date only from 1216. In fact, at that time,(50) under the influence of the canonical texts, the Preachers did not hesitate, though in quite a relative sense, to speak of stability. This selection of little details which help to place the writing of the First Distinction in 1216, could be increased.(51) Yet it seems superfluous to press the point.

The Bologna witnesses, as we noted, mentioned a number of prescriptions that St. Dominic had caused to be written into his Rule in 1220. The identity of the articles can be verified: all these rules and even phrases indicated by the witnesses may be found in the Second Distinction of the Rodez text.(52) The *Libellus* of Jordan of Saxony(53) also shows agreement on these points.

Thus even in the smallest details the accord can be traced between the legislations of 1216 and 1220 and the two parts of the Rodez text. If we bear the other arguments in mind, a conclusion is warranted. The law of the observance drawn up by St. Dominic in 1216 forms the First Distinction of the text. The constitutional law of 1220 is embodied verbatim in the Second Distinction.

It would be a long task now to examine word for word the Rodez text to ascertain therein the original Rule under the later modifications. In any case, such a scrutiny is not necessary for the purpose in view. Our purpose is served by an acquaintance with the first history of the law of the Preachers and the possibility of an analysis of its typical nature in the original itself.

Before closing this consideration, let us summarize the primitive substance of the Rodez text.

The Prologue is evidently from 1216. It forms part of those extracts from the Customs of Pre'montré which form the substratum of the First Distinction. The only later addition is the general precept of dispensation.

The section at the end of the Prologue which introduces two Distinctions is likewise from 1216, since it is modeled on the division of the Customs of Prémontré.(54) That does not mean that in 1216 Dominic foresaw in detail the work of 1220. In providing for a Second Distinction to include the future Constitutions, he simply conformed to the plan of the Prémontré texts and to the expressed indication of the Prologue.(55)

CONCLUSION

We can say that the First Distinction is comprised of the Customs of 1216. Its nature as a law of observance required that it should be written from the beginning and remain unchanged.(56) Furthermore the fact that in 1216 a second part was projected for later Constitutions, proves indeed that it was the intention to modify the first no further. If there were changes in the law of observance, they consisted only in corrections of words or parts of phrases, like those ordained in 1236 and carefully cited by Denifle.(57) One or another short chapter not listed in the Prologue might also have been added later.(58) For the discovery of these additions, there is a key in the belated character of certain prescriptions,(59) or at times in a typical word, like *statuimus* or *item*. Inversely, whatever has been derived from Prémontré is certainly primitive. The *regula conversorum* must also date from 1216.

The Second Distinction has passed through many more transformations than the First. In certain passages the most varied prescriptions have accumulated, are repeated, and appended sometimes at random. Introductory words like *Item*, *Idem*, *Statuimus*, *Praecipimus*, occur frequently, and the later form of certain determinations leaves no room for doubt. We can distinguish a fundamental group dating from 1220, another from a short time later, and finally a whole series of articles of diversified

character successively issued by general chapters, notably in 1228, 1236, 1239-41. The text of 1220 covers nearly half of the Second Distinction; the other portion is not quite so extensive.

THE NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LEGISLATION OF THE PREACHERS

The foregoing discussion has brought out more than one salient trait in the legislation of the Preachers. We can now study the design of the whole, with reference to the very text of that law which has been discovered in its primitive and substantially unchanged form.

Briefly we shall note five characteristics: the legislation of St. Dominic was a canonical law; it was, nevertheless, essentially original; in accord with contemporary law; inspired by the latest decrees of the Church; vigorously constituted and fruitful from its inception.

Jacques de Vitry made no mistake when he viewed the Order of Preachers as the last branch on the canonical tree and the ultimate expansion of the Augustinian institution. The large number of customs from Prémontré embodied in the Dominican law stand as permanent evidence to this fact. When he borrowed a great part of their observances from the Norbertines, St. Dominic did not hesitate to shape his Order, so to speak, in continuity with one of the most famous canonical types in the great movement of clerical reform. He had no hesitation in letting slip from their text into his own, words as typical as *canonicus*, *ordo canonicus*, *religio*, or *disciplina canonica*.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Once, in an original text, he referred to the promise of *stability* ⁽⁶¹⁾ which was to be made at the close of the novitiate. If he was actuated by any desire for a radical break with the canonical movement, he would have most carefully avoided this word, because the interpretation could be ruinous in view of what was most original in the design of the Order: its broad liberty of action and its universality.⁽⁶²⁾

What Dominic sought from canonical life, particularly from the text of Prémontré, was regular observance: the liturgical life; the hours solemnly chanted in the church; the ascetical life minutely organized in monastic tradition; austerity for hours of sleep and kind of clothing, coarse food, silence, a spirit of constant humility and fraternal charity, frequent chapter of faults, penances determined in advance according to a detailed and severe code.

With great zeal Dominic labored to have this Rule observed, even by those on a journey. Truly, he was the authentic heir of the reformers of regular life, among whom he did not hesitate to enroll his name. In that capacity, he was even a severe reformer, judging from the particular practices introduced by him into his own observances, which were, in truth, more rigorous than those of other canons.

At the same time he conserved what was best in the monastic heritage: the contemplative life. From the very first, the life of the friars was molded in this form. ⁽⁶³⁾ For his own life and for that of his brethren, St. Dominic resolved the seeming contradiction of continual prayer and the apostolate by his admirable command: "Speak only of God or with God."⁽⁶⁴⁾ Thought on the import of these words in the Rule of 1220 will lead to the discovery of one and the same meaning in the expression of St. Thomas, "*contemplata aliis tradere*,"⁽⁶⁵⁾ and in the theological mission of the Order of Preachers. Thus, while adhering to the traditional spirit of regular life, Dominic pursued an end quite different from that of the monks and even of the canons, and wrote a law that was essentially original. His Order was, above all, the Order of Preachers; regular life itself, as ordained to this new end, flowed in a vastly different channel; the result was a transformation.

The metamorphosis of the canonical order, *Ordo canonicus*, into the Order of Preachers, *Ordo Praedicatorum*, was effected by a series of laws absolute in originality.

REGULAR OBSERVANCE

In the Prologue, this end of the Order, noted in the little charter cited, led to a prescription that would seem calculated from the first to enervate the vigor of the regular life: the universal principle of dispensation. The Order had been instituted for the salvation of souls. Study and the apostolate had to stand in the forefront of the life of observance. Detailed provision was made for them in articles in the Customs.

It need not be thought that the apostolic end, as a first and normal consequence, sets up an obstacle to regular life. Far from opposing it, the apostolate requires and stimulates regular life. We may discern in the very strictness of Dominican observance an essential help to the apostolate. If St. Dominic, for example, cultivated the love of poverty to the extent of making his friars mendicants,(66) an unprecedented move, he knew well from his own experience and that of others in tragic extremities, that sacrifice and penance were the strong arms of the preacher. This mendicant spirit empowered the Order of St. Dominic with mighty energies for conquest in imitation of the apostles and effectively transformed it into an apostolic Order.(67)

In the spirit of this fundamental rule, there were certain other observances, like that of silence, which commands a very remarkable code in the Rule of St. Dominic,(68) the special injunction for the master of novices,(69) or some of the faults anticipated,(70) and the direction to quicken the recitation of the Office or to postpone at times the celebration of the chapter,(71) all of which were a consequence of the original orientation of religious life toward study and preaching.

Finally and emphatically as early as 1220, the law of the Preachers organized this study and preaching in a remarkable program which the sons of St. Dominic would keep ever in view. The Rule provided that each convent have a doctor and a master of students,(72) specified the courses and the books of study (strictly theological),(73) the dispensations and privileges of students, outlined their obligations, and sketched the plan for their education.

It regulated the choice of preachers, forbade their being occupied with temporal business, counseled them on their conduct in the world, on a journey, in regard to bishops;(74) described in a few profound words what their spiritual life had to be; and, in conclusion, organized the *officium praedicationis*, the selection and appointment of preachers general.

A MODERN RULE

For new wine, new bottles. To meet the essential needs of the thirteenth century, the Order of Preachers designed its legislation on the basis of contemporary law.

Though still uniquely original, the Constitution of the Preachers in this way reflected the tenor of the civil constitution of the communes. In that age, for a religious society to be modern to that extent was to find itself an innovator.(75) Is this to be wondered at?

Did not Dominic rear his Order in Bologna in the shadow of that law University to which students flocked from all corners of Christendom, and did not many of its famous jurists become his friars?

The Constitution of the Preachers as revealed in the primitive text and as it remained had a triple basis: a deliberative assembly, a personal authority, an electoral body.(76) The general chapter, which is elected, legislates and controls once a year; it has full powers; it can correct the faults of the master general and even depose him.(77) It has its counterpart on a lesser scale in the provincial chapter.(78)

The master general, likewise elected, governs in a permanent capacity. He is the defender of the law and is the head of the army of Preachers.⁽⁷⁹⁾ He is also the source of authority, confirming the prior provincial, who is in a certain sense his vicar and in his turn confirms the conventual prior.⁽⁸⁰⁾

Lastly, the electoral body, under certain conditions, is constituted by the assembly of the professed; it has the choice of superiors and of the delegates to general chapters; it can accuse them through visitators and chapters. Moreover, on certain occasions it selects the councilors of the superiors.

This organization, which creates neither an absolute monarchy nor a democracy in the modern sense of the word, is very balanced. The authority is conferred by the superior, but the choice of superior comes from the subject. A close contact binds the various organs. The council and the control are interposed from above.

The Order is strongly hierarchical, under the direction of a single head who confirms its superiors; through intermediary offices, however, it is decentralized; it avoids the arbitrary, because the law, which is the work of a general chapter, rules the general himself; it escapes paralysis because that law is living, a true *lex communis* generated in the thirteenth century.

ACCORD WITH THE LATERAN COUNCIL

This adaptation to the contemporary law evidently constituted a great force in the law of the Preachers. It had another spring of power, not less important. In becoming, as it were, an innovator in religious legislation, St. Dominic was, in last analysis, only realizing the imperative hopes of the fathers of the Lateran Council, and of Pope Innocent III, whose keen analysis of the religious needs of the age guided the conciliar deliberations. Dominic and his brethren fashioned their Rule in a certain measure in accord with the four canons of the Council of 1215.

Canon 13 prescribed cultivation of the traditional institution of religious life: regular spirituality.

Canon 12 dictated for him, under the form of provincial and general chapters and the provision for visitators, the modern government of his Order, common and controlled."

Canon 11 sketched his scholastic and doctoral program.

Canon 10 established his mission as preacher and pastor of souls.

Therein, surely, lay one of the notable features of the Rule of St. Dominic, namely, that it was drawn up in full accord with the designs and the projects of the Church. The official confirmation of the Rule in the very year of its foundation, unprecedented as such action was, shows how the Church regarded it.

This reliance upon, or better, this appeal to the solemn commands which the fathers of Christendom had just proclaimed in the Council, guaranteed the immediate fruitfulness and the rapid expansion of the enterprise. That is the final feature to be noted. From its inception, the Rule of St. Dominic was precise, vigorous, sound, clearly organized, and well adapted to the work which it pursued; and it was characterized by the essential features that it would preserve. From these qualities it derived a mighty impulse for conquest. Born of its own age, it was the product of ripe experience; thus, in two successive stages, within four years, the clear genius of St. Dominic endowed society and the Church with a Rule so well planned that it had only to develop according to its own power in order to govern and place at the service of Christendom an army of preachers that increased rapidly.

Soon, extending beyond the limits of the Order, the Rule of St. Dominic began to radiate an influence on other religious foundations that were groping, sometimes in the dark and often in dangerous bypaths far from their true end, for an answer to the unrest, if not to the needs, of contemporary Christian society.

NOTES

1 Father Denifle has carefully done this in his edition: *Die Constitutionen des Predigerordens in der Redaction Raimunds von Peñafort*, in *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, V (1889), 530-64; cf. *Liber Constitutionum Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum; Analecta sacri Ordinis Fr. Praed.*, III (1897), 2660, 98-122, 162-81.

2 *Die Constitutionen des Predigerordens vom Jahre 1228*, in Denifle, *Archiv*, I (1885), 162-227; the edition has been reprinted in *Liber Consuetudinum, Analecta O.P.*, II (1896), 619-48.

3 That runs directly counter to the statement of Humbert of Romans. Speaking of the *Salve* procession, which dates from 1221, he writes: "At the beginning of the Order, when the Constitutions were formulated, a procession of this kind was not usual" (*De vita regulari*, II, 131).

4 Reichert, for example, in his official edition of the Acts of the Chapters, declared without hesitation: "In this year (1228) the first Constitutions of the Order were promulgated" (*Monumenta O.P.*, III, 3). He merely relied on Denifle. The official edition of the Rodez text also proposed, and without proof, the date of 1228.

All the chronicles or legends or histories of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries repeat, often literally, the text of the *Libellus*, on which we rely. It is well to note the chronicle of Brother Pipin (early fourteenth century), which distinguishes the confirmation of the Order by Honorius III in 1216 from the confirmation of the Constitutions "in the third year following" (*Analecta O.P.*, XV [1921], 197). At first glance, this may seem to indicate the year 1219. But a more attentive reading will show that it is a question of the "third year following" the pontificate of Honorius, that is, the fourth, from July, 1219, to July, 1220. The information clearly refers to the legislative work of the first chapter of the Order (May 17, 1220). Moreover, the Constitutions were never confirmed, in the technical sense of the word.

5 Mandonnet, in *Rev. Hist. eccl.*, XI (1914), 13; see also *supra*, chaps. 3 and 4). Let us recall that the origin of the Constitutions of the Preachers in 1216-1220 is not only clearly evidenced by all the ancient documents, it was still held in the eighteenth century by the historians of the Order (Echard, I, 12, 20; Mamachi, pp. 376, 592).

6 Denifle, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

7 The following is the complete text of the prologue:

"In the year of our Lord, 1228, there assembled in Paris in the convent of St. Jacques twelve provincial priors, along with Jordan, the Master of our Order, each with two definitors delegated by the provincial chapters, to whom all the friars agreed to entrust their own votes, granting plenary powers to their delegates: that whatever would be done by them, either in constituting, or abrogating, changing, adding or modifying, would henceforth remain firm and stable: no one, whatever the authority would be permitted to change anything adopted by this chapter, because they themselves decreed that it was to stand in perpetuity. Therefore' having invoked the grace of the Holy Spirit, the aforementioned priors

with their definitors, after diligent consideration, with unanimity and concord, published certain constitutions for the welfare, the honor, and the preservation of the Order, which they took care to insert in their respective places among the other articles. The Constitutions which they wished to be observed inviolable in perpetuity concerned the alienation of property and rejection of all revenues, concerning removal of appeals, that nothing in their definitions might work to the prejudice of anyone through the friar definitors in the case of provincial priors, nor through the priors in the case of the brethren. There were certain constitutions which they wished to stand as decreed, so that, whatever the cause, circumstance, event, and business arising, no change could be made, except by the same kind of chapter. The making of constitutions with the approval of three general chapters, journeying on foot, carrying money for travel expenses, abstaining from meat except in case of illness. The relate however, had power to dispense from these according to conditions of time and place" (Denifle, Archiv, I [1885], 193 f.).

8 This is an indication that that constitution was not in effect from the beginning (the process of approbation by three successive chapters), and that is true. For in the beginning any general chapter could legislate; but on the occasion of the first chapter *Generalissimum* (1228) that constitution was enacted, as is patent in the acts, *De generalissimo capitulo*. Nor was it without cause. For when any chapter could make constitutions, and by the same right abrogate them, the result was ridiculous and confusing and what was established by certain definitors in one year was frequently abolished by the next chapter." Humbert, *op. cit.*, II, 58. Having entered the Order at Paris in 1225, Humbert was a direct witness for the years 1225-28.

9 Denifle noted about fifteen corrections or additions from 1236 (cf. Acta capitulorum I, 6f.) and one from 1241 (Denifle, Archiv, I, 226). There were others which Denifle did not notice, probably because he did not have access to a complete edition of the acts of the chapters.

10 Denifle, Archiv, I, 193.

11 Cf. Scheeben's introduction to his critical edition, p. 20.

12 Jordan, Epist. 49 (to Brother Stephen, provincial of Lombardy); cf. Epist. 48 (to Diana).

13 Jordan, *Libellus*, nos. 31, 37.

14 Ibid., no. 40.

15 The clause, "to whom the Bishop would assign a church," is missing in the manuscript of the Bollandists which, according to Scheeben, constitutes a first edition of the *Libellus*. The additions of this kind which are found in all the other manuscripts, point to a second copy, probably also from the pen of Jordan, who may have added these few details before 1235 from the accounts of the early brethren. The existence of such corrections enhances the historical value of the *Libellus*. Cf. Scheeben's Introduction.

16 Jordan, no. 42. The last four words of the Latin text, *eis adhuc habere complacuit*, are also from the second copy.

17 Jordan, nos. 86 f.

18 He recalls only that it was there decided to send friars under the direction of Brother Gilbert to found a convent in England. He was not present at this chapter (the only one in which he did not directly participate); he was there appointed provincial of Lombardy (Jordan, no. 88).

19 Humbert of Romans acknowledged this with frank simplicity in his explanation of the choice of the Rule of St. Augustine: A Rule was required which would in no way contravene the essential prescriptions on study and preaching which they proposed to enact: such a Rule was that of St. Augustine: "For, since it contains little more than certain spiritual exhortations and recommendations dictated by reason, a character not marked in other rules, all the statutes pertaining to the state of preaching can be added to it" (Humbert, *De vita regulari*, I, 51).

20 Cited by Du Cange, II, 557.

21 The corrector of the *Libellus* modified it slightly: (*Sed tantum reditus*) *eis habere complacuit* (no. 42), "But it was agreeable to them to have only revenues." It was, therefore, a desire, an intention, and not yet a statute. Likewise we see that the friars at Paris did not conform to it and that St. Dominic resisted (*Processus* [Bologna], no. 26).

The friars of Paris had, moreover, a very special reason for derogating from the ideal of absolute poverty: ecclesiastical decrees formulated in that city by Robert de Courson about 1213-14 obliged every superior of a monk or canon to provide traveling expenses and a horse for these religious on a journey so that they might not have to belz (Mansi, XXII, 828). In 1216, they were right, therefore, not yet to establish irrevocably the statute on apostolic poverty, and to allow freedom at least for revenues. If the rich holdings of the sisters of Prouille are compared with the meager possessions which the Preachers deprived themselves of in 1220, it will be granted that their derogations from absolute poverty were limited to the strictly necessary. It appears that the evidence of John of Navarre at the process of canonization should be carefully weighed. We do not know to what extent he generalized in the particular case of the Parisian Preachers. Furthermore, his statements tend to emphasize St. Dominic's confidence in Providence as well as his love of poverty, and not to give information about the economic condition and ideal of the Preachers. The testimony of this same John of Navarre about the travel expenses (*Acta Sanctorum*, August, I, 454) is capable of almost any interpretation.

22 The witnesses from Toulouse, on the other hand, were often unlettered men. There is a striking contrast between the character of their deposition and that of those from Bologna. The former contain many accounts of marvels, but nothing in particular about the subject in question. It is true that their testimony concerned a period in Dominic's life before the constitution of the Order.

23 "He did not spare himself in the least matter"; or again: "he observed the laws of fasting with all fidelity," are characteristic expressions which recur frequently.

24 The law of fasting was quite detailed; from one source it is known that he kept all the fasts imposed by the Rule, and from another source that he fasted from September 14 to Easter and on all Fridays of the year.

25 "He always observed silence at the customary hours and as appointed by Rule."

26 St. Dominic himself in 1220 carefully distinguished the obligations of the Constitution *under penalty* from the obligations *under sin*.

27 Cf. *Processus* (Bologna), nos. 25, 30, 41, 46; Jordan, nos. 58, 66; Frachet, p. 170.

28 This act, which had the advantage of superimposing on the vow of religion immediate obedience to a single head, was of great importance for the centralization of the Order of Preachers. It would be unnecessary, however, to emphasize the influence of this element: the *professio manualis* to a single head was already practiced at Cluny (much more strictly even than with the Preachers, since the abbot of Cluny was always to receive it in person) without effecting any resemblance between the unity of the Order of Cluny and the unity of the Order of St. Dominic (G. de Valous, *Le monachisme clunysien des origines au XV^e siècle*, 1935, I, 34 ff.).

29 The texts are as follows:

"It was his custom, whether in or out of the convent or on a journey, to speak either of God or with God; he encouraged the brethren in this practice and also inserted it in their Constitution" (Brother Stephen; no. 37). "Whence he enjoined that they should use coarse garments and never carry money for a journey but everywhere live on alms. And this he had inscribed in his Rule' (*ibid.*; no. 38). " He always spoke either of God or with God, and exhorted his brethren to this and had it written in the Rule of the Friars Preachers" (Brother Paul of Venice; no. 41). "And he provided in their Constitutions that they should not accept possessions in the Order' (*ibid.*; no. 42). "Never did he (the witness) hear an idle word. . .but he was always talking of God. And he preached of God to whomever he met on the road. And he encouraged his brethren to do likewise. And this he caused to be established in the Rule of the Friars Preachers" (Froger de Peña; no. 47). "And he loved poverty so greatly that he did not wish the brethren to have possessions but to live on alms. And he had this written in the Rule of the Friars" (*ibid.*; no. 47).

Thus we see that the texts are explicit; they indicate additions made in writing in a written Rule. They indicate that this earlier Rule was something they had always known. With the exception of John of Navarre (1215), all the witnesses from Bologna entered after the year 1216.

30 Humbert (*De vita regulari*, II, 46) seems to interpret the story as referring to the Rule of St. Augustine. But evidently it was not St. Augustine's Commentary which could give occasion for numerous and definite transgressions, but the detailed prescriptions of the Rule of St. Dominic. It might be wise also to note that the word is used in the plural, "rules."

31 In 1218, Dominic may even have decided on a date: he hoped to complete the work of organization two years later, that is, in 1220 (*Processus* [Bologna], no. 12).

32 The law referred to, which required renunciation of all property (nos. 38, 42, 47), was explicitly attributed by Jordan (no. 87) to the chapter of 1220. Note also the details mentioned by friars Rudolph and Paul of Venice (nos. 32, 42).

33 By the three bulls issued on the occasion of the confirmation. The first (Laurent, no. 74) was a bull of papal protection of the goods and observances of the community in Toulouse. The second (no. 75) confirmed the Order of St. Dominic and took its laws and its property under the protection and government of the Pope ("We confirm your Order. . . the Order itself, its possessions, and rights we place under our government and protection"). The mention of the rights and of the government is especially important. The third bull (no. 77), addressed to the friars, adopted them as *speciales filios* ("hoping to cherish you in our favor as our special sons.") This is not the least important of these three privileges. In the late twelfth century, under Alexander III, this was a technical expression to signify exemption, essentially for those religious who on account of poverty could not pay a tax to the Church and were dispensed by the regular channel of exemption (Schreiber, I, 47 ff., 52-55). Like each of the terms in the vocabulary of the exemption, the expression, when popularized, underwent a change of meaning. Between 1243 and 1253 Innocent IV declared that it did not signify exemption, but meant simply that the religious thus qualified could be excommunicated only by the pope and the legates *a*

latere (c. 1, *De verborum significatione*, V, 12, in VI^o; Potthast, no. 15127). Even with this restriction, the privilege was still considerable, since it deprived the local clergy of the chief weapon they had continued to use against the Preachers. Altogether these privileges cast a remarkable light on the action of St. Dominic a few months later, when, independent of his Bishop (*Processus* [Bologna], no. 26), he dispersed his friars, and by this act transformed his Order into a world-wide organization.

34 *Processus* (Bologna), no. 33 (Brother Rudolph).

35 *Ibid.*, no. 2 (Brother Ventura of Verona).

36 Echard, I, 20.

37 Cf. the deposition of Brother John of Spain at the process of canonization (no. 26). The friars had recalled the difficulties of the monks of Grandmont, maltreated and starved by the lay brothers, to whom they had relinquished power over their temporalities in order to devote themselves to contemplation. This is recounted by Jacques de Vitry in his *Historia occidentalis*, pp. 313-15.

38 *Processus* (Bologna), nos. 32, 38, 41,

39 *Ibid.*, nos. 35, 41, 47. Here we may note that this is very indirect information; the speakers are not historians of legislation but witnesses to the virtues of St. Dominic. Their remarks on legislation are thus the more interesting.

40 These Institutions of Prémontré were published by Martène (*De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus*) in 1737 and 1783.

In publishing the Rodez text, Denifle has carefully noted the parts borrowed from the Institutions of Prémontré, according to Martène.

41 That is, concerning the Office and the habit. For the rest, reference was made to the First Distinction: "Concerning fasts, food, abstinence, faults, and all other matters, let them conduct themselves according to what is prescribed in the Rule of the canons" (Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 227).

42 The title *Liber consuetudinum*, on the other hand, no longer suited the whole Rule when the Second Distinction, or constitutional part proper, had been compiled. That is why the chapters 1248-51 decreed its removal. But even in 1220 or 1221, the Preachers had substituted for it the more modern term, *Institutiones*.

43 "Moreover, for each of these Distinctions we have designated appropriate chapters, and we have noted the titles so that when information is sought by a reader, it may be found without difficulty." Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 195.

We must not conclude from this that the Dominican legislator had already composed the Second Distinction; he was only copying this statement from the text of the Prologue of Prémontré. He anticipates the copying of other Constitutions later.

44 Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 194.

45 Humbert, *op. cit.*, II, 23. His explanation is this: "And perchance it was imposed through an oversight, because it was found in the Constitutions of certain religious who had only conventual prelates." His mistake was only a slight one: these religious were the first friars themselves.

46 Chap. 16 (cf. Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 203). The title of Master of the Order appeared for the first time in a letter of Honorius III on April 28, 1221, that is, between the first and second chapters of Bologna. Only at this second chapter does it seem to have been definitively adopted. Previous to that time the papal letters used the term Prior ordinis; the Institutions of 1220 that of praelatus major.

47 Chap. 14 (cf. Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 202).

48 It was derived from the Benedictine formula which required the three vows of "stability, conversion of morals, and obedience." The term *communitas* or *vita communis* was an equivalent for *conversatio morum* or *regularis*. It had a special significance in the canonical reform of the clergy. Cf. this passage, written in 1148 at the house of the Canons of St. Genevieve in Paris: "When we made our profession, therefore, we promised, as we well know, three things: chastity, the common life, and obedience" (*PL*, CXCVI, 1399).

If we consider this equivalence, we see that the form used in the Dominican Customs recalls the very formula of profession among the Premonstratensians:

"I Brother N., making an oblation, consecrate myself to the church of holy Mary, the Mother of God, and its holy patron; and I promise amendment of manners and stability of habitation, according to the Gospel of Christ and the apostolic institution and according to the Rule of St. Augustine. I also promise obedience even unto death in Christ our Lord, to my Lord N., pastor of the aforesaid Church and his successors, whom the more prudent part of the congregation will have chosen" (*PL*, CXCVIII, 479).

The Dominican formula suppressed the dedication to the local church, a difference of no slight importance. It likewise suppressed the qualification, "whom the more prudent part..." a phrase which was included, however, in the privilege of foundation in 1216 (Laurent, no. 74).

49 "Ego N. facio professionem et promitto obedientiam Deo, et beatae Mariae et tibi N. magistro ordinis praedicatorum et successoribus tuis secundum regulam beati Augustini et institutiones fratrum praedicatorum, quod ero obediens tibi tuisque successoribus usque ad mortem."

"I N. make my profession and promise obedience to God, and to the Blessed Mary and to you, N., Master of the Order of Preachers and to your successors according to the Rule of St. Augustine and the Institutions of the Friars Preachers, that I will be obedient to you and to your successors even unto death" (Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 202).

50 In 1216 and 1217 (Laurent, nos. 74, 79). In fact, it was more a question of stability in the Order and of obedience to the superior than of stability of place. By suppression of the offering of service to the local church and to its patron, the profession of the Preachers, after 1216, differed notably from that of the canons.

51 For example, its detailed lists of faults and penalties, borrowed from the Customs of Prémontré, which had ten remarkable chapters on faults, composed in part of Clunysian elements.

The law of fasting from September 14 to Easter (chap. 6; Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 198), which was also taken from Prémontré.

The Customs of Prémontré as the model for its composition; the Rule of Prouille (Balme, II, 425 f.; Simon, p. 143), which was composed by St. Dominic, certainly before 1217 and probably about 1212-

13, already had for a foundation the Customs of Prémontré; accordingly, in 1216 Dominic must have composed the Customs of the Friars on the model of these same texts of Prémontré. That is exactly what Humbert of Romans maintains (*De vita regulari*, II, 2 f.).

52 Absolute renunciation of property, and revenues (*Processus* [Bologna], nos. 32, 38, 42, 47), recorded in chap. 26; the rule to speak only of God or with God (*ibid.*, nos. 29, 32, 37, 41, 47), in chap. 31; the command not to carry money on a journey (*ibid.*, nos. 26, 38), in chap. 31; the command to study the Bible continually (the theological books, *ibid.*, no. 29), in chap. 28; the prohibition against employing in a temporal office a friar successful in preaching (*ibid.*, nos. 26, 32), chap. 31; the rule requiring only humble and unpretentious convents (*ibid.*, nos. 17, 32, 38), in chap. 35.

53 The renunciation of possessions and revenues (Jordan, no. 87), recorded in chap. 26; the alternation of the general chapters between Bologna and Paris (Jordan, no. 87), in chap. 13.

54 Martène, *Rit.*, III, 323; Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 194 f.

55 The last Distinction of Prémontré is introduced in these words: "In this Fourth Distinction can be found certain points which were passed by the community council in general chapter for the preservation of the Order and if anything different in character of emergency measures shall be decreed later, they can be appropriately inserted here" (Martène, *Rit.*, III, 323). That is exactly what the Second Distinction in the Rodez text shows. It will be noted that the brief summary of the First Distinction which the Prologue of the Preachers gives is also drawn from the Prologue of Prémontré. It is true also for the outline of the chapters of the First Distinction (the only index given in the Dominican text). On the contrary, the summary of the Second Distinction as given in the Rodez text is thoroughly original.

56 The Prologue, taken from Prémontré, expresses this idea: "Now this uniformity will doubtless be more easily and more perfectly observed if everything that ought to be done be committed to writing."

57 Still it must be remarked that these additions are few in number: only four as against fifteen in the Second Distinction. It is true that, if the redactor of the Rodez text had made all the corrections required by the chapter of 1236, there would have been one in the Prologue, ten in the first part, and eighteen in the second. On the other hand, the inclusion of these revisions prevents our considering the First Distinction as immutable. To the ten corrections of 1236 should be added the six of 1240. Everything inclines to the belief that these sixteen changes were not the only ones; the other seventeen general chapters, about which unfortunately we know so little, could not have failed to leave some trace in the first part of the Rodez text.

58 This argument must not be carried too far; certain titles indicated in the list might conceivably cover several chapters: for example, *De culpis* (chaps. 21 to 25); *De jeiunio et prandio*, which structurally, it seems, ought not to be separated from *De refectioe et cibo*, which seems to contain it implicitly; *De novitiis*, which does not expressly correspond to any chapter, can be at once put in its class: *De magistro novitiorum* (13), *De recipiendis* (14), *De tempore probationis* (15), *De modo faciendi professionem* (16). Three chapters are omitted from the list: *De mulieribus non intromittendis* (3), *De lectis* (10), *De scandalo fratrum* (18). Each of these chapters is extremely short: one sentence, three sentences, one sentence.

59 Thus it is that the provincial and general chapters, the institution of which does not go back farther than 1220 and 1221, are mentioned altogether four times in the First Distinction (chaps. 14, 23, 24); the Master General twice (chap. 16); the conventual prior, once (chap. 14). The number noted is limited in the extreme, if we consider that the prior or prelate who, in name, dates from 1216, is

mentioned more than sixty times. Further, the five passages containing these terms should be regarded as revisions; in fact, when they were formulated, a place had to be left in the text for the inclusion of these later articles. It was necessary, here, to determine action on grave faults as affecting their penalty or conditioning entrance into the Order. Indeed the additions made by the chapter of 1240 concern these paragraphs (*De recipiendis, De culpis*).

It might be remarked that the paragraphs relating to the novices (chaps. 13-16) must certainly evidence the largest proportion of additions or corrections of this kind. The institution there regulated changed greatly as the Order developed and took final shape. We even regard the chapters *De magistro novitiorum* and *De recipiendis* as the only primitive ones in the whole text in question, though not in their totality.

60 Prol.; Dist I, chaps. 14, 25; *Reg. convers.* In chap. 14 the word also belongs in an original text. The Order adhered to it in a special way; in fact, this admonition is found in the report of the chapter of 1246: "Likewise let all know that in that article which reads that no one may be received as a canon or lay brother, the word ought to be *canonicum*, and let those who do not have the word *canonicum* inscribe it there." In 1249-51, the text was modified, and the word *clericum* then appeared. *Acta capitulorum*, I, 44, 49, 55.

61 Dist. I, chap. 14. Once even there was mention of the Rule of St. Benedict (*Regula*, Dist. I, chap. 21), taken from the Benedictine Customs through the medium of Prémontré.

62 In its original meaning, the stability promised in the Benedictine profession was limited to stability of habitation. It appears in most formulas of canonical professions, and notably at Prémontré. The canons were indeed also attached to a particular church. But the word has no such meaning in the text of the Dominican Customs from which there was suppressed in 1216 from the formula of canonical profession the offering by which the religious devoted his person to the local church.

Moreover, the correct of stability in place had by that time evolved far from its original meaning. In expressly reserving to religious in the privileges of foundation the right to go later on to a more austere Order, the popes had made a first breach. A still more important derogation, because of its more frequent occurrence, came with the affiliation to the monasteries of subordinate foundations, priories, hermitages, and especially churches in which the canons officiated. Their local stability was broken.

In 1108, Pascal II recognized it: "For after a cleric is transferred by his bishop, or a monk by his abbot, from church to church and from monastery to monastery, he is not held by the bond of profession to stability of place and obedience to the abbot." Cited by Schreiber (11, 327); but the reference he gives is incorrect.

63 "Since the importunity of Lia is almost continually jealous of the desirable embraces of Rachel, we more insistently ask your Order and more earnestly beg that you who (by your Rule) sit at the feet of the Lord with Mary, should humbly implore...." Letter of Honorius III to the Preachers of Paris, December 30, 1220 (Laurent, no. 122). Cf. (*in Analecta O.P.*, III, 379) a letter in a quite similar vein, written by Gregory IX to the Preachers on March 29, 1227, a few days after his election. Rachel and Mary of Bethany represented the contemplative life, especially since the time of St. Gregory (*Moral.*, VI, chap. 18). In the early thirteenth century these figures were not used as images, but as technical allegories in theology.

On the other hand, in 1205, Innocent III considered that the apostolic life meant a renunciation of the "embrace of Rachel" for the Cistercian Peter of Castelnau (*PL*, CCXV, 525). It was the triumph of the genius of St. Dominic to have reversed this situation.

64 The command has even more force since it was addressed by Dominic to friars about to set forth on a preaching mission.

65 For St. Thomas, it is the singular state of bishops, preachers, and doctors, to be able to keep their action in an overflow of contemplation, whence his formula; "Thus it is better to give to others the fruits of contemplation than simply to contemplate. *Summa theol.*, IIa, IIae, q.188, a.6; cf. q.182, a.1 ad 1um; IIIa, q.40, a. 1 ad 2um.

66 Dist. II, chap. 26, realized it in one phrase: "no possessions or revenues may be received." This prescription is so typical and so comprehensive in its simplicity that, when the Second Council of Lyons sought to describe all mendicants in one phrase, it borrowed this expression: "(orders) in which profession according to the rule or constitution forbids the holding of revenues or possessions" (Hefele-Leclercq, VI, 201).

Other features of the apostolic life are detailed: not to carry money on a journey (Dist. II, chap. 31); always to have a companion (*ibid.*); to eat what is provided (Dist. 1, chap. 8); to travel on foot (*ibid.*, chap. 22).

67 We cannot estimate the magnificence of the successful combining in one Rule elements so apparently contrary as the regular conventual life and apostolic labor. It was a case of supernatural inspiration supplementing the characteristic genius of St. Dominic.

Salanhac (no. 3) aptly comments on this balance of elements from the Benedictine, Augustinian, and apostolic spirit as realized by St. Dominic in his life and in his Order. He concludes: "The glorious confessors, Augustine and Benedict, endowed him who, by training in regular discipline, prepared himself for the office of preaching. For as he was a canon by profession, he was a monk in the austerity of his life, in fasts, in abstinence, in vesture, in the dormitory, in the discipline of silence and of the chapter, as well as in the other observances found in the Rule of St. Benedict, almost all of which, along with other special practices, he ordained should be observed. Likewise, as we profess the Rule of St. Augustine, he also observed it and gave it to others to be observed. Over and above that, according to the increasing grace of the apostolic rule, he required that we should not have possessions, that we should not use horses but travel about on foot, carrying neither silver nor gold, reaching and working for the salvation of men; contented only with the food at and according to the admonition in St. Luke 10:7, eating and drinking such things as they have. Desiring to do more, the holy man abstained from meat and willed and decreed that his sons should abstain, knowing what was said to the innkeeper: 'Whatsoever thou shalt spend over and above, I, at my return, will repay thee' (Luke 10:35). Therefore, it is evident to anyone who judges without prejudice, that the holy man was a canon by the vow of his profession, a monk by the austerity of his life, an apostle by the office of preaching."

68 Dist. 1, chap. 17.

69 Let him teach them "how assiduous they must be in study so that day or night, at home or abroad, they may be engaged in reading or meditation" (Dist. 1, chap. 13).

70 "If anyone shall fall asleep while studying, etc..... (Dist. I, chap. 21). Cf. the recommendation to visitators: "whether they dwell in peace, are assiduous in study, fervent in preaching," etc. (Dist. II, chap. 18).

71 "All the hours should be recited in the church *breviter et succincte* so that the brethren may not lose devotion and that their studies may suffer as little interruption as possible" (Dist. I, chap. 4); the chapter "may also be omitted at times, lest study should be hindered" (*ibid.*, chap. 1).

72 The office of master of students was an original creation of St. Dominic.

73 We use the term "theological studies" as the expression was understood in 1220: study of Holy Scripture, according to the method of questions and disputation. The prescriptions of 1220 fall into line with this academic ideal. St. Dominic's preaching was marked by it even in 1206.

74 While full of wisdom and urbanity, this recommendation treats the exemption of the Preachers as regards the bishops. They should, if they can, visit them and ask their direction, but they are not required to ask of them the commission to preach.

75 By the institution of general chapters, the Order of Cîteaux had already brought its Constitution into line with this law, so characteristic of the medieval period. But it did not modify the patriarchal and even feudal role of the abbot, who held a pivotal place in the Benedictine organization.

The religious world of the twelfth century, and Prémontré in particular, felt the influence of Cîteaux. Yet there remained a considerable stretch to be covered in order to adapt the ancient edifice of religious government to the lines of contemporary law: this was the feat which the Rule of St. Dominic accomplished.

76 In its principles, organs, and its fundamental balance, this legislative section was already contained in the text of 1220. Legislation at once collective, centralized, elective. It was already sketched in 1216.

77 The essential organ in the remarkably centralized body of the Preachers is not the Master of the Order but the general chapter, or, as it were, the complex combination of the Master and the chapter, with the chapter predominant. Final decisions are with the chapter. The Master governs between chapters. Further, the primitive legislation treats exclusively of the chapter and its rights in relation to the Master; not a word is said about the powers of the Master; but reference is often made to his possible excesses.

78 There may have been some influences from the Franciscan province (1217) on the Dominican province (1221); as in the chapters celebrated by both Orders on the feast of St. Michael (cf. *Regula I^a*, chap. 18, ed. Boehmer, p. 12; Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 218). The status of the provincial chapter among the Minors before 1221 is far from being clear. However, the differences are fundamental.

The Franciscan province was the very first step in the organization of an Order whose authority was still vested in one man, St. Francis. The province is a decentralized subdivision; the typical organ in the Franciscan system is the minister provincial, vicar of St. Francis. The provincial chapter is a huge gathering of all the Franciscans of a particular region.

The Preachers, on the other hand, had from the first developed a solid and classic conventual organization. The central authority, constituted in 1220 in the complex organ of the chapter of the representatives and of the Master, had been exactly balanced and arranged in anticipation by this conventual organization. The necessity of decentralization or of an administrative subdivision never made itself felt as it did with the Minors.

Another need, however, was felt, as it was by other monks and canons, that of regular control. To be efficacious, this control had to be regional. Thus it was that when all the great orders of the twelfth century, following the lead of Cîteaux, strove to establish this control by universal federation of convents, with the aid of general chapters and regular visitation, the thirteenth century saw the birth of regional federation. There was the organization of the provincial chapters of canons in Germany (middle of the twelfth century), the organization at Prémontré of visitation in the province (beginning of the thirteenth century), the "chambrière" at Cluny (beginning of the thirteenth century), and especially canon 12 of the Lateran Council (1215), which had an immediate influence on the provincial

institution of the Preachers.

It is worthy of note that the general chapter, universal, and commanding full authority, is primarily a legislative organ. The provincial chapter, with limited and regional authority, is primarily an organ of control. This results in two different but parallel bodies. That feature has been preserved in the Order. It is a magnificent heritage.

79 The power and duty of the Master and of the provincial are not defined by the law of the Preachers. This is owing to the fact that, on the one hand, the characteristic organ of the Preachers is the collective authority; on the other hand, personal authority exists of itself, and there is no need of describing it with the minutiae detailed for the original and complex organs of the chapters. That does not mean that personal authority has no importance with the Preachers, or that it may not be very characteristic. On the contrary. But its qualities are not stamped by legislation. They are rather the fruit of events and circumstances. The attitude of St. Dominic and especially his relations and the relations of his Order with the Holy See have contributed more than any other factor to determine the role of the Master. Finally, general trends in the thirteenth century seem to explain more clearly the nature of personal powers in the Order of Preachers.

80 This process of confirmation seems a definition of later date than the text under consideration, but previous to 1228.

81 Canon 12 of the Lateran Council did not, as is sometimes said, impose a general chapter on religious orders. On canons regular and monks of a like rule (kingdom or province) it imposed the celebration of chapters on the model of those begun by Cîteaux. Four persons were to preside at the chapters; visitors were to be elected, and the place of the next chapter designated (Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1342).

This prescription did not greatly influence the institution of the general chapter of the Preachers (which would have been instituted in any case), but the provincial chapter. In fact, the assembly of the convents of one section was much more efficacious or correction and visitation than the universal assembly. That fact explains the prescription of the canon for a provincial assembly. Moreover, the "Provincial Text" of the Preachers is inspired directly by the text of this canon. It also provided for the nomination of four definitors who would preside over the chapter. At the chapter, visitors for the province would be elected; faults would be corrected; the place of the next chapter would be appointed. In the Dominican texts the province is referred to repeatedly by the same expression as in canon 12 (Dist. II, chaps. 15, 16).

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

CHAPTER XXV

The Project of the Rule

THE PROTOTYPE OF THE ORDERS OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

THE year 1215 forged the bond of a central articulation in the history of religious orders. Up to that time the monastic and canonical orders of St. Benedict or of St. Augustine dominated the foreground of the scene. The twelfth century saw the ascendancy and influence of the Order of Cîteaux over most of the other forms of regular life. Early in the thirteenth century this pre-eminence was even confirmed by canon 12 of the Lateran Council, which, on an essential point of legislation regarding annual general or provincial chapters, imposed imitation of the Cistercians on all monks and canons.⁽¹⁾ At the same time, canon 13, by forbidding new foundations of a non-existent type, seemed to favor an arresting of the evolution and a confining of the regular movement within the mold perfected in the twelfth century.⁽²⁾

Yet, by an irony of history, it was the very same hour that brought forth the two great mendicant Orders of the Minors and the Preachers. Within just a few months of the Lateran Council, the Order of St. Dominic received a definitive confirmation, in fulfillment of a promise previously made. With the rise of this institution, the face and figure of the regular movement was considerably transformed. New problems and original solutions, fresh forces of evolution and characteristic types, worked themselves out. The age of the mendicant orders had begun. The ancient orders did not disappear, nor could they even be said to have been neglected; yet they no longer represented the principal and vivifying flow of the regular movement; in their turn, they were modified by the current of the new apostolic orders.

Undoubtedly the most remarkable phenomenon in this history of the orders of the thirteenth century was the decisive part taken by the papacy. The intervention of the Sovereign Pontiffs in the genesis of the new institutes, the echo of their more and more intimate influence in the life of Christendom, was already forecast, beginning in the growing success of Cluny in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and that of Cîteaux in the twelfth century. Before the thirteenth century, however, the work of the popes consisted mainly in supporting a privileged Order by great favors and exemptions, by frequent and glorious appeals for the service of the religious. The popes had approved of their enterprises, had fostered them. Never had they called them into being.

INTERVENTION OF THE POPES

In the case of the mendicant orders, on the other hand, the intervention of the popes was of a decidedly essential and vital character. Although it is true that the popes could not have created the spiritual current of lay piety and the apostolic life which kindled the initial spark in all the orders of the thirteenth century, at least they recognized its power and value and conceived the desire of giving it permanence in Catholic life. Their design directed the progressive accession of fraternities of spontaneous origin into forms of conventual and clerical life, and ultimately into the mixed and apostolic life in which the orders of the thirteenth century found their equilibrium and their very essence.

In this very formal sense the popes were the true "institutors," with few exceptions, of the orders of the thirteenth century, in a way in which they were not for those of the preceding period. Sensing the tempo of this evolution, the Church attentively encouraged the tendencies which she found infused into the heart of these fraternities by a few individuals. Where she did not find them, she challenged them to come forth. She imposed her own command upon them. Thus the popes of the thirteenth century

succeeded in achieving a plan for regular institutions with a continuity that would eventually be perfectly clear, even as Innocent III at the beginning of the century had to a certain degree foreseen. A careful study of the origin of the Humiliati, the Preachers, the Minors, the Servites, the Carmelites, the Augustinians, to name only the principal ones, leaves no doubt on this point.

From this intervention on the part of the popes arose some of the very elemental features in the history of the orders of the thirteenth century: the part played in their creation by cardinals or papal legates, an Ugolino, a Hugh of St. Cher, a Richard Annibaldi;(3) the role of the cardinal protector, to whose government, protection, and correction the new order was bound by direct obedience;(4) the profession made by all the members of each order to a single head, who was himself required to take an oath to the Sovereign Pontiff and petition him for his confirmation,(5) the frequent establishment of a major house near the Roman Curia.(6) Unprecedented as they were, such elements would in themselves testify to the authoritative intervention of the popes in the foundations of the thirteenth century and their intention to keep a directing hand in the formation and development of the new religious companies.

CONSTITUTION OF A TYPE ORDER

This era in the history of religious orders began in 1215 with the inauguration of the Preachers. More than one characteristic trait of the future institutes and their genesis could be recognized even then. Was not the Order of St. Dominic the first of the mendicant orders? Yet because of the many special features that marked its origin, attention should be focused, not on its being the initiator of the characteristic foundations of the thirteenth century, but rather on its being the creator of their prototype, an exemplary society which in its turn became an essential motor-power in the history of future orders.

This new religious society presented to the papacy a different aspect from that presented by the other companies or fraternities of lay origin out of which the other orders of the thirteenth century emerged. When in 1215 Innocent III and Dominic laid the foundation for the Canons-Preachers of Toulouse, they could at once assign to them the very program for preaching and teaching doctrine, which canon 11 of the Lateran Council had attempted in vain to impose on the dioceses, a program which later all the mendicant orders would assume, at times only after long aberrations.

Dominic placed at the service of the Church a community of clerics, capable of receiving immediately by commission the office of doctrinal preaching, which they had already exercised fruitfully in southern France, a good field for the experiment. Moreover, when these priests assumed the essential responsibilities of the apostolic life, they took upon themselves the regular common life according to the classic form of the canonical institution. Finally, through his antecedents, his experiences, and his particular genius as an organizer, Dominic enjoyed the full confidence of Rome. No protector, no legate was given to him; Honorius III took the young foundation "under his own government";(7) all power was concentrated in the hands of the Founder(8) and the capitular assembly of his brethren. Given the impetus and support of the pope, four years later the friars of St. Dominic had spread through the universal Church, and the first community of Canons-Preachers found itself transformed into a great Order. When it had drawn up its first Constitution in the general chapter of 1220, all the elements recommended and projected by the Sovereign Pontiffs as desirable in future foundations to provide for the urgent needs of souls and of the Church, took form in the Order of Preachers and reached stabilization in a strong Rule.

All the elements were assured: a clerical life, a program of doctrinal preaching and pastoral work, a discipline and provision for regular life, a flexible centralization at once personal and collective, a

contemplation and a radiation in "apostolic life." This young and vigorous society with its perfectly balanced Rule inspired such a confidence on the part of the papacy that from 1220 on there was no longer any question of government by the pope or of intervention or of the oath or confirmation of the master general. Both for its life and for its legislation, the Order was left in its own hands, entrusted (Z7) to the guidance of its chapters and its masters. It came into its majority at the age of four. If, as early as 1215, Innocent III saw growing before his vision the prototype of diocesan companies of regular priest-preachers whom he could call upon for all Christendom, in 1220 Honorius III and the new societies in process of evolution found ready for their imitation the exemplary type and the Rule of an *ordo praedicatorum*,⁽⁹⁾ so that by the end of the thirteenth century all the mendicant orders had in some way felt the impress of its nature.

CHANCELLOR OF THE EMPIRE

The ideals and hopes then conceived at Rome and in official circles in regard to the Order of Preachers are evidenced in a precious document from the pen of an illustrious contemporary. In November, 1220, the coronation of his master, Emperor Frederick II, brought Conrad of Scharfeneck, bishop of Metz and chancellor of the Empire, into relations with the Pope and Cardinal Ugolino in Rome. Upon his return to Germany he wrote this letter:

Conrad, by the grace of God, Bishop of Metz and Legate of the Imperial Palace, to all who read these letters, salvation in the Lord.

Since, according to the Blessed Gregory, the greatest gift which this life can give is zeal for souls, and since we believe with a great number of worthy men that by the zeal and under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit the Order of Preachers has been constituted by the Lord Pope and confirmed by him, an Order worthy of praise, which seeks through preaching for no gain but souls, we announce to you that we have received the brothers of this Order in grace and favor under our guidance and devoted protection.

Furthermore, knowing that if this Order possessed a house in the city of Metz their community could render great services not only to the laity through their preaching, but also to the clerics through their lectures in sacred science, and that this would be following, the example of many archbishops and bishops and of the Lord Pope who has given them a house in Rome, we advise you, with salutary exhortation, to give aid and counsel to these friars.⁽¹⁰⁾

The work of the Pope in the institution and development of the Preachers, the admiration and hope which their apostolate inspired, their learning, their poverty of life, and their sound organization, all this accounts for the early and the brilliant power of the Order of Preachers. It also explains the dominant influence it would exercise on religious congregations of the thirteenth century.

Though the Constitutions of the Preachers contributed only one part of that influence, it was a choice part, because legislation, the cornerstone of stability in a regular institution, raised the most delicate problem in the genesis of the thirteenth-century apostolic orders, the needs of which were almost contradictory. That influence, and even that alone, would be worth the difficulty entailed in describing and analyzing it; it is extremely significant.

Further, as a type of Augustinian legislation, the Rule of St. Dominic, by the inherent force of events, replaced the *Disciplina monasterii*, that is, the primitive Rule of St. Augustine, which might be regarded as the legislation par excellence on the "apostolic life." The new Rule and its influence spanned without any break the history of the legislation of St. Augustine. Essentially and universally

the Rule of the Preachers was the heir of the apostolic law of Augustine in the thirteenth century. In this study, therefore, a section on the influence of the Dominican law should run in normal sequence to the history of the Rule of the Bishop of Hippo.

INFLUENCE OF THE DOMINICAN CONSTITUTIONS

In the course of the thirteenth century the rules of a large number of religious societies were modeled in various ways and often in great measure on that of the Preachers. The reason is now known. If, as it was constituted, the Order of Preachers was to be the prototype of religious foundations of the thirteenth century, its religious Rule should naturally have a share in its influence.

First, the radiation of its influence was spontaneous. Here something fundamental should be recalled, namely, that the Preachers from the first quarter of the century had a superior and typical organization, created in view of the specific needs of the age and animated by its particular spirit; in virtue of this it possessed a directive and attractive power that would draw contemporary foundations within its orbit.

Moreover, with a personnel of educated men, superior to the ecclesiastical rank and file of their time, the Order of Preachers was certain to exert influence through this intermediary. In fact, in the beginnings of many orders which borrowed much from the Dominican Constitutions, certain celebrated Preachers appear: Blessed Jordan of Saxony, friend of Aymon of Faversham, with the Franciscans;⁽¹¹⁾ St. Raymond of Peñafort, counselor of St. Peter Nolasco, for the Mercedarians;⁽¹²⁾ St. Peter Martyr, guide of the Servites; Hugh of St. Cher, reformer of the Carmelites, and so on. Nor was this legislative influence of the sons of Dominic confined within the domain, vast though it was, of religious life. It was St. Raymond of Peñafort who compiled the book of the Decretals, at the command of Gregory IX; about the year 1233, Dominicans reformed the laws of a large number of communes of the Marches and Lombardy.⁽¹³⁾

The features we have emphasized as fundamental would suffice in themselves to explain the general phenomenon whereby the new orders of the thirteenth century evolved in their organization toward the form created by the Preachers. But the trend was so universal and concentrated that an understanding of it would require an appeal to another agency already taken into account: the Holy See itself had approved and promoted in the Order of Preachers a type perfectly conformed to the ideals of the Church and to the needs of the time. Its action, discreet yet lawful, might be regarded as the power behind the great success of the Constitutions of this Order. However it was, we shall briefly review the evidence attending this remarkable permeation of Dominican influence.

INFLUENCE ON MENDICANT RULES

That the mendicant rules should have been affected by the legislation of St. Dominic was, in the first place, natural. All of them bear its mark. Although the changed form in which they have come down to us only imperfectly reveals their form at the time of the first borrowings, it is not difficult to find in them texts from the Rule of the Preachers. From one end to the other, the Constitutions of the Minors (1260) included numerous sentences, paragraphs, summaries, or transpositions of chapters: these texts are but the evidence of a progressive attempt to parallel the legislation of the Minors in line with that of the Preachers. This was achieved gradually in the years 1220, 1221, 1223, and particularly in 1239. The Constitution of the Saccati except for a few passages, purely and simply reproduced those of the Preachers (before 1241). That of the Carmelites, which also runs constantly parallel, was traced on their model, perhaps in 1250. That of the Augustinians (1284-90) still retains at the base of later developments and along with them numerous Dominican articles that likewise stand as evidence of a complete legislative concordance. This influence had been at work, even before the founding of the

Order of the Augustinians, on some one of the branches that constituted it; doubtless the Bonites or Brothers of Brittono (between 1239 and 1251).

Identical in form with those adopted by the mendicant orders, the Constitutions of the Servites (1256-57?) were fashioned almost word for word on the pattern of that of the Preachers.[\(14\)](#) After the secession of the lay element prompted the pope's command to make their government clerical (beginning of the fourteenth century), the Order of Mercy recast its Constitutions on the model of the Preachers. About the same time the Humiliati of Lombardy revised their legislation in accord with the Dominican Constitutions.[\(15\)](#) A short time later the "United Friars of Armenia" adopted the Constitutions of the Preachers.[\(16\)](#)

In quite another category, certain canons regular and even some canonical orders likewise sought the legislation of the Preachers. Though not at all surprising, it is splendid testimony to the wide power of radiation inherent in the Dominican law. Using Dominican texts as an exclusive model, the Crosiers of Belgium built the Rule of a powerful congregation (1248).[\(17\)](#)

The Regular Chapter of Belley, reformed by Hugh of St. Cher (1248), compiled their Rule on the same pattern.[\(18\)](#) This would happen more than once in connection with the many reforms entrusted to the Preachers in the course of the thirteenth century.

It is more surprising to find the part played by Dominican law as the prototype of a whole series of statutes (after 1249) for Hôtels-Dieu, the offshoots of which are to be found at Lille, Pontoise, Vernon.[\(19\)](#) This impress is, in fact, much more significant than it might at first appear. The hospitaller foundations that arose in great numbers in the twelfth century changed in the thirteenth century, under the strong pressure of the Church, from their life as seculars without vows to a life as a religious community. The statutes of the Institute of St. John of Jerusalem contributed almost all the regulations for hospital activity, but the great regular laws, and the law of the Preachers in particular, inspired what constituted the common observance.

Lastly, it would be interesting to compare with the prescriptions fundamental for the scholastic life of the Preachers the different educational statutes which the ancient monastic or canonical orders elaborated or developed when, drawn into the movement inaugurated by the sons of St. Dominic, they ardently devoted themselves to the work of study and appeared in the *Studium Parisiense*.

ORDERS OF WOMEN

Paralleling the radiation of the Constitutions of the Preachers in the legislation of the orders of men, another of no less importance spread through the orders of women. The two great Rules for religious women in the twelfth century -- originated by Prémontré and by Cîteaux -- were in the thirteenth century (the one before 1198, the other in 1228) found inadequate to the urgent task of regulating the new currents of feminine devotion. The Rule of St. Sixtus provided what was required, especially in Germany.[\(20\)](#) But this was none other than the Dominican Rule of Prouille, the oldest part of which was like a sketch of the first Custom of the Order. Moreover, evidently it was revised after the compilation of these Customs and was completed by statutes drawn from the first Constitutions of the Preachers. Later, after the Rule of St. Sixtus, the Preachers wrote and elaborated another Rule for their sisters, which followed the development of their own Constitutions. Finally, in England, an important Rule for women, called the "Ancren Riwe," seems to have been inspired by prescriptions in the law of the Preachers.[\(21\)](#) Nor does that represent fully the extent of influence exercised by the Dominican law. If the Rule of the Order of Penance of St. Dominic, in consequence of the circumstances attending its institution, had no relation to it, other forms of semi-regular life were affected by it, doubtless

through the apostolic activity of the friars. As a curious example of this, we mention the two recluses of Bischofsheim who, in 1293, adopted the Rule and the Constitutions of the Preachers.(22) In some instances the effect was limited to the adoption of the Office, as was the case with the Teutonic Order.(23) Finally, the use of the Dominican habit, a tendency which called forth a papal pronouncement, had its own particular sidelight: the desire of unorganized groups to use the fame of the Preachers to procure their own advantage, particularly to collect alms. Yet it might be also the sign of a legislative influence.

ORDERS OF MEN

In this varied influence the most significant phase was the action exerted by the law of the Preachers on the communities of men formed in the thirteenth century. Minors, Carmelites, Augustinians, Poor Catholics,(24) Saccati, Servites, Mercedarians, Humiliati, all the foundations of any importance, showed its penetrating influence. In every case the process was clearly the same.

Those who came within the orbit of this influence were caught up in a "movement" of lay origin, drawn by a powerful attraction for spiritual perfection, for a life of prayer and penance. They longed to practice literally the Gospel teaching of detachment, and their aspirations toward a more simple life breathed a naive disregard of rules with a scorn for set forms, as fostering a routine way of life. The incomparable spirit of St. Francis comes to mind at once. A similar evangelical trend, though less purely Catholic, ran into the current of the Waldensian movement, became the source of the Humiliati, and doubtless also of the Saccati, all of whom rose out of the Albigensian soil in Provence.

The first seven Servites, while still married, longed for a life of prayer and solitude, away from urban conventions, according to the ideal of the Gospel. The Carmelites, Bonites, Friars of Brittno, Tuscan anchorites, all were hermits, devout laymen. From the outset they developed more or less completely their life of prayer and poverty, outside the walls of the cloistered and classic common life of monasteries with their assured economy and Latin liturgy. This desire for solitary prayer also accompanied the inclination to various evangelical labors, such as the care of lepers, and the exercise of the apostolate in a simple and spontaneous way. In the religious unrest of the masses in that age, there was no spiritually-minded person who did not attract others, no ascetic who did not feel himself an apostle. The thirteenth century saw the development of the aspirations of the twelfth century toward the apostolic life, the life of the primitive Church.(25) The Franciscan movement summarized and surpassed all the others, not only in the lofty holiness of its Founder and his ardent obedience to the Church, but also in the personality of the friars whom Francis attracted, many of them clerics and men of learning whose contribution was notable in the rapid evolution of the movement. Moreover, it was the most advanced of these Catholic movements in the understanding of its apostolate as one of "penitential exhortation."

The influence of the Dominican Constitutions on these rudimentary associations accompanied or supplemented a first attempt on the part of the Church to transform these fraternities of spontaneous growth into orders properly so called, to direct them into a conventual and regular life as well as to a minimum of organization, and finally to make them clerical to some extent. Indeed, such a program was indispensable. Picture, for example, the Franciscan bands before 1220: animated by an earnest spirit, increased to the point of extension in a great number of provinces and of meeting in annual assemblies of several thousand men, yet without a regulated common life, lodged in poor cabins, without novitiate, without profession, without local authority, with nothing to give shape to this inorganic mass but the great Pentecostal gathering and the spiritual direction of Francis and the provincial ministers.(26) The effort of the Church to give a clerical and conventual form to those masses is evidenced by the bull of institution of the novitiate with the Minors (1220) and the revision

of the Rule of St. Francis (1221, 1223),⁽²⁷⁾ by the correction of the Rule of the Carmelites (1247),⁽²⁸⁾ and even more simply still by the grant to the Servites (1240) and the various pre-Augustinian groups (1228, 1231, 1243) of the Rule of the Bishop of Hippo which completed the great privilege of foundation (1244, 1253, 1255).

At this stage the influence of the life of the Preachers, if not of their statutes, was already felt.⁽²⁹⁾ The privilege that gradually stabilized the various groups that would form the future Order of Augustinians was particularly remarkable.⁽³⁰⁾ It was none other than the classic privilege for the foundation of canons given to the Preachers, December 22, 1216. There was absolutely no precedent for constituting eremitical groups of lay origin into an *ordo canonicus*. Were not canons by very definition clerics? If it was necessary to affiliate these hermits at least legally to one of the approved forms of religious life, would it not be the normal thing to introduce them to the contemplative life and in the lay division of an *ordo monasticus*?⁽³¹⁾ Real anomaly as this is, it will be understood better if we recall that under the influence of Innocent III the first evangelical Order of the Humiliati was likewise constituted as a canonical order and that the clerical Order of Preachers was the pattern on which all these new foundations would be gradually and completely remodeled. The Commentary of St. Augustine was exercising its own weight in the trend of this assimilation.

In this light the nature of the rules taken from the Constitutions of the Preachers is explicable. The new religious companies first of all took a certain number of rules for common life and ascetic practices, as well as for canonical and clerical observance; liturgy and ceremonies, fast and abstinence, housing, novitiate, profession, shaving, chapter of faults, and lists of faults. In the case of the Saccati and the Servites (and the Crosier Canons), the proportion of the Rule adopted was ponderous; it was notable with the Augustinians, and evident with the Minors. It filled a basic need. A common life, a novitiate, and liturgical observance could not be improvised all at once; besides, the Commentary of St. Augustine, if not the Rules of St. Francis and St. Albert, required this indispensable complement of regular customs. The orders of the thirteenth century could, no doubt, have searched out statutes directly from the rules of the monks and canons; as a matter of fact, the text of the Preachers holds the trace of a certain number of prescriptions taken from Prémontré and even from Cîteaux. Nevertheless the new groups looked neither to Prémontré nor Cîteaux, but to the Preachers.

In the Rule of the Preachers they found observances, already selected, adapted, and completed in accord with exigencies of the apostolic life, notably of mendicant poverty. From this point of view what was borrowed had a distinctly formal character. It was not a question of assuming merely any set of observances, but the observances of the Preachers. Further, even in the case of the Crosiers, where the transcribed texts were carefully limited to canonical prescriptions, these texts carried with them the stamp of something proper to the life of the Preachers; an orientation toward study and the apostolate much more pronounced than with the ancient canons.

Therein lay a noteworthy feature of the influence of the Rule of St. Dominic.⁽³²⁾

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

Study and the apostolate, however, did not constitute the chief feature in this sphere of influence. The orders of the thirteenth century were indebted to the Preachers particularly for their social organization: prior general and priors provincial, general and provincial chapters, elections, definitors, visitations, itinerants, measures of protection from internal disorder and narrowness, and so on, all the institutional legislation of the Preachers carried over into the orders of contemporary or later origin, most often in substance, but sometimes even verbatim.

The Preachers invented neither the obedience of a whole group to a chief who takes an oath of submission to the pope, nor the periodic meeting of the whole society in general assembly. This mode of organization, which was characteristic of the mendicant orders, existed from the beginning in the Franciscan fraternity (1210) and developed in all the later foundations. It was perfected by the designation of responsible subordinate heads and the meeting of general assemblies in the various regions (provinces) to which the movement spread. But in the face of these unwieldy masses and in the absence of any legislation to determine exactly the form, the functions assigned, and the legal relations of these various elements, the organization remained rudimentary and inadequate. This condition was evidenced by the grave crises which the Minors and the Augustinians experienced about the middle of the century. But it was quite otherwise in the Order of Preachers. The centralizing impulse from the Holy See at work in a canonical form of life already established and embraced by educated men, often lawyers by profession, had long since resulted in an organic constitution admirably balanced and precise. This instrument could not fail to exercise a regulative action.

In 1239, after the serious difficulties in the government of Brother Elias, Aymon of Faversham borrowed a major part of the text of the Preachers for the writing of the first constitutional rule of the Friars Minor, based on the Narbonne Constitutions. It is possible that about the same time (1247?) the Carmelites, under the direction of Hugh of St. Cher and of William d'Anthérade, their Dominican correctors, modeled on the legislative type of the Preachers a rule which they have since retained. In 1248, the Crosiers, using the constitutional texts of the Preachers, succeeded in establishing a congregation in which the federative form, classic among canons, was notably enriched with elements of personal centralization.⁽³³⁾ In 1253, the great difficulties of the Order of John Buoni caused the Pope to create a new organization of the Augustinian hermits, who were established on the centralized type of the Order of the Preachers; that was the last step preliminary to the great amalgamation of 1256,⁽³⁴⁾ In that year the Servites obtained the right to elect a prior general and also became independent of the Augustinian Order. This change apparently afforded them the occasion to make the Constitutions of the Preachers the foundation of their own.⁽³⁵⁾ In all these cases the influence of the Dominican legislation gave to the orders of the thirteenth century a vigorous and definite structure, thoroughly modern in its lines.

One last aspect calls for mention, the influence of the Dominican Constitutions in rearing thirteenth century orders into apostolic societies. Here the examination of documents discloses only a limited influence.

The Saccati, who took their whole first legislation from the Preachers, also adopted their formal texts on study and preaching. The Constitution of the Minors also retains traces of the Dominican prescriptions. But, except for these two instances, apparently the influence of the Dominican text itself was relatively slight in the evolution which, by the end of the thirteenth century, carried the life of mendicant orders a little closer to the scholarly and preaching life of the sons of St. Dominic. Not any of the societies that took the Prologue of St. Dominic accepted the aim of the Preachers, as it was precisely defined therein: As "our Order was especially instituted from the beginning for preaching and the salvation of souls, our study ought to be directed principally, ardently, and supremely to the end that we may be useful to the souls of our neighbor."

Evidently this difference was owing to the fact that not any of the orders of the thirteenth century was in a position to formulate such a summary of its early history. Among them only the Friars of St. Francis, and perhaps also the Saccati of Provence, were from the outset authorized to engage in a certain form of evangelization. Even so, study and doctrinal preaching were outside the range of the program and the rules of St. Francis. The trend toward the apostolate and study as carried on by the Preachers found only a marginal entry in the primitive texts of the Franciscans, and this was effected,

to a certain extent, in spite of them.(36) What is more, at the particular period when the Constitutions of the Preachers were used to shape the various communities of hermits, there was still no thought of drawing these companies into the apostolate of learned preaching, but only of getting them established, bringing them into dependence upon the Holy See, and little by little making them clerical. The scholarly and apostolic expansion was felt only later, in the last quarter of the century.(37) Probably this change was precipitated by canon 23 of the Second Council of Lyons. This canon, since in principle it suppressed all the orders given to begging, threatened the future state of the Carmelites and Augustinians. It is worded as follows:

"The Order of Carmel and the Hermits of St. Augustine, whose foundations antedate the aforesaid council, we permit to continue *in suo statu* till we ordain otherwise. Decision will not have been taken in their regard . . . For we intend to provide for these . . . such measures as we may deem expedient for the salvation of souls and for their own welfare."(38)

Since this statement directly followed a reference to the Preachers and the Friars Minor "whose eminent usefulness to the universal Church is apparent," the implication was clear; there was nothing for the other orders to do but to place themselves at the immediate service of the Church and to strive for a fruitful apostolate, according to the practice of the Preachers and the Friars Minor. The Carmelites and the Augustinians understood and responded. They had at that date already attained such a development that they could compose their own academic legislation. No longer did the influence of the Preachers have to flow through the medium of its legislative text.

THE CRITICAL PERIOD (1215-74)

Two canons of ecumenical councils thus place in perspective the history of the influence of the Preachers. In 1215 there was a decree which would deal the death blow to all new orders before their birth. In 1274 another decree renewed the fifty-year-old pronouncement, but, for all its rigor, it exempted the four mendicant orders. The years between the two canonical decrees saw a surge of spiritual forces, an intense germination of fraternities or religious companies, and efforts on the part of the Church to discipline and mold these masses to fit the shape of her own needs. Crises ensued. Certain excesses in the new movements aroused strong opposition on the part of bishops, the secular clergy, and the old orders. Between these two critical dates when the universal Church made pronouncements regarding the foundation of new orders in the thirteenth century, the institution of the Preachers formed the wedge that opened the way to a final acceptance of the four mendicant orders. In this achievement the influence of the statutes of the Preachers was of no little importance.

Their action was not felt steadily during the half-century span. Almost all the dates cited in this connection fall within the second third of the thirteenth century, under the pontificates of Innocent IV and Alexander IV. It was an era of great activity for the Sovereign Pontiffs and their legates (Richard Annibaldi and Hugh of St. Cher), who sought to normalize the movements of lay piety. The same era saw the outbreak in Paris of the violent quarrel over the mendicant orders. There was nothing fortuitous in what occurred. In his *Defensio fratrum mendicantium*, written at this time, the Friar Minor, John Peckham, has left us the suggestive recriminations of an enemy of the mendicants, as follows:

"Look at these canons, see these regulars, behold the men of Grandmont, think of the Templars and certain other very popular groups, laymen in their lack of learning, seculars in their way of life.

"So it is that the bearded Hermits, the magpied Friars (Carmelites), the Saccati, the Baptists, the Crucifers, the Williamites, while in the act of becoming, are already on the verge of ruin; they have a sorry reputation; their yesterdays are upon them.

"Like to them, the Cordeliers and the Jacobins, although far removed from this form, although of holy life, and although firmly grafted on the vine of Christ, will in their turn end by following the beaten path."⁽³⁹⁾ The Latin of the original is not always intelligible, and it is difficult to identify some of the references; the meaning, however, is clear. In the wake of the Cordeliers and the Jacobins, and without the semblance of regularity, there circled a large, unlettered multitude of laymen living a quasi-secular life. In the procession are Carmelites, Saccati, Crucifers, Williamites, and a vast number of unclassified hermits, preceded by the earlier Order of Grandmont, the order of endless reincarnations. These masses in full decline seemed destined for inglorious ruin, and about to sweep to a like fate the Preachers and the Friars Minor, ⁽⁴⁰⁾ notwithstanding their hitherto irreproachable life.

Such circumstances made it imperative for the Church to be more vigorous than ever in dealing with this mixed throng that was compromising the modern foundation of the two great mendicant orders. The final fusion of the various branches of the Augustinians and Poor Catholics, the organization of the Servites, the Williamites, and the Hermits of the White Mantle⁽⁴¹⁾ -- this achievement of Alexander IV in realizing the projects of his predecessors is seen when viewed in perspective as the generous intervention of the Pope in favor of the mendicants (1255-56).

In fact, the two influences, that of the Church and that of the Order of Preachers, were closely connected. In the year 1255, everything in the history of the mendicant orders came suddenly to an issue: crises, opposition to the mendicants, the program of the popes, formation of new institutions, the influence of the law of the Preachers. It was the turning point in their history. And then the moment struck for the most significant move in this evolution: the commission of Alexander IV in 1255 to Hugh of St. Cher to compose a Rule of the Friars Preachers. This happened some months before the Augustinian amalgamation. The import of this design may be conjectured.

THE PROJECT OF FUSION

From the time they were formulated, the Customs of the Preachers had the force of a rule; that is, a basic and balanced law designed to organize legally a religious society and direct it toward its supernatural and social end. It was drawn up in accordance with Augustinian legal tradition, it fulfilled in conjunction with the Commentary the actual purpose of a rule. Nor were the Friars Preachers unmindful of this fact. We have already noted that St. Dominic himself employed the term "rule" to designate his Constitutions, and the witnesses for the process of canonization displayed an almost challenging insistence in their systematic reference to the *Rule* of St. Dominic, the *Rule* of the Friars Preachers.

Because of its juridical character, it was a rule; it was one likewise by its novelty. Truly, in writing it, St. Dominic had achieved the work of an innovator or, in the terminology of the thirteenth century, an institutor. Thereby he shared that *auctoritas* which made of St. Augustine and St. Benedict the great and acknowledged masters of religious life in the Middle Ages, founders of rules. No one sensed this originality more fully than Jordan of Saxony when he thus answered someone's query: "The Rule of the Friars Preachers? Behold their Rule: 'to live in perfection, to learn, and to teach.'"⁽⁴²⁾ No statement could have more justly defined the characteristic legislative work of St. Dominic in his Constitutions. Last of all, it was a rule by virtue of its widespread influence, comparable in the thirteenth century to what the influence of the great monastic or canonical laws had been in the past.

Indeed, it was not without a feeling of chagrin that the Friars Preachers saw the little *formula vitae* of St. Francis of Assisi, many times revised, elevated to the dignity of a religious rule of equal rank with the patristic rules, while the law of St. Dominic, notwithstanding its power and beauty, was relegated to a secondary rank as an adjunct of the mutilated Commentary of the Bishop of Hippo. Anyone who has leafed one or more of the pamphlets that picture the religious of the thirteenth century contending over the respective excellence of details in their way of life, will appreciate how this little circumstance could be a source of vexation.

Moreover, had they not, in a very real manner, recognized the true character of the Commentary of St. Augustine? It would be reckless to state categorically that they knew how the mutilation had been effected in the preceding century, but it is not impossible. Was not Humbert of Romans aware of the two editions of the pseudo-rule, and did he not recognize as authentic the *Disciplina monasterii* to which he referred in explaining the Commentary? The Friars were, at any rate, under no illusions as to the limited legislative value of this traditional text. They were not blind to the legal artifice whereby the Commentary of St. Augustine was made applicable in the life of the Augustinian foundations of the thirteenth century. Had it not been necessary to abide by a conciliar canon on religious rules, a decree which circumstances rendered inopportune? Whatever the cause, the Friars at the middle of the thirteenth century had little regard for this venerable text, and among themselves they even spoke of it with enough scorn to disquiet their general, the good Humbert of Romans. Soon their attitude would be bolstered by a more serious justification. The form in which the legislation of the Preachers was cast caused concern among the Friars for reasons much deeper than those suggested by considerations of pride or terminology.

ORIGIN OF THE PROJECT

Included in an extensive spiritual discourse, the few precepts retained in the Commentary of St. Augustine were indefinite and strikingly lacking in the precision characteristic of the Constitutions. The latter, placed in sequence to the Commentary, seemed to be only secondary, and thus the weight of their authority might be questioned by the religious. Apprehension was voiced especially in view of the fact that, as an adjunct to the approved and immutable Rule, the Constitutions formed the variable part of the law, liable to perpetual correction by general chapters. Left to the temper of men and the demands of changing times, their precious and original spirit might be exposed to a disintegration or a diminution. The Prologue sounded this note of warning: "lest we fall away little by little." The adversary of the Jacobins, in Peckham's poem, cleverly created the specter of the inevitable decline: they "will in their turn end by following the beaten path."

It would have been possible, no doubt, for the Preachers to have the basic elements of their Constitutions consecrated with finality by the authority of the Holy See. The general chapter of 1228 had viewed this as an eventuality,⁽⁴³⁾ but the plan had been given up for fear of another complication. To propose the intervention of the Holy See in the Constitutions would be voluntarily to tic their own hands in a domain in which more than in any other the Preachers were proud and jealous of their independence. Moreover, irrevocably to fix this part of the legislation would have meant losing the benefit of the remarkable flexibility which the periodic constituent assemblies assured to the law of the Preachers.

HUGH OF ST. CHER

Another and better solution would be to assemble the fundamental texts of the Dominican law into a rule, properly so called, which would henceforth be unchangeable and could be confirmed, while reserving to certain variable constitutions the possibility of adaptation. This, too, would afford the best

method of reducing the whole to order and of finally assuring to the Preachers the advantages and influence of an integral rule. Such, in effect, was the purpose of the altogether unexpected powers which Alexander IV conferred on Hugh of St. Cher at his own instigation, February 3, 1255:

Alexander, Bishop, Servant of the servants of God, to our dear son, Hugh . . . Cardinal Priest of Santa Sabina, health and apostolic benediction.

It is manifest that the Lord of all virtues has from your earliest years made you remarkable for holy desires, right counsels, and just works, and it is evident that the love of a holy and religious life increases in your heart each day. A very striking instance reveals this in the present hour: I mean the humble and suppliant petitions you have made that we should deign to watch, with the solicitude of the Apostolic See, lest in the very salutary and illustrious Order of our dear sons, the Friars Preachers- although it is now devoted with fervor to the cultivation of the virtues and is constantly exercised in the rigor of discipline- the strength of regular observance be weakened through a certain carelessness, or negligence, or weakness of some one of its members in the future. Therefore, fully approving your laudable and worthy proposal, by our authority we grant you in these present letters the right, aided by the counsel of the Master and some discreet friars of the same Order, whom your judgment will deem it good to choose, to examine with diligence their Rule, their Constitutions, and their Customs, and to choose from these texts what is most important and useful, and to reduce all of this to one single rule, or to dispose of it in some other way, according as it will appear good to you for the inviolable preservation of this Order and its perpetual stability.

Given at Naples on the third day of February, the first year of our pontificate.(44)

The text of the letter has no ambiguity. A project of fusion is proposed whereby the Rule of St. Augustine, reduced to its useful precepts, would be combined with the actual substance of the Constitutions and practices of the Preachers. A unique text would be produced, a Rule. Therefore the papal document concerns not a correction in the Constitutions of the "very salutary and illustrious" Order or a change in them, but actually the substitution, in the name of the Holy See and by its authority, of the Rule of the Preachers for the Rule of St. Augustine.(45)

A few words will focus this project in its proper light.

QUESTION OF THE RULE

Scarcely nine months had elapsed since the harsh change of Innocent IV in his attitude toward the mendicants (May, 1254). It was but two months since the bull *Etsi animarum*(46) threw the Preachers and their friends into dismay by suddenly ruining the prospect of their apostolate. Then Innocent died. Alexander IV immediately suspended the formidable decree;(47) the Preachers began to breathe freely. The Pope was ready for another step. Had not the time come to consolidate the position of the Friars by inviolably and finally stabilizing their law in its present perfection?

The project did not originate with the Preachers. To be certain of that, we need only note the enormous power which the Cardinal of Santa Sabina arrogated to himself. The right of altering the Constitutions belonged to the capitular fathers alone, and they would not have entertained the idea of surrendering their prerogatives and abandoning their law to the discretion of one who was an outsider as far as they were concerned -- Had he not, in accepting the purple, left the Order? -- and of a commission entirely of his own selection. They would not have entrusted such a commission even to their master general without reserving a control or exercising a surveillance over his possible encroachments.(48) Moreover, they themselves were concerned about the strength of their legislation and had recourse to

other measures: the chapter of Buda (1254) had just commissioned Humbert of Romans to correct the "letter" of the Rule of St. Augustine in view of its final edition in the great collection of the liturgical books.⁽⁴⁹⁾ They had no mind, therefore, to cause the disappearance of the Rule by any project of fusion.

The import of the papal bull shows the character of the projected work, which was being undertaken by Hugh of St. Cher. Hugh enjoyed the cordial esteem of the new Pope, who supported him by his authority. As an undertaking independent of any initiative on the part of the governing body of the Preachers,⁽⁵⁰⁾ this plan might be characterized as a kind of official interference in their legislative work. Indeed, that fact accounts for its failure.

That, too, from one point of view, holds the key to its importance. It ran in the general current whereby the interests of the Pope and his cardinals inclined them to a direct intervention in the way of life of the religious associations and especially of the mendicants. If the gravity of the threat made against the Friars Preachers suffices to explain the move of the Cardinal of Santa Sabina and the authorization of it by the Pope, it should not obscure all the successive efforts of Alexander IV in reference to the various branches of the Augustinians, the Servites, the Poor Catholics, and the Williamites, all of which help to throw into perspective the purpose of the first undertaking. Neither should we forget that Hugh of St. Cher was, in the name of the Pope and by his authority, a great reformer of religious, and that more than once he used the Constitutions of the Order to which he had belonged to regularize companies assigned to his direction. These two considerations lead us to conjecture that in requesting or in according the powers to constitute a new religious rule, the Cardinal of Santa Sabina and the Pope envisaged not only the particular needs of the Preachers but anticipated something still more universal. Perhaps it was their plan to utilize this new rule in constituting future foundations. The bull is silent on this detail. We dare not affirm it. But why should the bull have to state it?

It is certain in any case, that the foundations of apostolic orders, which canon 13 of the Lateran Council had rendered difficult without making them less opportune, would have been helped considerably by the appearance of the rule. When the evolution of the orders of the thirteenth century began, if a rule of the Preachers, composed of essential provisions from St. Dominic's legislation, had been available for the new religious societies in the character of a law approved by the Church, nothing would have been changed in their inner organization. What they would have found in their rule, they did, in effect, progressively adopt into their own constitutions from those of the Preachers. In the end, the result would have been the same, but the evolution, easier and more rapid, would have avoided the subterfuge of recourse to the Commentary of St. Augustine, the roundabout procedure in the correction of the modern rules, and the slow but successive infiltrations from the Dominican statutes.

Hence we believe that, if the project of Hugh of St. Cher and Alexander IV had been carried out, it would have made manifest in a more striking and fruitful way the real influence of the Rule of St. Dominic, while effecting its substitution in place of the Rule of St. Augustine. The act of February 3, 1255, by affixing to it an authoritative signature, would have illuminated in all its truth the evolution which these pages have attempted to describe. But the project was not realized. We have shown the reason. Never would the Friars have tolerated the interference of the Cardinal of Santa Sabina, Preacher though he might have been. There and then the matter was dropped.

Yet the true function of the Commentary of St. Augustine appeared once more in an unfavorable light. There was murmuring among the friars.⁽⁵¹⁾ More than one felt a lessening of his reverence for the first part of his law. Humbert of Romans was exceedingly distressed about the situation because he venerated this traditional text. In an outline for a sermon, he wrote: "Shame on all who lose a taste for the pasture which so good a shepherd provides for them in the Rule!" Upon reflection, he chose an

antidote more salutary than chiding would be. In praise of the Rule, he composed a commentary on the Commentary. Therein he included minute applications of the discourse of Augustine to the life of the Preachers, and in a prologue enumerated six reasons why a son of St. Dominic should be devoted to it.[\(52\)](#)

The impossibility of rejecting a living law that was accomplishing its purpose did the rest. The friars continued to pronounce their vows "*secundum Regulam beati Augustini et Institutiones fratrum Praedicatorum.*" Today, as they hear the old spiritual text read each week, they may not know that many centuries ago it was almost absorbed by the Constitutions of St. Dominic, which had in reality supplanted it.

NOTES

1 Hefele-Leclercq, V. 1342.

2 *Ibid.*, 1344.

3 Honorius III concerned himself directly with the organization of the Preachers; but Cardinal Ugolino, though much interested in it, did not have a great influence upon it. During half a century especially from the pontificate of Innocent III, the cardinals exercised a more and in~re important role in the correction of rules and new orders.

4 Some, in order to reserve to the *regula bullata* of St. Francis (1223) the distinction of being the first to provide for a cardinal protector, would hold that the Rule of the Order of the Holy Spirit (1213), which several times mentions cardinal protectors (*PL*, CCXVII, 1143, 1148 f., 1152), is an interpolated document. Can this be proved? It seems quite normal that Innocent III should have assigned a cardinal protector to direct the work of an Order which he had himself established at Santa Maria in Sassia at Rome, after it was completely reorganized and brought by its Master under his immediate jurisdiction. Furthermore, in the Order of St. Francis the Cardinal Protector had a new and special significance. St. Francis says: "I enjoin upon the ministers in obedience that the edition the Lord Pope for one of the cardinals of the holy Roman Church who will be a governor, protector, and corrector of this brotherhood, so that they may always be governed by and subject to the same Holy Church" (Boehmer, p. 24).

5 In 1210 the oath of St. Francis to the pope was inscribed in the beginning of the *Regula I^a* (Grundmann, p. 133). On October 4, 1254, Pope Innocent IV, allowed the general of the Minors to enter upon his office without waiting for the confirmation of the Holy See; but he did not suppress the necessity of this confirmation. The general of the Saccati was confirmed by the pope after his election. The prior general of the Bonites followed the same procedure as did the general of the Servites, of the Augustinians until 1398, and of the Order of the Trinity also. The Master of the Preachers alone was always exempt from this confirmation by the Holy See; he received his power by force of election (Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 216). On January 17, 1244, Innocent expressly recognized this original privilege: "according to the custom hitherto observed in this Order and tolerated by the Apostolic See" (*Bullarium O.F.*, I, 129). The last words indicate the exact sentiments of the Pope toward this independence, which, however, he did not wish to deny to an Order which merited it; further, it was only the common law until the beginning of the thirteenth century.

The new mode of papal control had grown up during the course of the thirteenth century, imposed by the very nature of the contemporary religious foundations. It proceeded, we believe, from the oath pronounced frequently in the course of the twelfth century by the itinerant preachers. There is a

relationship between the oath of St. Francis in 1210 and the oath pronounced by Durandus of Huesca or Bernard Prim in the name of the Poor Catholics (1208-1210) (*PL*, CCXV, 1512; CCXVI, 291).

6 Between 1220 and 1222, Honorius III established the Preachers on the site of his own family palace, at Santa Sabina (*Bullarium O.P.*, I, 15). In 1248-50, by command of Innocent IV, the Minors were given possession of the Convent of Ara Coeli, which was taken from the Benedictines (Gratien, p. 163). The Convent of Santa Maria del Popolo, which evidently the Minors had just left (*Archivum Franciscanum*, XVIII [1925], 293-95), was then granted by the Cardinal of Sant' Angelo to the Augustinians; from then on he played a fundamental part in their organization.

In 1204, when establishing it at Santa Maria in Sassia at Rome, Innocent III reorganized the Order of the Holy Spirit, whose center previous to that time had been in Montpellier (Potthast, no. 2248; *PL*, CCXIV, 377 ff.). In 1220-21, in organizing the monastery of St. Sixtus, Honorius III made it the center of an important reform for nuns, the influence of which extended into Germany and southern France, so that even the Prouille convent, which had itself provided the Rule, was in 1236 considered as being *sub regula monialium S. Sixti de Urbe* (Guiraud, *Cart.*, I, 7).

The long absences of the popes from Rome, the incessant journeys of the generals (the first Masters of the Preachers had no fixed residence; they went from chapter to chapter), the existence of other houses of first importance (studia of Paris and Bologna, with the Preachers; convent of Assisi, with the Minors): all this forbids our calling the convents in Rome the center of the Order; such houses came into that title only later. But in their very origin those convents were oriented toward that importance. Already there was sketched the plan of a system which has prevailed, whereby the general houses are centered in Rome. To the degree in which this system was consciously promoted by the Curia, the thirteenth century was nearer to the twentieth than it was to the twelfth. That was the age of Cluny, Cîteaux, and Prémontré.

7 Bull *Nos attendentes*; Laurent, no. 75.

8 "At this time (before 1220), the Blessed Brother Dominic, in dependence only on the Pope, had plenary power, all right to manage, organize and correct the whole Order of the Friars Preachers." Ventura of Verona at the process of canonization; *Processus* (Bologna), no. 2.

9 The term *ordo praedicatorum* was in common use in the early thirteenth century. Thus, in his description of the companions of St. Francis in his *Historia occidentalis*, Jacques de Vitry says: "This is the true religion of the poor and of the crucified, an *ordo praedicatorum*, which we call Friars Minor" (Boehmer, *Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi*, p. 69).

10 Laurent, no. 136. Attention should not be given merely to the second part of this letter, which introduces the Preachers to Metz. The first and more important part, being a general letter of protection from the Chancellor of the Empire, recalls the privilege of papal protection, December 22, 1216. If account is taken of the great difficulties experienced by the first Minors in Germany, the protection of the Chancellor of the Empire will be estimated as of no little significance. This letter of protection was included in the political religious measures agreed on by the imperial Chancellor on the occasion of the coronation in Rome.

What Burchard of Ursberg wrote about the same time (before 1225) seconds, as it were, the pronouncement of Conrad. "Since . . . the Order of Preachers was established and confirmed by the Lord Pope . . . "Desiring to correct these (the preaching excesses of the Humiliati), the Lord Pope instituted and confirmed the Order of Preachers" (*Chronicon, Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, XXIII, 377). These statements have a parallel in the following: "Devoting themselves truly to the study and the reading of Sacred Scripture, they accomplished much in writing books, and so very diligently followed the teachings of their own masters that with bow and arrows and all the armor

of strong men they went forth to stand in defense of our holy mother the Church." Thus he enumerates the work of the Preachers: to strengthen, to instruct, to teach, to praise, to refute, and to correct. He adds: "They are obedient to the Apostolic See, from which they have special authority."

11 On the relations of Jordan and Aymon, who was instrumental in having the Minors in 1239 adopt a number of Constitutions inspired by the Preachers, see Gratien, pp. 151-55; Eccleston (ed. Brewer), pp. 11, 19, 22.

12 This point has aroused vigorous polemics for many years. The contention of Vacas Galindo (*San Raimondo de Peñafort, fundador de la Orden de la Merced*, 1919), based on the belated account of Nicholas Aymerich (fourteenth century), seemed exaggerated and called forth a lively rejoinder from Faustino D. Gazulla, (*Refutación un libro titulado San Raimundo*, etc., 1919). But the view of the latter in his *La Orden de Nuestra Señora de la Merced*, 1934, based on records of the sixteenth century, does not appear unassailable, especially, his systematic exclusion of St. Raymond. Besides, St. Raymond did not intervene directly in the Constitutions of the Order of Mercy, which yielded to the Dominican influence only in the fourteenth century.

13 "And almost all the cities of Lombardy and the Marches placed their deeds and their statutes into their hands to be arranged and changed at the will of the brethren, so that they were free to omit, add, shorten, or change them according as it would seem expedient." Brother Stephen, *Processus* (Bologna, no. 39).

14 Soulier, I, 28-54. The editor has noted the borrowings, chapter by chapter. According to the evidence of the text, the borrowing seems to be from 1256. Chapter 21 has a sentence from the law of the Preachers which dates from that year. There is none of later origin. The date also coincides with that of the organization of the Servites as a centralized and autonomous order, a status which permitted their breaking away from the great congregation of the Augustinians.

15 Tiraboschi, III, 99-146.

16 M. A. van den Oudenrijn, *Das officium des heiligen Dominicus des Bekenner im Brevier der "Fratres Unitores" von Ostarmerien* (1935), pp. 32, 34. The Rule was adopted before 1350.

17 The Constitutions and office of the Preachers were granted to them by Innocent IV, October 23, 1248, with the condition that they should not take their habit. Hermans, *Annales canonicorum reg. S. Aug. Ord. S. Crucis*, II, 64-68. Text of the Constitutions, *Ibid.*, II, 30-59.

18 Hugh had been commissioned by Innocent IV to reform the Church of Belley, April 15 and 16, 1244 (Potthast, nos. 11333 f.). He gave to the canons constitutions modeled to a great extent on those of the Preachers and dated February 21, 1248. Sassen, Hugo von S. Cher (1908), p. 12. Constitutions in the *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Sulpice* (1884).

19 L. Le Grand, *Statuts d'Hôtels-Dieu et de Léproseries* (1907).

20 Grundmann, 175, 205, 233-37.

21 V. McNabb, "The Authorship of the Ancren Riwle" in *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* (1934), pp. 49-74. Text in *The Ancren Riwle*, ed. by James Morton (1853). See also B. du Moustier, "Carthusian Inspiration in the Ancren Riwle" in *Pax*, XXV (1935), 37-41; "The Ancren Riwle and the Contemplative Prayer" (*ibid.*, pp. 59-62).

22 Fina Heilwic and Katerina, "Recluse in Bischovesheim," declare: "To the honor of God, with simplicity and pure devotion, we accept the Rule of St. Augustine, binding ourselves to the same with solemn vow, for fasts, conduct, food, clothing, according to the way of observance of the Friars Preachers." They promise obedience to the prior of the Preachers at Strasbourg, giving him the right of dispensation, and they agree not to receive anyone who may not wish to abide by all these statutes. March 8, 1293. Bibl. nat. Paris, MS. lat. 10897, f. 336.

23 On February 27, 1257, Alexander IV granted: "To the Master and Convent of the Hospital of St. Mary of the Teutonic Knights of Jerusalem, that they might observe the Divine Office according to the Order of Friars Preachers in their own Order in a certain form harmoniously adapted to their type of religious life." Potthast, no. 10754. Strehlke, *Tabulae Ord. Theuton* (1869), pp. 357, 878.

24 Established in the Order of St. Augustine in 1256. Cf. Pierron, pp. 168-70.

25 For the Saccati, see the opinion of Eccleston (*De adventu fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, p. 71).

26 Note the concern of Jacques de Vitry as he surveyed the situation (March, 1220): "Nevertheless, this company seems dangerous to us, because not only the perfect but even the young and the imperfect, who ought to be subjected for some time to training and proved by conventual discipline, are dispersed two by two through the wide world" (Boehmer). In contrast, we may recall what Dominic wrote in 1216 on the Master of novices: "[he should instruct the novices] as to how zealous they must be in preaching *tempore opportuno*." *I Const.* A 13; Denifle, *Archiv*, I, 201.

27 Bull *Cum secundum consilium* (Sept. 22, 1220). It was given during the sojourn of Francis in Palestine or just after his return. "By this necessary institution of the novitiate, the Order of Minors took an immense step toward imitation of the ancient monastic rules" (Gratien, *Histoire . . . de l'Ordre des frères Mineurs*, p. 72). Upon that followed, as a matter of course, profession the regime of authority, stability in the Order, the common life. On the relations with the Preachers, cf. Gratien, pp. 70 f. The Rule of 1221 embodied each of these "novelties."

28 If a comparison is made between the primitive Rule of St. Albert (*Analecta Ord. Carm.*, 1914, III, 213-18) and the text of Hugh of St. Cher, it will be remarked that by a few changes in expression there were established or emphasized: common life, liturgical life, the possibility of dwelling in inhabited localities, a certain study (Holy Scripture).

29 The Servites in 1240 received from their Bishop Arding the Rule of St. Augustine, confirmed in 1251 by Cardinal Raniero, and by the Pope in 1256. Cf. Soulier, I, 8; Potthast, no. 16302.

30 Empoli, pp. 166, 181.

31 One division of the Williamites, which had been included by the Pope in the grand association of 1256, succeeded with much effort in finally withdrawing and retaining the Rule of St. Benedict. Henriques, *Regula, Const. et Privilegia O. Cisterc.* (1630), p. 458; Bull of August 22 (Potthast, no. 16528); cf. the bull of Innocent IV, September 3, 1248 (Henriques, p. 456). In 1235, Gregory IX had granted the Rule of St. Benedict to the Hermits of Antioch (Potthast, no. 9892).

32 See especially Hermans, II, 43f., 56-58. That is the reason why, although a certain number of regular prescriptions from the Preachers, thus popularized, were, in the first instance borrowed from Prémontré, Cîteaux, and Cluny, the influence of the observances of the Preachers constitutes

something totally original, which was more than a result of the influence of the observances of Prémontré, Cîteaux, and Cluny.

33 As in the congregations of the thirteenth century, the head of the Order was the prior of the Central Abbey (Huy). But he was elected according to the method established for the master of the Preachers, the religious promising obedience to him directly.

34 The crisis was induced by the progressive accession of a group of houses to a centralized Order, an evolution not provided for by legislative texts. The secession which followed as a result was serious.

35 Soulier, *Monumenta Ordinis Servorum S. Mariae*, I, 19.

36 Gratien, pp. 81-96, 102 ff., 125 ff.

37 The Augustinians and Carmelites were established at Paris about 1260, but in a convent distant from the schools (Denifle, *Chart. universit. paris.*, I, 405, 469); the first *Studens parisiensis* of the Augustinians appeared only in 1278, and the first university post in 1279, Van Moe in *Rev. des quest. hist.*, CXVII (1932), 292; with the Carmelites, the first master was the Prior General, Gerard of Bologna, 1297-1317 (Zimmerman, *Monumenta historica carmelitana*, pp. 225, 232, 250, 377). The Williamites established at Montrouge, in 1256, were also distant from the schools. In 1298 they obtained from the Pope and Philip the Fair for their students in theology the Convent of the White Mantles (suppressed at the Council of Lyons), situated on the right bank of the river, north of the cathedral. Cf. Felibien, *Histoire de la Ville de Paris*(1725), III, 238. It was not until about 1309 that the Servites had some students in Paris. Cf. Soulier, I, 159.

38 Hefele-Leclercq, VI, 201 f.; Schroeder, *Councils*, p. 351.

39

Respice canonicos, vide regulares
Vide grandimanicos, attende templares
Atque status aliquos multum populares
Sensu quasi laycos, victu seculares.

Itaque barbiferi, picati, saccini,
Baptiste, cruciferi, atque Guillelmini
Modo sunt in fieri, nunc merguntur fini.
Reputantur miseri, propinquant herini.

Cordati similiter, atque iacobite
Quamquam distant iugiter, quamquam bone vite,
Et inserti firmiter sint in Christo vite
Tenebunt finaliter modum vie trite.

Iam venere noviter ordines diversi
Multiformi turpiter colore respersi
Turbant rairabiliter vultum universi
Utinam totaliter fuerant submersi.--

Now various orders newly furred,
In multiform fashion basely spread,
Wonderfully o'erturn the face of the world.
Would that, submerged, they all were dead.

De paupertate, ed. by C. L. Kingsford [British Society of Franciscan Studies II] 1910, p. 173; see also p. 168.

40 The editor places this little work between 1255 and 1270, at Paris where Peckham was teaching. The mention of the Williamites, who were incorporated with the Augustinians in 1256, might indicate that it was written before that date, or at any rate shortly after. It is certain, moreover, that one division of these religious obtained their autonomy in France and in Germany. In fact, they were established in Paris in 1256. It seems, indeed, that none of the terms in the enumeration applies to the Augustinians: a thing easily explicable if the poem was composed before 1260, the date when these religious were established in Paris. Therefore we place the work between 1256 and 1260.

This presents a picture of the mendicant lay movements of the Ile de France; that is why it does not include the various groups of Augustinians, Servites, Humiliati, Poor Catholics, movements in Italy, Provence, or Spain. But everywhere the same impression was created.

41 Williamites, the Order of the White Mantle or Servants of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of Christ, of Marseilles, received from their bishop in 1257 the Rule of St. Augustine at the command of Alexander IV. Cf. Soulier, I, 153; Felibien, *op. cit.*, III, 234.

42 Frachet, p. 138.

43 "Indeed, as it seems to me, the Constitutions contain nothing of so grave a nature that it may not be dispensed with according to the necessity of persons, place, and time, with the exception of those three articles which were so firmly established in the last chapter that they may not be revoked; nor do they admit of dispensation, and we even then wished them to be confirmed for you through the Curia" (Jordan, in the summer of 1229; *Epist.*, 50).

The confirmation was never asked, and the Order remained free. No restriction was laid on the power of modifying a general statute or a custom of the Order, provided it was submitted to three successive general chapters (*Acta capitulorum*, 1240, I, 14). Furthermore, Pierre de la Palud, consulted by the General, wrote: "Since nothing is more natural than that any law should be revocable in the way in which it was rendered binding, so the Order in a chapter *generalissimum* has decided finally that revenues and possessions should not be received, and that flesh meat should not be eaten; so through the same kind of chapter *generalissimum* either law may be revoked, if such action is judged expedient, just as the Constitution may be changed through the action of three general chapters" (Florence, Bibl. Naz. J. X., 51 [*conventi soppressi*]; Mortier, III, 131).

Only one statute was approved, or rather the absence of a statute: the Order's independence of the Holy See in the installation and deposition of the Master. The liturgical Office was also confirmed in 1267 (*Bullarium O.P.*, I, 480; Echard, I, 145; Potthast, no. 20069). Nevertheless, on October 1, 1285, the Order obtained from Honorius IV the power to correct its liturgy in its own way, by the intervention of three consecutive chapters (Potthast, no. 22299; *Bullarium O.P.*, II, 8).

44 *Bullarium O.P.*, I, 271, no. 9; Potthast, no. 15669.

45 It is a monstrous error to read into this document the order to correct the letter of the rule which was given to Humbert of Romans in the chapter of 1254. See *Analecta O.P.*, II (1896), 615; XVII (1926), 815. There was no question at all of change or of correction, but of taking prescriptions as they were

and grouping them into a new rule, This power itself was wholly unexpected. See also Sassen, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

46 November 21, 1254; Potthast, no. 15562.

47 Innocent died December 7; Alexander IV was elected December 21; the bull *Nec insolitum* was published the next day.

48 In the preceding chapter, the capitular fathers had just imposed on the Master a supplementary ceremonial of humiliation on the occasio of the "correction of his faults." He was to prostrate himself humbly, ask pardon, accuse himself, and listen to the accusations. The pre-eminence of the deliberative assembly was thus emphasized. *Acta capitulorum* (1254), I, 66.

49 *Ibid.*, p. 68.

50 Mortier, *Histoire des mattres généraux*, I, 478.

51 "Since I am aware of the charge made by some of the brethren concerning the Rule of St. Augustine, and since I fear lest talk of this kind should weaken the evotion of others in regard to the Rule, I have composed part of a study which I intend to pursue further when there is time for consideration on these things" (Humbert, *op. cit.*, I, 43).

52 The work was begun between 1254 and 1263, but we may judge, from what followed the prologue, that it was completed only after 1263 and then sent to the capitular fathers. Cf. Heintke, *Humbert von Romans*, pp. 86-88.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

I

An Embassy into the Marches by M. H. Vicaire, O.P.

THE purpose and the nature of the journey which took Diego de Acebes and St. Dominic out of the Diocese of Osma and after several detours led them into the Albigenian country are even now still interpreted in various ways. The seventeenth century in particular accumulated so many different stories on this point that in the following century, in spite of a true critical sense, the Castilian historian Loperraez found no better way out of the confusion than to close his eyes to the difficulty and repeat the description given in Fleury's ecclesiastical history. It is possible, however, to avoid such a desperate solution. To escape it, we believe it will suffice to travel the length of the seven-century-old procession of hagiographers and historians, asking of each the how and the why of his innovation, testing the worth of witnesses and treasuring the reliable information. Through an adventure very rare in the critical examination of an intricate tradition, we think that this time we take our stand on solid ground where we may finally gain conclusive views on certain points.

THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

Leading in the traditional lines is Jordan of Saxony, who, around the year 1234, recounted the story thus. (1) King Alphonso IX of Castile desired his son Ferdinand to marry a noble girl of a country called "the Marches." He confided this enterprise to the Bishop of Osma, who set out, taking in his company the subprior of his chapter, Dominic. Passing through Toulouse, where Dominic converted his host, they came after fatiguing travel to the end of their journey. When the embassy was concluded, they returned. Then they set forth again with a larger retinue for an escort of the young lady; but she had died. With their mission thus ended, Diego and Dominic then proceeded to visit the Pope, from whom the Bishop sought in vain to obtain permission to resign from his diocese in order to devote himself to an apostolate among the pagans. On their return journey they stopped at Cîteaux, and found in Languedoc the Cistercian monks who finally detained them to preach with them. This account was repeated in all the legends and Dominican chronicles of the thirteenth century. (2)

A careful comparison of these different recitals warrants our concluding that in the course of the thirteenth century there was added to Jordan's account only one word: that of Dacia (Scandinavia), which was used in the *Chronica prima* to identify the enigmatic *ad Marchias*, and was copied by Bernard Guidonis. On the other hand, certain details were omitted by one writer or another: the matrimonial nature of the embassy; the name of the future husband; the second journey; the plea for resignation from the diocese; the visit at Cîteaux.

In documents as concise as the two Chronicles, the résumé of Bartholomew of Trent, and to a certain extent the legend of Constantine of Orvieto (and that of Roderick which follows it), there is not one of these omissions that might not be expected. Vincent of Beauvais offers as his contribution in this matter only some extracts selected from Ferrand. It would be a mistake to think that the differences discernible between these few secondary accounts and the record developed from Jordan resulted from a historical improvement or from a critique on the text of the *Libellus*; rather would it be a case of diminution. The narrative of Thierry of Apoldia, which, in accord with his method, contains all earlier accounts and omissions, offers nothing better than the text of Jordan. Thierry dropped many details that he did not find in each of the oldest accounts. It is easy to understand how the project of the

marriage of Ferdinand, whose premature death caused even his name to be forgotten, did not interest him.

In concluding this examination of the thirteenth century histories, we can say that the record of Jordan of Saxony, continually repeated, is the unique source for Dominican accounts of the journey to the Marches; a single little detail has been added (Dacia); many features have been progressively effaced by the work of successive borrowings.

The legend of Thierry of Apoldia closes at one and the same time a century and a period in our tradition. From the time of its appearance his study became for modern times almost the only source for the history of St. Dominic, causing previous records, with the exception of that of Vincent of Beauvais, to be unknown.

Now it is remarkable how one and then another of these writers notably obscured the clearness of the primitive record in the matter of the legation and the second journey. In addition there was great lack of precision in the expression *ad Marchias*. The incident of the embassy of the Bishop of Osma passed into fourteenth century accounts with dangerous vagueness. All later history gives the proof.

LATER EVIDENCE

At the end of the fourteenth century, the brief résumé of Pierre Desnoels⁽³⁾ did not mention the mission of Diego. In 1457, St. Antoninus made no allusion to it. According to him, when the Abbot of Cîteaux and his twelve confreres were sent to the Albigenses, Diego joined them with Dominic; then he went to Rome to offer his resignation that he might devote himself more fully to the apostolate. The account is a mere combination of elements and is evidently false. In 1517, John Garzoni of Bologna referred again to the mission and approximated the idea of Thierry in attributing to the King the initiative of the Bishop's journey to Rome, charged with an embassy to the Sovereign Pontiff.⁽⁴⁾

But in the meantime Alanus de Rupe introduced something new into the life of St. Dominic. Future mothers learned from his lips of the desirable blessings which grew out of an interview of Blanche of Castile with the Patriarch. The future Queen of France, saddened by not yet having an heir to the throne, was led to resolve, upon the exhortation of the saint, to recite the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin and to distribute rosaries to those who wished to recite it. In consequence of this devotion, she conceived and brought into the world the great St. Louis and all her other children. The anecdote, repeated with enthusiasm by innumerable preachers of the Rosary, was soon woven into the legend of St. Dominic and into that of Queen Blanche,⁽⁵⁾ and precisely to throw light on the nature of that mysterious embassy entrusted according to Thierry of Apoldia, to Diego and his subprior, by King Alphonso of Castile.

Fernando del Castillo, in 1584, gives an example of this collusion;⁽⁶⁾ in the ignorance which he acknowledges about the exact nature of Diego's mission in 1203, he can give only this detail: the King sent the Bishop, among other purposes, to visit his daughter who had just been married the preceding year (Castillo was mistaken: Blanche was married in 1200, not in 1202). Then follows with all its details the story of Alanus de Rupe; in effect this would place the conception of St. Louis eleven years before his birth. Furthermore, even if he had not had the anecdote of the Breton Preacher at his disposal, we cannot help thinking that the Castilian historian, in the pride of his national glory, would have introduced into the account the daughter of Alphonso of Castile. Did not the connection suggest itself? That is what gives to the narrative the false aspect of likelihood.

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that in the method and contents of his history as a whole, Castillo dominates not only his predecessors but all his successors in the seventeenth century. For example, in the prologue he declares his program as a historian and even his judgment on the chronicles and legends of St. Dominic: "It seems that the weakest incidents have been committed to writing and the most important omitted; works have been filled with accounts of miracles of which there is no need to recount many in order to praise the saints, and to imitate them, none." The Dominican bibliography which he also gives *in extenso* in this prologue shows that he knew most of what had been written previous to his time. A fervent Castilian and favorably situated for the collection of ancient items still available in Osma about Diego and St. Dominic, he had the merit to add, it seems, a single new fact to this history: the date of Diego's death inscribed on the tomb in the cathedral. On this score, his contribution marks a new stage in the tradition we have watched growing: in the dawn of the modern era his work constituted an inventory of Dominican tradition and Castilian documents. Inadequately prepared to weigh the respective values of his sources, Castillo evidently could present no more than a kind of probable collection, gathered from a vast medley of records. At least in regard to Diego's mission, he shows he could find nothing more than the sheaf of thirteenth century legends and the little anecdote about the Rosary.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Then it is that the official historians enter the scene. No longer do the last years of the Bishop of Osma belong, as formerly, almost exclusively to the history of St. Dominic. Historiographers and hagiographers of Castile, of the Church of Osma, of the Church of Spain or of the Universal Church, of the Cistercians or of the Jacobins, appropriated him in turn. Obligated by their position to compose great general works, these writers produced little more than compilations. Often they contributed nothing original but a certain number of national or corporate prejudices, and displayed relatively little scruple in the choice or even in the character of their sources.

Following Antonio of Siena,⁽⁷⁾ who speaks of Dacia, the good Malvenda⁽⁸⁾ was satisfied simply to repeat the version of Thierry of Apoldia, suspending comment on *ad Marchias*, which he despaired of being able to explain,⁽⁹⁾ and mentioning the journey into France and into Italy. But Réchac was much more positive. All the incoherences of the earlier accounts were easily resolved for him by a manuscript which he chanced to find in the Convent of St. James in Pavia (?). It did indeed concern a legation and a marriage for Ferdinand, as Vincent of Beauvais said, with Mlle de Lusignan, daughter of Hugues le Brun, the Count of the Marches. Diego and Dominic, therefore, journeyed into the territory of Limousin (the Marches) to a certain château of Gace, whence the error in some manuscripts which, having confused G and D, indicated *Dacia*.⁽¹⁰⁾

Meanwhile in Spain, the official Cistercian annalist, Manrique⁽¹¹⁾ cited a manuscript book which he consulted at Osma in which the Castilian account was supplemented by elements from Thierry and from Vincent. These included the record of the embassy into the Marches, the visit to Blanche of Castile, the mention of the royal household of the newly married, and the visit to the Pope, etc., in a very ingenious narrative: the Bishop who was to present himself to the Sovereign Pontiff was requested by his sovereign the King to stop off in the Marches to visit Blanche of Castile and Prince Louis. Manrique does not give the origin of the manuscript book (and does not say it is ancient); it is certain that this work has a curious likeness to that of Gil Gonçales Davila,⁽¹²⁾ which was in course of printing when the Cistercian composed his own volume.

Finally appeal was made to a third manuscript, and this time it was published by J. Tamayo-Salazar.⁽¹³⁾ The Bollandist Cuyper was cautious in accepting it as genuine, because he said he had

often noticed that Tamayo for ancient documents had given his own compositions.⁽¹⁴⁾ Moreover, in nearly every respect, the work was but a reproduction of that of Thierry of Apoldia.

The rapid survey we have just made showing the vast accumulation of unedited records and unlooked for documents which were added in the seventeenth century to the production of the preceding ages enables us to realize how Loperraez might have been somewhat abashed in 1788 and finally took refuge in the attitude of dismay spoken of at the beginning of this little sketch. Nevertheless the historian, along with Castillo, happily succeeded in organizing the contributions of the century. Loperraez was also a Castilian writer, historian of the Church of Osma. He was superior to his rival contemporaries through a solid critique and a genuine care to construct the history of Diego only on official works, a great number of which he published, at the same time correcting the epitaph given by Castillo. He might be said, more than any other, to have been placed where he could bring new documents to the light of day and judge the value of the sources purported as discoveries by his modern predecessors. If like Castillo he found nothing and laid hold of nothing original on the subject of our interest, it must mean that the Castilian archives, which alone might house something unpublished, could at that time yield nothing new.

JORDANS RECORD

We are now in a position to judge. To the Dominican tradition of the thirteenth century, the following centuries added nothing authentic but the date of Diego's death. A supposititious incident without historical foundation like the visit to Blanche of Castile, inserted in the context of a spiritual treasury on the use of the Rosary, is not by its nature calculated to convince a historian. The tradition of the thirteenth century added to the record of Jordan only a vagueness and the mention of Dacia. Finally, we believe that a statement on the embassy of Diego can today be founded historically on no other source than the *Libellus* of the successor of St. Dominic. Is it, therefore, a hopeless question? Not at all. In our opinion, this source is worthy of thorough credit on this point in particular.

In Jordan's book, the embassy of Diego of Osma is not mere chance detail, a hypothetical transition, a passing thought or intention on which one might be mistaken even without willing it; it sets forth a concrete fact with varied and extensive implication.⁽¹⁵⁾ Thirty years after the event, the account was written, Though Jordan was not a witness, could he not have had trustworthy informants? Their identity might be easily guessed: Castilians like Mannes, the brother of St. Dominic, or Friar Dominic of Spain, or some canon of Osma become a Friar Preacher and a son of Jordan. The witnesses at the process of canonization cited several details supplied by these canons.⁽¹⁶⁾ They could have furnished Jordan with desirable details on the subject of the legation. If the King of the Belgians were to dispatch the Bishop of Tournai and the Prior of Le Saulchoir on an official embassy which consumed a long period of time and finally ended in the establishment of a new religious Order, completely changing the life of certain friars of the convent by attracting them to the new institution, is it not credible that thirty years later those friars and other witnesses would be able to relate the circumstances to anyone inquiring about the purpose of the journey? An official embassy would not be secret or obscure. Jordan had no need of inventing a story: the royal legation was a celebrated affair.

Furthermore, the account set down by him can be checked for verification on more than one point of importance. There was mention of a Ferdinand of Castile. Alphonso IX, in fact, had two sons of this name: the one born in 1184 died less than four years later; the other was born November 9, 1189.⁽¹⁷⁾ The second evidently is the one referred to here. In consequence of the early death of the male descendants who had preceded him (a Henry and a Ferdinand), he became at birth heir to the throne. In 1203-5 he was about fifteen years old; according to the custom of the time it was the age for arranging a marriage. The negotiation which Jordan of Saxony refers to was admittedly a highly important one.

Many circumstances, moreover, make particularly remarkable the mention of the young prince in the *Libellus*. He died prematurely, certainly before 1214, since at that time it was not he but the little Henry, born only in 1204, who became heir to the throne. This brief career, therefore, did not carve a place for him in history, nor even ensure his ever being known out of Spain. Only with great difficulty could historians of Castile today discover his existence (unless they knew also the text of Jordan). Further Jordan was a German who had not come to Italy from Paris before 1220, at least a decade after the death of Ferdinand. In no way, therefore, could he have known of the fleeting existence of the boy, if it were not through direct and detailed information. All this confirms the historical value of the *Libellus* on the point at issue.

DACIA

The Marches were designated by Jordan as the place of the matrimonial legation. The *Chronica prima* specifies Dacia. An examination of the text of the *Libellus* will show that, even though the chronicler might not have had independent information, he was but identifying in one specific word what Jordan had written. In fact, neither the Marches of Ancona, nor of Treviso, nor of Poitou seem likely to be correct. If there had been the least possibility of identifying the last-named territory with the country mentioned by Jordan, Gerard de Frachet (if he is really the author of the *Chronica prima*) and Bernard Guidonis, who were both natives of that district, would not have failed to claim for their home land the honor of being traversed in the first journey of St. Dominic. Moreover, the term "Marches" was not currently employed to designate that locality; not once does Frachet in his work use it in speaking of Limousin. Jordan speaks of the distance between Toulouse and the Marches, whither the Bishop was traveling, in strong terms: "arriving at length in the weariness of many labors"; and further: "undertaking once again the laborious journey." He employs no such terms in describing a passage of the Pyrenees, or for that of the Alps, or for a journey to Rome. Furthermore, for the master of the Order, a man of the thirteenth century and an indefatigable traveler, short journeys from France into Italy or Spain would not have merited such ponderous attention. The natural interpretation of Jordan's text, therefore, suggests the distant Marches: those of Brandenburg or of Dacia, Denmark or the Scandinavian countries.

And, here again, there appears a remarkable historical context. In the first half of the thirteenth century, not less than four alliances were entered into between the House of Castile and the Scandinavian countries. Blanche of Castile, sister of the young Ferdinand, by her French marriage became a sort of daughter-in-law of Ingeborg, sister of Valdemar II of Denmark. Urraque, another sister of Ferdinand, by her marriage with Alphonso II of Portugal became the sister-in-law of Valdemar II of Denmark, who had married Berengaria, sister of Alphonso II. Later she became the mother-in-law of Valdemar III, husband of her daughter Eleanor. Finally Alphonso X of Castile, in 1254, married Christina of Sweden. Therefore at the beginning of the century it would have been natural for Alphonso IX, in seeking a wife for the heir to the throne, to think of the princely houses of Scandinavia. Not only does Jordan's text seem thus to have a solid historical basis, but the interpretation of the *Chronica prima* also seems probable. The record of Jordan, rendered precise in this way, appears, therefore, to be the best account a historian even today could give of the embassy of Diego and Dominic.

In concluding this little study we may note that Scheeben's account of this voyage (18) seems unacceptable because of the proofs just given on the preceding pages. Although the documents substantiating his account have not been indicated, evidently they are derived in part from Manrique, to whom Scheeben attached too much importance. It is scarcely reasonable, on the word of a seventeenth century author, to prefer an uncertain document which is manifestly a late compilation to the certain evidence of Jordan of Saxony, who was almost a contemporary of the events he relates. Another remark will suffice to refute the thesis directly. In 1206, Alphonso IX would not have

commissioned the Bishop of Osma to cross the Pyrenees in order to carry a message to his daughter in the course of a hypothetical journey into the ancient Marches of Aquitaine, because the King himself at that date was in Aquitaine. [\(19\)](#)

NOTES

1 Jordan, nos. 14-20.

2 Ferrand, Constantine, Bartholomew of Trent, Vincent of Beauvais, Humbert, Roderick of Cerrate, Thierry of Apoldia; we may add Bernard Guidonis, who really belongs to the thirteenth century.

3 *Catalogus Sanctorum*, Bk. XI, chap. 72.

4 Leandro Alberti, *De viris illustribus ord. praed.*

5 Elie Berger, *Histoire de Blanche de Castille*, p. 21.

6 *Historia generale de S. Domenico e dell' Ordine suo dei Predicatori*, chap. 7.

7 *Chronic. fr. Pr.*, p. 9.

8 *Annalium S. O. Fr. Centuria I^a*.

9 Modern authors have made great efforts to learn into what country and kingdom he went; the cause of this difficulty was that, not being French, they could explain neither in Latin nor in their mother tongue what Vincent of Beauvais meant in his *Miroir historial* (Bk. XXIX chap. 95): *Ivit ad Marchias*. Curious about the possible explanation of these words: Malvenda named various provinces having for the seignorial title the name "la Marche," as in Italy, the Marches of Ancona and the Marches of Treviso; in Saxony, the Marches of Brandenburg and others. He concluded finally that he did not know to which one Dominic went with the venerable prelate, Dom Diego de Acebes (Réchac, p. 104).

10 This solution was adopted by Percin, and later in part by Fleury (*Hist. ecol.*, XVI, 198).

11 *Cisterciensium . . . annalium*, III (1649), 460.

12 *Theatro Ecclesiastico de la Iglesia y ciudad de Osma*, 1648. On pages 29 and 30 are found the citations given by Manrique.

13 *Anamnesis sive commemoratio omn. Sanct. hisp.* (1651), I, 2, 65-68.

14 *Acta sanctorum*, August, I, 396.

15 Jordan, nos. 14-19.

16 *Processus* (Bologna), nos. 14, 29.

17 Schirmacher, *Geschichte Castiliens*, pp. 686 f.; Elie Berger, *Hist. de Blanche de Castille*, Paris, 1895, p. 4.

18 *Der heilige Dominikus*, pp. 12-27.

19 Elie Berger, *Hist. de Blanche de Castille*, p. 13.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

II

The Birth of St. Mary of Prouille

THE oldest official document in which the religious of Prouille are named is a charter of donation from the Archbishop, Berenger of Narbonne, dated April 17, 1207. If Bernard Guidonis, Jean de Réchac, and Percin, in their respective periods, successively noticed this deed at the very beginning of the register or estate rolls of the monastery, we may naturally conclude that it already had that place in the thirteenth century and consequently introduces us to the very origin of the foundation. The circumstance is fortunate, since the deed is of capital importance. By supplementing and supporting it with contemporary evidence, we can describe briefly the birth of Prouille, its personnel, its nature, its purpose, its material resources, its founders, and, to a certain point, even its chronology.

Berenger of Narbonne granted the revenues of an important parish to the prioress and the nuns "recently converted by the exhortation and example of Brother Dominic and his companions." Thus are introduced the first members of the future convent. Even their number may be known. Jean de Réchac, Percin, and Echard enumerate the first eleven nuns whose names they read in the ancient papers or records of Prouille. We have no reason to reject this information, because it can be checked by the list of the nineteen nuns who were living May 15, 1211. (1) Berengaria, in the process of canonization at Toulouse (2) mentioned nine converts, one or more of whom entered perhaps at Prouille, as Constantine of Orvieto (3) affirms, though one might be tempted to see in the account only a legendary fabrication. In any event, that these nine women and the diabolical apparition which worked to their good, were associated with the origin of the monastery, is false. (4) Is there, then, no identity between the converted women referred to by Berengaria and the *conversae* mentioned by the Archbishop of Narbonne? Who were the latter?

The term *conversus* (*conversa*) had long been in the vocabulary of religious life. Over and above its use in a restricted sense, meaning adult postulants or lay religious, in the early thirteenth century it still retained much of its original significance and was used to designate Christians who by a radical change in their habits embraced a state of penance by entering religion. Among the Albigenses of that time, therefore, conversion, strictly speaking, could signify at once either entrance into religion or a turning from heresy. Considering the circumstances, the second meaning seems more obvious. Moreover, Dominican registers and records of the period employed the term only in its precise application to the conversion of the sinner, a return to the faith from heresy or amendment of life. (5) It is indeed to this kind of conversion (coupled with a religious vocation) that the text refers. The mention of the apologetic efforts of Dominic and his companions is characteristic, as is the specification in another record: (to the women) "converted by the preachers delegated to preach against heretics and to drive out pestilential heresy." (6) Another document (7) makes still clearer the distinction between conversion from heresy and the embracing of religious life; it uses the expression, "to the women converted, to those living religiously." The first nuns of Prouille, therefore, had at first been reclaimed from error to truth by St. Dominic.

THE "PERFECT"

In any case, the beneficiaries of possible reconciliation were not wanting in this unhappy country. (8) Situated at the crossroads from Limoux to Castelnaudary and from Foix to Carcassonne, Prouille marked the center of one of the most active strongholds of Catharism. Particularly the road from Carcassonne, with its meeting places for unbelievers from Mirepoix, Fanjeaux, and Montréal, formed

the highway of the heresy. In 1206 the first of these towns had been host to a great council of the "perfect" where no fewer than six hundred of these elect of the second degree⁽⁹⁾ were gathered. Fanjeaux, on the hill from which it dominates Prouille, was celebrated for the solemn apostasy in 1205 of Esclarmonde, sister of the Count of Foix.⁽¹⁰⁾ Heresy flourished there openly and freely: among some fifty knights composing its nobility, there was not one who was not a heretic or a fomenter of heresy, beginning with Dame Cavaers, the mistress of the place. Certain families had been Cathari for several generations; they were born "believing." Guilbert de Castres preached the tenets of the sect there with great success, and people from the country round came to Fanjeaux to be instructed or to receive the *consolamentum*.⁽¹¹⁾ Colleges of the "Perfect" for the men and for the women⁽¹²⁾ who were "vested" were numerous, and these institutions gave heresy its best weapons.

Thoroughly inspired in principle by a desire for religious perfection, the Catharist movement in the twelfth century quite naturally developed, for ascetical life in common, colleges resembling in their organization that of Christian religious houses.⁽¹³⁾ In this sphere, as in many others, Albigensianism displayed its opposition to the Church. For the men these centers of perfection provided places for preaching and teaching as well as retreat houses and seminaries; for the women they were rather hospices where retreatants or even travelers were received. The great attraction which the women of Europe had for religious life in that century was reflected in this arrangement. In these houses the women led a life that was poor, austere, and chaste. Likewise, although the "perfect" Cathari, unlike the Waldenses, did not go out of their habitations to engage in the ministry or in preaching of any kind,⁽¹⁴⁾ by the very spectacle of their life and particularly through their hospitality they exerted a profound influence. Finally, according to a custom prevalent at the time and practiced by them on a bigger scale perhaps than by Catholics, these organizations received and reared very young children who were entrusted to them by their parents, that in their turn they might become "vested" heretics.⁽¹⁵⁾ The disinterestedness of these Catharist convents, the protection which they enjoyed from the lords of the territory, who often confided their own relatives to them, the fraternal and pecuniary benefits dispensed as part of their apologetic and propagandist program⁽¹⁶⁾ make comprehensible their attraction and the resistance they mustered against Catholicism. The force of it is expressed clearly in a brief dialogue heard after one of the discussions.

"Never would we have believed," said a hearer, "that Rome could bring such effective arguments against these men."

"Ah well!" Bishop Foulques replied, "and do you not see how their power collapses in the face of these objections?"

"Perfectly," came the answer.

"Then why not expel them from your country?" he asked.

"We cannot; we are supported by them; our own relatives are in their number, and we see how they are living in perfection."⁽¹⁷⁾

This was the attraction that drew the apostolic preachers into the canton of Fanjeaux-Montréal under the leadership of the Bishop of Osma. Dominic from the first penetrated the very heart of the Catharist institution. Peter Ferrand⁽¹⁸⁾ gives an account of one of his campaigns of conversion in a hospice of the "Perfect." His radiant holiness quickly made conquests among these misguided but generous and sincere souls. Then the problem opened up to him in all its fullness. It was not a work that could stop at conversion alone.

"The Bishop of Osma established a convent in the place called Prouille, between Fanjeaux and Montreal, to house there certain noble girls whose parents, impelled by need, entrusted them to the heretics to be trained and reared." The information in this brief note from Jordan of Saxony(19) is in perfect accord with what the charter of Berenger and the situation at Fanjeaux reveal. It throws light on the type of convert women who were the beneficiaries of the gift of Berenger in 1207 and on the nature of the house that was opened at Prouille.

Independent of any promptings of a religious nature, the presentation of children and the entrance of adults to the heretical colleges had an unmistakable economic aspect. The institutions of oblates, *donats*, and lay brothers or sisters, and the whole feminine religious movement of the thirteenth century cannot be understood without a knowledge of underlying temporal conditions. Finding it impossible to live in impoverished families, in the midst of criminal surroundings, laymen, women and children, offered themselves or were offered to societies of common life, better prepared to defend them. The second charter of Prouille, issued four months after the first, was a contract of "donation."(20) Among the landed nobility the material situation in Languedoc was particularly difficult; the custom of division of inheritances by equal shares had resulted little by little in an infinitesimal parceling of property, so that often the same village was sharing its revenues among twenty-five, thirty-five and even fifty co-lords; this last was the number at Fanjeaux.(21) The religious crisis, therefore, was closely connected with an economic and social crisis. There could be only one solution. If the converted were to be allowed to exist, if the way of salvation was to be opened to those whom misery alone bound to the Cathari, a Christian life in common would have to be instituted to receive them. Prouille was provided.

PROUILLE

What is more, these "perfect" apprentices had true spiritual aspirations for prayer, for asceticism, for a life separated from the world. Prouille was to be not a simple hospice but a religious house, a convent. In the words of Jordan of Saxony, it was the *monasterium*. From the beginning, according to the charter of Berenger, the foundation had the character of a regular house, with a prioress and nuns; the religious, established in their provisional lodging,(22) were separated from the world; the gift which they received from their Archbishop was received in their name by a male personnel similar to that customary for the contemporary feminine communities and represented by Brother Dominic and Brother William Claret. The Prouille convent was in this way a challenging answer to the colleges of the "perfect"; it was like them even to the degree in which these communities were modeled on Catholic monasteries and satisfied legitimate desires for Christian perfection. Like the colleges of the Cathari, Prouille was to radiate influence through the good life of its religious. Like them and in greater truth, it was to be a rallying point for the apostolate of the preachers. Further, it had its Catholic concept for the interior appointment of a religious house.

Its installation in a church was profoundly significant. Not one word in the documents suggests that the *ordo*, though yet hardly sketched, would in any way depart from what was classic for nuns' convents. On one point, this contact with what was customary in contemporary regular communities placed precise limits on the extent to which the house would undertake the work of protection. In principle, Prouille would receive only adults or, at any rate, girls of an age to become nuns; it stood against being transformed, like some of our modern convents, into an institute of young girls. Not only do the texts never mention any other class than the converted, or nuns, or sisters,(23) but an ancient Rule of Prouille reads, "It is not at all our custom to receive girls younger than eleven years of age; nevertheless, if any should be received before this age, to avoid a serious occasion of a fall or to procure some spiritual benefit, they should be cared for apart and educated carefully to the age of fourteen."(24) The precocity of children in that century and in that province should be taken into

consideration. The first part of this prescription, which can be found equivalently in other contemporary rules (since Cluny had taken the initiative), shows the general reaction in religious congregations against the disorders which the presence of too great a number of children had caused in cloisters. The second part, however, gives an idea of the preservative intentions which had given rise to the practice.

On April 17, 1207, Prouille was but a new-born institute. It would be fantastic to attempt to distinguish there all the elements of the future convent. With its economic status uncertain and its living quarters temporary, the whole tenor of regular life was conditional. Is not the beginning of every foundation the same? The first converted women established themselves, according to the charter of Berenger, "in the church of Prouille," that is, in some buildings adjoining this little sanctuary;(25) but, probably for lack of space,(26) all the girls were not yet lodged there; during the first weeks they remained at Fanjeaux.(27) Needless to say, the buildings were not very commodious. Prouille had at one time been a parish;(28) but its title and revenues had disappeared, probably on account of the heresy of the inhabitants. There were, it seems, two abandoned chapels, in such poor condition that the sisters were soon obliged to reconstruct them; one was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, the other to St. Martin.(29) The nuns immediately made their residence in the first; the second, which was in ruins, was given to them in 1246 and at that time became the chapel of the friars. What was called a building was a shack, so poor that no one would have been tempted to appropriate it, and no donation was required for its occupation.

TEMPORAL STATUS

All the changes that can be traced in the first period of Prouille follow the variations in its economic condition. In the early days the sisters lived as well as they could on alms and on the revenues donated by Berenger, the first of which did not accrue to them perhaps before 1209.(30) But after 1211 the victorious crusaders began to endow them generously. When Bishop Foulques regained possession of some of the property of his diocese, formerly in a dilapidated condition, he in turn imitated other benefactors. And in that year, by two successive grants, he first definitively secured to the religious women the property of the church of St. Mary. In the seventeenth century, Jean de Réchac read these two deeds together in the rolls of the convent. He published the first one, which was a donation pure and simple, with a reservation of the tithes and first fruits. This deed, which bears no notice of month or day, must have been given prior to May 15, when apparently Simon de Montfort considered the church as belonging to the sisters.(31) A short time later (perhaps before the siege of Toulouse?), in response to the repeated request of St. Dominic, Foulques stated the specifications of his grant; he added the gift of thirty feet of ground on each side of the church, exempting from tithes and first fruits the property acquired by the sisters, and had his act confirmed by the provost of his chapter.(32) The sisters, whose number meanwhile had increased from eleven to eighteen or nineteen, were able to think of constructing a suitable convent, thanks to the numerous gifts which now flowed in upon them.(33)

The work of building went on without delay. A whole series of records mentions the "monastery" and even the new "abbey."(34) Should the latter term be understood in its technical sense? Certainly it was not definitively adopted, because at the same time more unpretentious words like *domus*,(35) *locus*,(36) and *ecclesia*(37) were employed, or quite simply the name, St. Mary of Prouille, or just Prouille. Besides, never did the prior or the prioress claim the title of abbot or abbess. In short, after 1213, the term "abbey" disappeared. The rather high sounding title reflects in a way the impression made on the people by the relatively large size of the new edifice. The prior of Prouille himself would have rejected a term of such little apologetic worth in an Albigensian stronghold. But it is probable that the appearance and disappearance of the word "abbey" indicated something even more significant.

CISTERCIAN SISTERS

Prouille rose and developed in the heart of the Cistercian atmosphere. Numerous traces show the relations of the convent with the Order of St. Bernard, the great preceptor of nuns in that age. Now, when Dominic arrived in Languedoc, he was neither prepared to be the founder of an order nor bent upon becoming so. It is quite natural to think that from the first he considered having his religious house incorporated with the Order of Cîteaux, as an "abbey" of women, once it was fairly established. In 1212-13, the time seemed to have arrived. Perhaps Dominic instituted some proceedings. The year 1213, on the other hand, marked the first show of resistance by the Order of Cîteaux to new incorporations. It soon became invincible. Perhaps for this reason Prouille was not officially recognized as a Cistercian abbey and was not confided to the administration of these religious.⁽³⁸⁾ Its juridical status and its proper name of "monastery" were not definitively settled until early in the year 1218, with the concession of the great bull of foundation, which sanctioned the independence of the house.⁽³⁹⁾

Whatever the situation, beginning with 1212, the religious life of the sisters expanded into its normal and ultimate frame. It would seem natural to place in this period the first writing of the Rule of Prouille⁽⁴⁰⁾ and doubtless also the establishment of the cloister. Certain elements of this Rule were borrowed from the great codes of religious life for women as conceived by Cîteaux and Prémontré. But the Rule was original in the sense that it was not made part of a traditional rule. Its existence at Prouille in October, 1215, may be confirmed by the fact that the bull of protection then accorded by the Pope made no mention of a classic rule. We may, however, ask whether an elementary bull of economic protection would have to mention the rule.⁽⁴¹⁾

As to the enclosure, probably the sisters had been able to maintain it from the very beginning in their temporary buildings, as all the early historians of Prouille attest; but it seems more likely that Dominic did not establish it before the erection of regular monastic quarters. Finally, the significance of the proceedings of 1218 was, for the sisters, economic rather than religious, because the purpose was to separate them definitively from the Order at St. Romanus, while at the same time it consecrated the friars in their own regular life of the Preachers, by a privilege identical with that received a year earlier by the friars of Toulouse. It is, therefore, an error and somewhat of an anachronism to interpret this event, as Percin does, as the transition of the sisters from a profession of simple vows to a profession of solemn vows. He says that the first companions of St. Dominic made no profession before that date⁽⁴²⁾ and that the sisters were at times called *dominae*. There is nothing surprising in the title; it was classic for nuns in the thirteenth century.⁽⁴³⁾ In the records of Prouille it is used along with the designations *moniales*⁽⁴⁴⁾ (nuns), *sancti moniales* (holy nuns),⁽⁴⁵⁾ and particularly *sorores* (sisters), which appeared to be the preferred title as in accord with their humility.⁽⁴⁶⁾

DATE OF FOUNDATION

One point still awaits consideration, one that gave the new community its true character: its relation to the apostolate of the Preachers among the Albigensians, as directed by Diego of Osma. It is bound up with some chronological details.

The miraculous sign, the occupying of the convent, and the establishing of the cloister were respectively assigned by Percin to July 22, November 22, and December 27 of the year 1206. Echard⁽⁴⁷⁾ also mentions the last two dates as having been read by him in the Acts of Prouille. But Réchac, who wrote earlier, had known only the third date.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Further, the date, December 27, for the enclosure was already traditional in the early fourteenth century (1307), when Bernard Guidonis gave it as a heritage faithfully transmitted through the generations of sisters.⁽⁴⁹⁾ It is the only one of the

three dates which can at present be considered as having some foundation. Bernard Guidonis also thought it might be December 27, 1206, because he assigned to that year the foundation of the convent with its cloister.⁽⁵⁰⁾ But he himself does not join the two (date and year); thus we see that the two chronological traditions of day and year were transmitted separately. We have suggested that the establishment of the cloister might have occurred several years after the foundation, perhaps in 1212 or 1213. In that case, the year 1206 stands as the only indication given by Bernard Guidonis for the birth of Prouille. According to his method of calculation, the foundation was made between April 2, 1206 and April 22, 1207 (or perhaps March 25, if it is a question of accordance with the Annunciation). That is the sole chronological note of ancient record for this event, the thirteenth century having left no testimony. While it lacks precision and seems rather late, it may be considered approximately correct.

The chronology of Prouille depends, in fact, upon the chronology of the apostolic journeys of Diego and the legates. They were in Carcassès in the late summer or early autumn of 1206, and then again, after the apostolate in the Toulouse district, in the first part of 1207. It is possible and even probable that some conversions were already made among the women at the time of the first visit. The idea of a foundation, however, if it presented itself to the Preachers at all, was something not yet feasible. They could not shoulder such a burden; they had to make their rounds as itinerant preachers. Early in 1207, however, their apostolate centered more in the region of Fanjeaux-Montréal,⁽⁵¹⁾ one of the principal strongholds of heresy. At the same time (March, 1207), Arnold Amaury of Cîteaux arrived with a strong contingent to join the legates at Montreal. This reinforcement was the signal for a complete change in the apostolic method. The system of having a little missionary band tirelessly traversing the whole country was abandoned. The territory was divided among the principal preachers; within each of the new districts, a headquarters or rallying place was appointed from which the work of preaching proceeded. The Bishop of Osma, who with Raoul of Fontfroide was the leader of the apostles, actually organized the system and financed it with modest revenues from his diocese.⁽⁵²⁾ While to all appearances Diego and Raoul were occupied in visiting the different groups in turn, Dominic was definitely assigned to the neighborhood of Fanjeaux-Montréal, the border country of the itinerant mission. It was at this time that he established his preaching center at Prouille.⁽⁵³⁾ That was in April, 1207.

This orientation of the apostolic enterprise, on a more stationary basis, led to the beginning of other works. It became possible to assemble the converts, whose number had grown during the missions, and whose distressing plight had doubtless become a matter of concern. In organizing his center, Dominic provided a place for the sisters. Berenger, the archbishop of Narbonne, was then at Carcassonne,⁽⁵⁴⁾ evidently hoping through his proximity to show a semblance of participation in the apostolate of the legates. Urgent circumstances obliged him to show at least a minimum of good will.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Dominic profited by the occasion to ask him to support the new nuns; as religious head of the territory, it was the duty of the Archbishop to defray the expense of the apostolic work.⁽⁵⁶⁾ Berenger could not refuse. What he gave was the charter of April 17, 1207. If this document is not the birth certificate of Prouille, at least it is a very close echo of it. It was, therefore, about the month of April, 1207, that the religious house was instituted; preliminary plans for the project apparently go back to the year 1206.

THE FOUNDER

The convent for the sisters took its place among the dependencies of the apostolic organization directed by St. Dominic. Economically and legally (so far as juridical terms are applicable in the case of new institutes), it was not distinct from it and was known by its title, *Sancta Praedicatio*. This was the title used four months later in the second charter of Prouille, a deed whereby Saris Gasc and Ermengarde Godoline "donated" themselves and all their possessions to the Lord Dominic and all the friars and sisters of the Catholic establishment. The good name and the prayers of the sisters of Prouille

were an apologetic support to the word of their brethren; in return, the nuns looked to the Preachers for their prior and their necessary officials. Certain elements essential to a women's community of the period were ensured in that way. In any case, the nature and the importance of the male element in this community were quite unusual. In likeness nearer to the "double monastery" of Prémontré and Fontevault than to a simple house of nuns, in reality Prouille was of a type entirely original. Something of that stamp was to mark it always, even when the primitive *Praedicatio* became a real monastery of Preachers.

The foregoing considerations in settling the foundation date have also settled a final question: Who were the founders of Prouille? The answer is easy. If the founder is he who converted the first recruits, united them, undertook their direction, treated with the Archbishop of Narbonne to obtain their first dowry, attended to the construction of their convent, wrote and put in force the Rule for the nuns, and for eight years acted as prior of Prouille, undeniably St. Dominic merits that title. In the first authentic records, he is the only one explicitly mentioned as concerned in these various functions.⁽⁵⁷⁾ The fact that he is the only one named in the charter of April 17, 1207, as having converted the nuns and taken charge of their interests, is particularly remarkable. At that date Diego was still in Languedoc. If the Bishop of Osma had played a part comparable to that of Dominic in the foundation, there would have been no reason for not naming him. In 1259, after Humbert of Romans, in the course of an official visit at Prouille,⁽⁵⁸⁾ read the primitive documents on which we now rely, he ordered the name of Dominic to be substituted for that of the Bishop of Osma ⁽⁵⁹⁾ in the legends concerning the foundation, and though his act had the disagreeable aspect of a pious falsification, it was founded absolutely on truth.

Not that Diego did not merit the place accorded him by Jordan of Saxony in the *Libellus*.⁽⁶⁰⁾ The Bishop was also a founder of Prouille, but in another sense. The foundation was made under his authority, certainly with his counsel, and according to his direction and with his help. When he left for Spain, the future of Prouille was one of his concerns.

Foulques ascribed to himself the construction of the convent.⁽⁶¹⁾ The gift of the church of St. Mary and of the land adjacent to it, that of the church of Fanjeaux and its revenues, of the church of Bram and its tithes and first fruits, justify this affirmation. But Foulques was not a founder; he came on the scene only in 1211. Berenger was on hand at the beginning, but the note of compulsion in his one donation would hardly merit for him a title of honor. Moreover, whether his generosity was sincere and whether the church which he gave really belonged to him may be questioned. The monks of St. Hilary soon reclaimed this benefice, which was still in their possession at the beginning of the century.⁽⁶²⁾ Finally Dame Cavaers, the châtelaine of Fanjeaux, was listed by Percin in the number of the founders. Apparently she had no other title to that honor than her existence and the error which Percin made in supposing that her intervention was necessary. Balme⁽⁶³⁾ readily accepted Percin's word, because he believed that this lady, alone among the nobility of Fanjeaux, was free from heresy.⁽⁶⁴⁾ But Guiraud⁽⁶⁵⁾ discovered that she had yielded as early as 1193. There is no room for her intervention in 1207 in a Catholic cause.⁽⁶⁶⁾

NOTES

1 Laurent, no. 9; Balme, I, 141.

2 *Processus* (Toulouse), no. 23.

3 *Legenda Sti. Dominici*, no. 49.

4 Balme, I, 141; Altaner, pp. 36 f.

5 Cf. Jordan, no. 17; *Processus* (Toulouse), no. 23; Ferrand, nos. 11, 12, 21; Constantine, nos. 48 f.; Laurent, nos. 67, 78; Balme, I, 171, 187, 470 f.

6 Laurent, no. 11.

7 *Ibid.*, no. 9.

8 For all that follows, see Guiraud, *L'Inquisition au moyen age*.

9 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 269.

10 *Ibid.*, pp. 290 f.

11 *Balme*, I, 115 f.

12 *Guiraud*, pp. 148 f.

13 *Ibid.*, pp. 146-51.

14 *Ibid.*, pp. 227 f.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 150; Balme, I, 131 f., 171-73; 271 f.

16 Guiraud, pp. 353 f.; Jordan, no. 35.

17 Puylaurens, no. 8.

18 No. 22.

19 No. 27.

20 Laurent, no. 6. These interested recruits were not always reliable. In 1220 there was a lay member at Prouille who secretly attended the heretical meetings. Guiraud, *L'Inquisition*, p. 348; in 1258, Humbert of Romans worked carefully to define their status. Guiraud, *Cartulaire de Notre Dame de Prouille*, I, 156.

21 Guiraud, *L'Inquisition*, pp. 326 f.

22 *Habitantibus nunc et in perpetuum*, "to those dwelling here, now and in the future."

23 Laurent, nos. 5-9.

24 Balme, II, 431.

25 Laurent, no. 5. In 1211 the expression was made more precise (*ad ecclesiam*, adjoining the church). *Ibid.*, no. 9.

26 Réchac, p. 202,

27 The charter of April 17 is the only one containing definite mention of some who were apart from the others; that of August 15 following makes no further reference to it, nor does any other document except charter 7 (1209) and charter 24 (1212) in which the articles restate purely and simply, and not without anachronism, the articles of charter 5, which served as their model.

28 Laurent, no. 11.

29 Cf. Laurent, nos. 5, 7, 8, 11 ff.; Guiraud, *Cartulaire*, II, 58; Réchac, pp. 196, 205. 80

30 Laurent, no. 7.

31 The Act edited by Réchac was reprinted in Echard, I, 7, n. Q; Mamachi, App., p. 39, but not in Laurent. Charter 4, found in this last collection, is a questionable document proceeding from the Diocese of St. Papoul (*Gallia Christiana*, XIII, 247), concerning which Guiraud (*Cart.*, I, cccxxxv) remarks that the mere mention of the year 1206 is not sufficient to establish the date. Now this one date is about the only point distinguishing this charter from that of Laurent, no. 11. Further, a reading of the common text leads to the conclusion that it was evidently rewritten and that the addition supposes an earlier text which is none other than that of Réchac; it might be that the Act of St. Papoul was but a document reconstituted after the loss of the deed given by Réchac; such things are not uncommon in the case of such restored documents. Scheeben (*Archivum O.P.*, II, 291-93) disregarded this uncertain document, not without becoming involved in some errors of reasoning. It will be noted that Réchac did not publish in full the date of the charter either; but he certainly read the year 1211 on the terrier; manifestly he would have preferred to read 1206 (Réchac, p. 196).

See Laurent, no. 8, the donation of Simon de Montfort "to the house of Prouille, to the prioress," etc. May 15, 1211.

32 Laurent, no. 11. According to canon law, a gift of 90 feet of land extended the right of sanctuary over a portion of the adjacent land. Thus the sisters obtained a piece of land about 150 feet square beside the church. On this their buildings and other possessions would be respected under pain of sacrilege.

33 For the number of sisters, see Laurent, no. 8; on their acquisitions, see nos. 8-59.

34 *Abbatia noviter constructa, abb. de novo facta*, Laurent, nos. 23 f., 29 f., 32 f 35,42, 45.

35 Nos. 8, 27 f., 47.

36 Nos. 23, 35.

37 Nos. 8, 31, 33 f., 52 f.; according to the custom which included in the church the house for religious.

38 The house for the sisters was founded within the precincts of the great Cistercian mission. During that period Dominic kept in close contact with the Order of Cîteaux. In 1213 he was vicar-general for the Cistercian bishop, Guy of Carcassonne. He was still preaching in the company of the Cistercian abbots or lay brothers (Balme, I, 471; Frachet, p. 76; Constantine, no. 55). Moreover, the Rule of Prouille was thoroughly Cistercian. Taeggio (*Chron. ampliss.*, an. 1206; Mamachi, p. 158) mentions also a tradition saying that the first sisters were vested in the habit of the Order of Cîteaux. Hence it is possible that at the outset, and particularly when the monastic buildings were under construction (1212-13), Dominic cherished the plan of confiding to the Order of St. Bernard the convent of nuns

which was already following Cistercian observance. At that time the Friars Preachers did not yet exist; if Dominic were to disappear in this arena of battles, what would become of the monastery? It was but natural to affiliate it to the Order of Cîteaux, which in the early thirteenth century was the great and practically the only educator of nuns (Grundmann, p. 203). Moreover, it was always the desire of St. Dominic to be free from all other responsibilities in order to devote himself more fully to the apostolate (*Process-us* [Bologna], no. 12).

In view of this consideration, we can understand the use of the name "abbey," when the buildings were being constructed. It is true, likewise, for the title, The Abbey of St. Mary of Prouille: all the Cistercian abbeys were dedicated to Our Lady. In the next decade when the Order of Preachers found the *cura monialium* more or less a burden, the attempt of William Claret to have Prouille incorporated in Cîteaux was but a renewal of an earlier project (Mamachi, p. 368).

But in 1213 the general chapter of Cîteaux for the first time showed signs of an unwillingness to have the *cura monialium*. This attitude grew stronger year after year. In 1228 any new incorporation was forbidden (Canivez, *Statuta Cap. Gen. O.C.*, I, 405). Such a reluctance would be more pronounced in the case of a convent among the Albigenses, where the Cistercians had experienced great difficulties. Thus it will be readily understood that Dominic, informed of the decision of this chapter (September, 1213), renounced his plan and established his residence again near Prouille, allowing himself to be appointed curé of Fanjeaux (Laurent, no. 54). Instead of becoming a Cistercian abbey, the monastery of the nuns continued as an independent convent without any change in its form of life.

Scheeben deserves credit for calling attention to this significance of the word "abbey" in the charter of Prouille.

39 Laurent, no. 86; bull *Religiosam vitam*, March 30.

40 Balme, II, 425-53; Simon, *L'Ordre des Pénitentes*, pp. 143-53.

41 Laurent, no. 62.

42 According to Jordan, no. 31.

43 De Valens, *Le monachisme clunysien* (1935), I, 380; Balme, II, 458; Humbert of Romans, *Sermones* (1508), p. 49.

44 Laurent, *passim*.

45 *Ibid.*, no. 49.

46 "Let the nuns of Prouille be called not ladies, but sisters." Douais, *Acta cap. prov. ord. fr. praed.* (1894), p. 54.

47 Echard, I, note 2.

48 Réchac, pp. 119, 196 f.

49 Mamachi, p. 160.

50 Martène, *Script.*, VI, 399, 438, 539.

51 Cernai, nos. 26-30, 54.

52 *Ibid.*, nos. 47 f.; Robert of Auxerre (*Mon. Ger. hist., Scriptorum*), XXVI, 271; Jordan, no. 28.

53 At this date Dominic no longer figured as assistant to Diego, but as the head of a company organized by the Bishop. Laurent, no. 5; Jordan, no. 29.

54 Laurent, no. 5.

55 Villemagne, pp. 97-99.

56 Potthast, no. 2103; Villemagne, p. 76.

57 Laurent, *passim*.

58 The year 1258, according to Guiraud, *Cartulaire*, I, 255.

59 *Acta capitulorum*, I, 98.

60. *No. 27.*

61. ". . . which was reared and constructed by us," December, 1230. Guiraud, *op. cit.*, II, 78; cf. I, 6, 15.

62 Guiraud, *op. cit.*, II, 158-64; *L'Inquisition*, pp. 343 f. The latter entry must be erroneous; St. Hilary could not have been despoiled already in 1207 by the crusaders.

63 Vol. I, p. 139.

64 *Ibid.*, p. 116.

65 *L'Inquisition*, p. 291.

66 Scheeben's view is quite different. See his *Der heilige Dominikus* and his article, "Die Anfaenge des zweiten Ordens des heiligen Dominikus," *Archivum O.P.*, II (1932), 284-315.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

III

The *Sancta Praedicatio* in Narbonne (1204-8)

Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.

In dedicating, his *Historia Albigensis* to Pope Innocent III, Peter of Vaux-de-Cernai summarized his plan in the following words: "In the first part of the work I sketch briefly the subject of the heretical sects and review how the people of Provence were, in times past, infected with the leprosy of unbelief. Then I consider how as sinners these heretics were warned and often exhorted to repent by the preachers of the word of God, ministers of Your Holiness. Then follows the account of the crusades."[\(1\)](#)

It might be noted here that the story of the apostolic undertaking of Innocent III did not enter directly into the scope of a book devoted specifically to the war against the Albigensians. Yet Peter recognized that he would quite falsify the Pope's attitude unless, at the beginning of a book which would be filled with the noise of battle and of political intrigues, he first devoted at least a few pages to the recurring attempts of the Sovereign Pontiff to save and restore this people to the Church by preaching. The words of his prologue echo the many declarations of Innocent in his bulls, or his still more solemn utterances at the Lateran Council: "Nearly everyone the world over is mindful of how the Church has labored through her preachers and her crusaders to overthrow the heretics and the military force in the province of Narbonne."[\(2\)](#)

In his résumé, Peter merely touches on these efforts, but he treats what is of most interest to us, the apostolic campaign of 1206-8 in which Diego and Dominic collaborated for the development of an undertaking started only two years before. Through the pages of the Cistercian chronicler, through the letters of the Pope, through the study of some other sources, we are able to form some idea of the character of the pontifical organization of 1204-8, which was given the name *Praedicatio*,[\(3\)](#) *Sancta Praedicatio*.[\(4\)](#) We shall attempt to outline it.

THE PURPOSE

Innocent's letter (January 24, 1204),[\(5\)](#) which constitutes the charter of foundation for the papal mission, clearly expressed the purpose of this enterprise.

Almost as soon as he entered upon his pontificate, the Pope dispatched envoys into the Albigensian territory. Toward the end of 1203 the two legates, Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, both Cistercian monks of Fontfroide, were occupied in official negotiations with the prelates and the civil authorities in Narbonne and Toulouse.[\(6\)](#) In conformity with the canons, they sought first to expel the promoters of heresy who corrupted the people. Soon, as a normal consequence, though official mandates were issued only against the heretics,[\(7\)](#) they launched a reform of the local clergy, hoping to effect a dismissal of the most scandalous leaders whose lives created a definite obstacle to their work.[\(8\)](#) Thus from the beginning they were engaged in a series of administrative and political affairs. During the following years they pursued the execution of these measures. At their request and in certain particular cases the Pope bestowed on them all the necessary powers.[\(9\)](#) Fully conscious of his duty, Innocent never neglected to make use of the armed forces which in that age the power of the state placed at the service of the faith. Not in view of such aid, however, had he first dispatched these legates, and it was

in another direction that he aimed to orientate their labors. To be persuaded of this, even though we have not the bull of institution, we need merely to read the bull of January 29, 1204.

THE BREAD OF THE WORD

Innocent was thoroughly aware that the crisis could not be met by political or business negotiations. The problem to be solved was not the suppression of the heretics, but the complete evangelization of the country. The essential evil was this: while the heretics had full liberty to ravage the flock of the Lord, those who had care of it did not trouble themselves to defend it; they no longer occupied themselves with their people. Not without emotion can these sad words of Innocent be read in the bull of January 29:

The pastors who feed themselves first do not provide nourishment for the flock of the Lord; they have no solicitude to strengthen what is weak, to nurse what is sick, to bind up what is bruised, to search for what has strayed, They keep their sword in the scabbard and negligently celebrate the *opus Dei*. There is a famine in this land, the little ones cry for bread; and there is almost no one to break it for them.(10)

In these words Innocent outlined in its fullness the preaching and teaching program of the prelates. Truly, it was designed not only to check the boldness of the heretics and rescue strayed believers, but more especially to minister to the faithful and to appease their hunger. In calling this program to the attention of Berenger, head of the Church of Languedoc, the Pope severely reproached him for his negligence. He also addressed a letter identical in form to all the bishops, abbots, priors, and other prelates of the province. And he did more.

To compensate for the lack of cooperation on the part of the prelates, a condition foreseen only too well, he reiterated the command to Berenger to assist in every way possible the two legates just sent in order "to extirpate the heretical perversion." In a few words he defined the essential character of the mission: *verbo pariter et doctrinae insistere*, "to engage in preaching and teaching."(11) At the same time he sent the bull to many groups of preachers, *ad praedicationis officium idoneos*. He designated two in particular, Raoul, canon of Narbonne, and Peter, abbot of Valmagne,(12) leaving the choice of the others to the Abbot of Citeaux, who was to appoint them. He placed these preachers under the direction of Peter and Raoul; at their summons the workers were to enter the harvest field of the Lord.(13) Thus was the papal mission constituted, and the letter of January 29 served as its fundamental charter.

The legates and their preachers, therefore, received their apostolic appointment from the prelates. They were sent into the field of the ordinary pastors who had neglected their work. As the following letters will show, (14) it was this provisional substitution, independent of the administrative and political matters attended to by the prelates as the occasion arose, which characterized the preaching program in Narbonne as projected by the Pope early in 1204.(15) The events attending its origin and the circumstances of its institution reveal it essentially as an enterprise directed against heresy: "preachers were delegated to preach against heretics and to stamp out pestiferous heresy."(16) But, in fact, in a country where everyone was drawn toward apostasy and where Catholic views were almost no longer heard, it was not only a question of disputing against the miscreants but of spreading the word of the gospel among the people at large. The ordinary prelates had failed in this duty; consequently the papal preachers had to assume the full burden of Catholic instruction; the admirable pastoral program contained in the bull which instituted them was written as it were for them alone.(17)

It was this program that Foulques assigned to Dominic and his companions in 1215 when, as will be seen later, he revived in his diocese the *Sancta Praedicatione* of 1204-8, "to extirpate the heretical errors, to hunt out vices, to teach the *Regula fidei*, and to lead men to the practice of sound morals."[\(18\)](#)

THE METHOD

When he appointed the preachers to the field of their apostolic labor, Innocent III at the same time designated their method. Already in a letter on Berenger, the Pope stigmatized the counter-preaching which had found fuel in the scandalous life of the Archbishop: "a dumb dog," "a pastor who prefers to gorge himself," "a servant of avarice and not of doctrine," his vices and those of his colleagues gave the heretics their best weapons against the truth. "If indeed everywhere and publicly the heretics propagate their doctrine and seduce defenseless men, they attract them the more easily as they point to the life of the Archbishop and other prelates of the Church as a most pernicious argument against her, and they blame the whole Church for the crimes of a few."[\(19\)](#)

Thus it was under the device of preaching by *word and by example* that the Pope desired to promote his mission. That fact explains why he sought his preachers first among the Cistercians, religious whose austerity and holiness were at that time most celebrated. He selected his two legates from their ranks. He sent to the Abbot of Cîteaux the bull which instituted the mission (January 29); he looked to him for additional preachers. On May 31, three days after he had reproved the attitude of Berenger, he again confided to the same Abbot of Cîteaux the direction of the preaching enterprise and appointed him a legate; he then opened his whole mind:

We rejoice and we give thanks to the Giver of all good gifts, considering that in your Order there are a great number of men filled with an enlightened zeal for God, powerful in work and word, and ready to give to whoever asks it a reason for the faith and the hope in which we abide;[\(20\)](#) men in whom, we believe, charity grows strong to prepare them to give their lives for their brethren, if the needs of the Church demand it; who are so much more fitted to confound the fabricators of false doctrines as they are above the least reproach from a jealous adversary; they enjoy a good reputation even among people at large, because in them the holiness of their lives is in harmony with sound thought, and their life vivifies their teaching so that their word is living, efficacious, and more piercing than a two-edged sword; their teaching penetrates their life so that men can read in their manners what their sermons explain.[\(21\)](#)

Each word of this text with its wealth of Scriptural allusion might be commented upon. The picture of the preacher is the direct antithesis of that inscribed in another bull three days before on Berenger. Nor is the Pope yet satisfied with the description. He has so much at heart the apologetic method that he takes his pen again to append a last sentence at the close of the letter: "Therefore we will and advise you to proceed so that 'Your modesty' may be known to all, that you 'may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men "[\(22\)](#) and that in word or deed there may appear nothing in your conduct to which even a heretic might take exception."[\(23\)](#)

The motto of the preaching designed by Innocent is in some way expressed by the last sentence and by other terse formulas equivalent to it: "Let men read in their manners what their sermons explain," or "through the good example of works and the teaching of words."[\(24\)](#) In the charter of the foundation of Prouille, mention is made of the conversion of the future nuns "by the exhortation and example of Brother Dominic";[\(25\)](#) the same expression was used again in 1215 in the charter of preaching of Toulouse,[\(26\)](#) as in the tenth canon of the Lateran Council concerning the Preachers.[\(27\)](#)

Furthermore, late in 1204 the Pope, when appealed to by the legates, forbade them to engage in the general correction of scandals, however much they might be tempted to do so, lest occupation with secondary problems should binder their consecrating themselves with full ardor to their principal mission.(28)

THE APOSTOLIC LIFE

In 1206 the method was given remarkable precision. It seems that the legates did not willingly accede to the recommendation not to pursue the correction of the clergy; in May, 1206, the Pope had to repudiate their action in the case of Berenger.(29) Again it seems that in spite of their Cistercian austerity the papal missionaries failed to give in all its vigor the apostolic example which was to support their doctrine. If it behooved them to break radically with the conduct of the gluttonous and avaricious pastors, they could do it only through the poverty of monks. If they had need to avoid the least cause for reproach from the heretics, how could they do so except by practicing poverty according to the very counsels of the Gospel which seemed to prevail in the lives of their enemies? Now, though they may not have had the sumptuous train on which Dominican hagiography has been pleased to lay stress, the legates went about on horseback, paid for their daily fare, and showed no sign of the austere poverty habitual with the heretical preachers.

Then it was that Bishop Diego of Osma, on his way from Rome, intervened on a certain occasion at Montpellier. Had he been counseled by Innocent? Had he come with a command from the Pope? Later on we shall speak of what gives us a quasi-certitude regarding this. In any event, it is beyond question that Diego then made them understand in their precise terms the two chief features of the apostolic method proposed by the Sovereign Pontiff with a consideration of their logical consequences. According to Peter of Vaux-de-Cernai, he then exhorted the legates: first, "to forget every other work, and to devote themselves more ardently than ever to preaching; secondly, in order to close the mouth of the wicked, to go about with humility, acting and preaching according to the example of their holy Master, journeying on foot without gold or silver, imitating in all things the custom of the apostles."(30)

The second prescription, taken from the Gospel texts, had a background with a depth we can hardly conceive today; it imposed on the ministers of the Pope the role of the evangelical preacher with imitation of the apostles in the total poverty and severe austerity which, at that epoch in Christian Europe and particularly in Languedoc and Lombardy, conferred on the preachers of the Cathari and the Waldenses their redoubtable power.(31) The counsel relayed from Rome by the Bishop of Osma carried in full the apologetic thought of the Pope. It clothed Catholic preachers in that robe of poverty which the heretics made the glory of their preachers. Shortly after, on November 17, 1206, a letter arrived to prove the authentic character of Diego's declaration. In this letter the Pope confirmed the evangelical method with his own authority, and recognized it as the official line of action for all who were engaged or would be engaged in the *Praedicatio*.(32)

The apologetic method was thereafter determined for the mission in Narbonne. The explicit allusion to the Gospel texts placed it beyond all discussion; the contemporary need determined its meaning. There was to be preaching without interruption; two by two they would travel about; no one would carry money; each would be content with the food given him, and in case of need he might beg his bread from door to door. The practice was adopted at once by the papal preachers; later it was carried on by the Toulouse *Praedicatio* as reorganized by St. Dominic.(33) Here we touch the origins of the mendicant character of the future Order of Preachers.

THE COMPANIES

From the beginning the program of Innocent III had provided for the placing of a great number of apostolic workers under the direction of his representatives. Through the bulls of January 29, he invited the Abbot of Valmagne and Master Raoul of Narbonne, when called for, to report to the legates. He also requested the Abbot of Cîteaux to place at their disposal a certain number of religious capable of preaching.

Did Arnold Amaury supply men at that time? It scarcely seems so. On the following May 31 the Abbot received another bull. Innocent lamented the "greatness of the harvest" and "the fewness of the laborers"; he praised the great number of apostolic men in the Order at Cîteaux and conferred on its head the responsibility for the mission.(34) The invitation to provide numerous missionaries was again unmistakable, but the Pope did not wish to impose on the religious from whom he was asking much, a burden particularly disagreeable to them.(35) and desired still to appeal to the good will of the Order. At that juncture it seems that the number of preachers had not yet increased.

Late in May, 1206, Diego and his companion, Dominic, on their return journey from Rome, came to enlarge the band. From the outset they were associated in the papal *Praedicatio*.(36) It is almost certain that the Pope was responsible for this change; otherwise there is no explanation for the fact that the Bishop became at once the head of the enterprise. For, as he had long hoped, the Pope had now found men of good will who voluntarily offered themselves.

The time had come to augment the number of the workers in the *Praedicatio*. Thereupon the Abbot of Cîteaux took his leave of the company in order to hold the next chapter at his abbey, and, according to Peter of Cernai, to assemble a certain number of abbots selected as his auxiliaries in the preaching office imposed upon him. Thus began the mission of the twelve abbots who entered Languedoc in the train of Arnold Amaury early in April, 1207.(37) Writers of the time agree in attributing to Innocent the call for this supplementary force, alluding either to a formal order brought from Rome by the Bishop of Osma or, more probably, interpreting the move of Arnold as the tardy execution of the desires expressed by the Pope on January 29 and May 31, 1204.(38) Let us add that the letter of November 17, 1206, granting to certain religious the right to preach, seemed to concern the new missionaries. In the September chapter the abbots would have anticipated that a papal letter might come, explicitly conferring the *officium praedicationis*.(39) It reached them two months later, having been forwarded by Raoul, chief of the Cistercian preachers in Languedoc, to their respective abbeys whither they had gone to settle their business affairs and prepare for the great rendezvous at Cîteaux in March, 1207. It was from Cîteaux that the mission set forth. With the twelve abbots and their leader, Arnold Amaury, went other monks as preachers; in all they numbered about thirty.(40)

From April to July, 1207, the papal *Praedicatio* was carried on by a much larger number than during the first three years. It was only then that it fulfilled the designs proposed by Innocent as early as January 29, 1204.

NAMES OF THE PREACHERS

Of these preachers, only some of the names are known. Diego, the Bishop of Osma, had but one companion, St. Dominic.(41) There were the three Cistercian legates: Arnold Amaury (abbot of Cîteaux), Raoul, and Peter of Castelnau, monks of Fontfroide. Among the twelve abbots, Guy of Vaux-de-Cernai (near Paris) did not yet have with him his secretary, Peter;(42) listed also was Henry, abbot of Mont-Sainte-Marie (Besançon diocese).(43) By way of conjecture, we may add that there might also have been the Abbot of Bonnevaux (near Vienne)(44) and the Abbot of Preuilly (of the Meaux diocese).(45) The Abbot of Valmagne (Diocese of Agde) had perhaps joined the preachers in 1204 as

the Pope appointed. We know nothing of Canon Raoul of Narbonne. But there was the Cistercian Abbot of Villelongue (near Limoux), who worked with Dominic in several conversions.(46)

The recruiting of this company was remarkable. All were religious (the Bishop of Osma was no exception); they were almost exclusively Cistercians, except Dominic and perhaps Raoul of Narbonne, who were canons regular. This is significant. Innocent III himself explained it in his letter of May 31, 1204: the religious life of the members of the papal mission was indissolubly linked with their preaching; both were identified in the apostolic method *verbo et exemplo*.

Here it should be recalled that this union of regular life and apostolic activity had evolved after a long historical preparation from the days of Peter Damian, whose preaching inspired the canonical movement; in that light it will be comprehensible that, by a kind of natural sequence, the *Praedicatio* of Toulouse, which grew out of the papal *Praedicatio*, was transformed into the Order of Preachers.

THE ORGANIZATION

The *Praedicatio* of Narbonne was not a chance association, nor was it purely a good-will foundation. The letters of the Pope had brought it into being (first with Peter, Raoul, Arnold, Master Raoul, and Peter III of Valmagne; later, with the dozen abbots). The position of the Castilians was unusual, yet it was from Rome that they too would receive the final command to associate themselves in the mission. The letter of November 17, 1206, shows that the legates did not believe they had the right to confer the *officium praedicationis* without previously receiving the authorization of the Pope.(47)

It appears that the duration of the *Praedicatio* had been determined in advance as in the case of a military crusade.(48) After the assassination of Peter of Castelnau, Peter of Vaux-de-Cernai declared that in fact, "the *Praedicatio* had already run nearly the full length of its course."(49) Nevertheless, the abbots did not go on to the end of the time before abandoning the work.

In his bulls of institution and in his later letters, the Pope had even assigned to his legates their districts in the three provinces of Arles, Aix, and Narbonne, their program against the heresies, and their occasional powers.(50) All these acts promulgated by Rome conferred on the mission a solid juridical constitution, which assured its cohesion and order. The *Praedicatio* was aware of this unity. In the course of his account, Cernai continually repeats: "our preachers," "one of us," and such expressions.

All the members of the group worked together at first in harmony and without difficulty. After the arrival of the two Castilians, the preachers still moved about from town to town as one apostolic company from which had dropped out Peter of Castelnau,(51) who was little disposed for this apologetic work. There were great disputes between the Catholic and the heretical groups. Early in 1207, when the whole field had been somewhat furrowed, the little band became more stationary and tarried longer in the neighborhood of Fanjeaux and Montreal.

THE LOCAL STATIONS

After the arrival of the thirty new preachers in April, 1207, the company became too numerous, uselessly numerous for a concentrated field, and Arnold at once divided the territory among the abbots, assigning to each abbot one or two auxiliary preachers, who could generously devote themselves to the disputes and sermons.(52) Then it was that Guy of Cernai made his headquarters in Carcassonne where he later became bishop; Henry of Mont-Sainte-Marie at Pamiers; Dominic and William Claret at Prouille. More enduring than the others, the last named center is better known, and thus it is possible to conjecture what went on at these stations. At Prouille with its temporary quarters, serving at once as a

rest house and a rallying point, there was a rudimentary court where the papal preachers delivered letters of reconciliation.(53) Being an official personage, the missionary apostolic had the privilege of the seal and could thus affix an authentic stamp on the letters patent which he gave to the converts to certify their return to the faith and to state their penance.(54) Something will be said later about the economic life of the little center.

The name *Praedicatio*, by which the general mission force was known, was extended to the auxiliary bands. The seal used by St. Dominic bore the inscription, *Jesu Christi et Predicationis*, or perhaps *Predicationis Jesu Christi*.(55) That was the title which the people of the time gave it. On August 8, 1207, Sans Gasc and Ermengarde Godoline, his wife, "offered" themselves with all their property "to the *Sancta Praedicatio* and to the Lord Dominic of Osma."(56) Since the *Praedicatio* had, almost from the first, a group of women converts round whom grew the celebrated convent of St. Mary at Prouille, some have thought that the title *Sancta Praedicatio* was the first name of the house of the sisters, such as it was; there is no foundation for such a belief. *Sancta Praedicatio* was the name of Dominic's mission band, a name which was dropped, moreover, in the year 1207 when the *Praedicatio* in Narbonne dissolved.(57)

But it reappeared after 1215 with the *Praedicatio* of Toulouse. From then on Dominic was known as the "humble minister of preaching."(58) In 1221, reviewing the beginnings of the Order of Preachers, Foulques, by anachronism, still called its head, "Master of the *Praedicatio*." (59) For a long time it was customary to apply the term to the Dominican convents of the Midi: "the *Praedicatio* of Toulouse, of Limoges,"(60) and in the first years the Order itself was at times known as the "*Ordo Praedicationis*."(61)

THE AUTHORITIES

No organization can function without authority: the papal *Praedicatio* had its leaders.

First and foremost, there was Innocent III. The different letters we have cited trace the stages of his governing action with all desirable precision. It was he who conceived and established the *Praedicatio*. He appointed its directors.(62) He determined its purpose and method. He recruited the forces, late in 1203, in January and May, 1204, in the spring and in November of 1206. He conferred upon his preachers powers as extensive as needful,(63) and, more remarkable still, he knew how to withstand their appeals and hold them more strictly to the line he had laid down. He kept watch over the little society, requiring of the directors that they render him a careful account of all their difficulties and seek counsel of him: "If any difficulty presents itself which requires the consideration of the Apostolic See, seek counsel on the matter by means of letters."(64)

He gave minute replies and satisfied the requests of his legates.(65) He encouraged them by his praise(66) and when, in discouragement, someone wished to abandon the mission, he retained him by exhortations which were in reality a command.(67)

Originally it was intended that Arnold should only supply the recruits ; (68) but soon the Pope thought it well to give him a more active role. On May 31, 1204, with the advice of the cardinals, the Pope made him responsible for the whole enterprise, placing him at the head not only of the recruiting but even of the whole work of the *Praedicatio* and associating him with the other legates.(69) The reason for this appointment was quite apparent: Arnold was the head of the Order of Cîteaux. After the conference of Montpellier, it was he who set out in search of new helpers;(70) he assigned the districts to the different preachers;(71) he delegated Dominic to the work of reconciling the heretics.(72)

But Arnold's high office made it impossible for him to be always on the ground.(73) There was need of a local authority. On January 29, 1204, Peter and Raoul were appointed to this office: preachers summoned to the service by the bulls were to report to them at their call.(74)

Peter of Castelnau seemed not to realize the true role of a preacher. This impetuous Cistercian who, before his appointment as a legate, had been involved in lively administrative quarrels in the Church of Maguelonne,(75) would have achieved greater success (or at least he thought himself more adept in that line) in political and legal arguments than in preaching. His provocative attitude constrained the other preachers to act apart from him much of the time.(76) He was interested particularly in the political affairs of his legation. Moreover, worn out perhaps by his own violence, he was subject to profound discouragement, and twice at least he wished to give up his post.(77)

When Diego of Osma arrived, he replaced Peter of Castelnau as the head of the mission, in conjunction with Raoul of Fontfroide.(78) The part played by the Bishop was considerable; not only did he introduce the new apostolic method, but he imparted the spiritual enthusiasm which caused it to be accepted and practiced; he animated and renewed the vigor of the *Praedicatio*. He developed its rudimentary organization, directed it, and, as will soon be seen, even supported it from his own revenues. He bore the burden of the undertaking, and it was in the hope of reviving it in an hour of supreme crisis that he undertook the journey to Osma in the course of which he died, not long after Raoul.

Then, after the disappearance "of these two lights," Guy of Cernai was appointed in their place(79) late in the year 1207.

Interest attaches to the titles of these leaders; several times Cernai mentions the "chiefs and masters of the *Praedicatio*," "the first among the preachers and the master."(80) The word *magister* ("master") was, in fact, traditional, having become current early in the twelfth century to designate the head of a company of itinerant preachers appointed by the Church; Robert of Arbrissel, St. Norbert, and Bernard of Thiron had claimed it.(81) Evidently the title grew out of the doctoral character (*praedicator et doctor*) of the instructions of the preacher who had received an official mission (*officium praedicationis, insistens doctrinae*). It was this type of preaching that Dominic renewed in 1215 in Toulouse, and from the time the *Praedicatio* of St. Romanus was inaugurated, he was known as "Brother Dominic, Prior and Master of the Preachers." (82) In 1221 Foulques still spoke of the head of the Preachers as "Master of the *Praedicatio*,"(83) the title by which he had known him, although at that time it had been replaced by the more definitive title, "Master of the Order of the Friars Preachers."

ECONOMY

During the first years, the *Praedicatio* in Narbonne was supported according to the plan in use for ordinary legations; the expenses incurred in the apostolic work of Peter and Raoul of Fontfroide were to be met by "subsidies" paid by the heads of the dioceses in which they worked. Rome watched carefully that this economic system was not made a pretext for the extortion of money or for "policy" gifts.(84) The subsidy was estimated daily according to the actual expenses incurred for food and shelter and within the sumptuary limits set by the Third Lateran Council for ecclesiastical dignitaries.(85) After the solemn injunctions of Innocent to his legates, when he confided to them the mission among the Albigensians, it may well be believed that the Cistercian monks would strive earnestly to avoid any excess that could give scandal to the heretics. But even had they not wished it, they would have been forced to it once they set foot in the Province of Narbonne. As religious they had no personal resources at their disposal and had to be content with what Archbishop Berenger was willing to give them. But he was a miser whom the Pope finally had to depose for his scandalous

attitude.(86) Before the legates were in charge a month they found it necessary to complain to Rome about the conduct of the Archbishop in their regard. Berenger did not even give them what was necessary. He had even refused the Pope's representatives a horse for the journey to Toulouse and had relented only when confronted with indignant reproof.(87)

After the stern protestations from the Sovereign Pontiff, Berenger probably had to be more generous. But soon, deprived by the Pope of the revenues of the Abbey of Montaragon(88) "which gave him a greater income than his archbishopric,"(89) Berenger found a new excuse for tightening his purse strings. Fortunately at that time Arnold of Cîteaux, who could count on revenue from his abbatial income, joined the legates and provided for the needs of the *Praedicatio*. There was nothing very prosperous about the economic situation of the missioners, therefore, and, even had they been so disposed, though it would be truly surprising, they would have been in no position to display the gorgeous train which the biographers of St. Dominic have been pleased to picture. Moreover, the heretics could find nothing to criticize on that score.(90) Indeed, the cortege of Diego of Osma, intended by his king to escort "in grand style"(91) a young princess for a marriage with his son, might have been the one to excite the anticlerical criticism by the heretics, and indeed on no grounds at all. The Provençal Preachers in the thirteenth century used to recall the story of trouble experienced by the Bishop of St. Dominic when he had decided to preach to the miscreants in the course of one of his trips through Languedoc.

After the conference at Montpellier, the problem of supporting the preachers was in every way simplified. The evangelical method adopted by Diego provided for travel on foot, and begging from door to door. This meant no baggage and no unnecessary servants. Not the least relieved was Berenger. Henceforth all the missioners pursued the life of "journeymen of Christ."

ECONOMIC STABILITY

With the arrival of the twelve abbots, however, their way of life required some organization. The interior spirit of a Diego and a Dominic was equal to a program of unreserved heroism; but it could hardly be proposed for a group of forty religious as a whole. Between their rounds of preaching, they must have time to breathe and refresh themselves at some hospice, instead of being always at the mercy of the charity that was so straightened in a hostile atmosphere. The more orderly distribution of the work, as effected by the plans of April, 1207, permitted the beginning of an economic organization. Among the preachers, the Abbot of Cîteaux and the Bishop of Osma were the only ones who enjoyed personal revenues. The latter, who could easily draw on his resources, made use of them to support the missioners.

According to Robert of Auxerre, out of his revenue, he had consignments of food sent to the different centers where the preachers could receive them. He was the provider for all the local centers. In August, 1207, when Diego returned to Spain, it was to settle certain domestic affairs and to allocate a part of his fortune for the maintenance of the *Praedicatio* of Narbonne.(92) Evidently Prouille was the first beneficiary of this generosity.

In the meantime Dominic obtained assistance much more unexpected. Probably to ward off the threatening anger of the Pope, Berenger, who should have been the normal financier of the enterprise, had decided to make a striking gesture of generosity: he endowed the women converts whom the canon of Osma had established at Prouille. On April 17, 1207, he gave them a very handsome gift, the initial grant of the patrimony of the future convent. The temporal welfare of St. Dominic's preaching center was thus assured for the future. Thereafter the friars and sisters of Prouille possessed common revenues.

The system organized in 1207 for the papal *Praedicatio*, to support a mendicant apostolate through established centers, was restored in 1215 when the *Praedicatio* was founded in Toulouse. Dominic and his companions traveled about on foot, preaching in evangelical poverty. But between missions they returned to their house in Toulouse, where their wants were provided for by Foulques their bishop, who assigned them as revenue a certain share in the tithes of the diocese.(93) Grants of revenue and of possessions(94) assured to the *Praedicatio* that would soon grow into a great Order, an economy in which could be recognized the principles advocated for the *Praedicatio* of 1207. But its stability made it resemble a religious foundation in a way that showed it was no longer meant to be simply a temporary venture.

SUCCESS AND FAILURE

It was to a thankless work that the Pope had appointed his legates. William of Auxerre at that time recalled the memory of Master Prévostin, "who had lived among the Manichaeans for a long time but had never been able to lead more than a few back to the way of truth."(95) All the Catholic workers had the same experience. In the beginning Peter and Raoul had no more difficulty than their predecessors; in May, 1204, the Pope was pleased even to remark that already "their labor had not been in vain."(96) But the results were not commensurate with the toil, and the legates, one after the other, yielded to discouragement. In May, 1206, they wished to resign their post "because their preaching had accomplished almost nothing for the heretics."(97) The arrival of the Castilians reanimated all their hopes. The first disputation, at Servian, was a notable success;(98) others were less fortunate. Soon the ardor of the heretical preachers, stirred by the opposition, became more intense. The arrival of the twelve abbots made little impression. It was not so much a question of number as of disproportion between the spiritual force of the Catholic preachers and the heretical preachers. After three months of fatiguing hardships, during which they traversed hamlets, villages, and towns, what the Cistercians accomplished could be told in a few words: "They reclaimed a small number; they instructed and confirmed in the faith the few Catholics whom they encountered." Others, in vast numbers, imitated the asp in the psalm, closing their ears in order not to hear.(99) Dismayed, the abbots began their retreat from the battleground. In the summer of 1207 their report struck the same note of melancholy as that of the preceding year.(100) The word of the preachers did not touch hearts; it was answered by mockery:

"The truth must be told," cried William of Tudela, "(God forgive me!), these men care no more for sermons than for rotten apples. For five years they have carried on this way. This erring people has no will to be converted."(101)

The abbots returned to their monasteries. Then came the death of Raoul (July 9, 1207); the departure and death of Diego (December 30, 1207); finally, the assassination of Peter of Castelnau (January 14, 1208) and the tidal wave in the crusade of the barons. The *Praedicatio* in Narbonne was practically ruined.

Not entirely, however. Guy of Cernai, who was named Master of the *Praedicatio*,(102) went on preaching. Still, if Cernai's account is reliable, his manner of exhorting the heretics under threat of fire was more calculated to precipitate them into it than to hasten their acceptance of the Catholic faith.(103) When the noise of battle was stilled enough, and Arnold and Bishop Foulques found occasion to address their flocks, they used similar tactics. "There goes the roaming bee," said the Cathari in derision.(104) Finally, a certain number of "preachers of the faith" still worked on for the Church among the Albigenses. In 1213, Master Robert de Courson, the papal legate, in need of preachers for the Holy Land, judged it expedient even to draw upon their numbers and to give them

back to the Albigensian cause only a whole year later;(105) most of them were occupied in France, preaching the crusade.

The little center at Prouille still carried on. The *Praedicatio* of Innocent III gave promise of surviving without loss of vigor in the *Sancta Praedicatio* at Prouille. About the middle of the year 1207, when Diego saw the Cistercian organization crumbling, he decided to go to Osma in the hope of returning with subsidies and perhaps also with men.(106) If Jordan is to be relied on, Diego even intended, with the consent of the Pope, to reconstruct the whole preaching enterprise and erect a permanent institution. (107) His death caused his project to fall through. But in Languedoc he had left his companion and disciple, the best heir of his spirit. At Montreal, at Fanjeaux, at Prouille, Dominic had from the outset reaped more abundant fruit than any of the collaborators in the papal mission. He continued his labor. A charter of 1211 bears this humble signature: "Brother Dominic, Preacher.(108) Though the accounts are sketchy, some authentic documents indicate how vain was the toil of this evangelical preacher in the period of battles and revolts.(109) But would not the foundation and growth of the Monastery at Prouille be enough to prove the efficacy of his work?(110)

Vanquished after its last revolt, in 1215 Toulouse opened its gates to the Church. In this capital and stronghold of the Albigenses there then began a renaissance of the *Praedicatio*. Dominic led the way, rich in his experience of nine years. A year later, he founded the Order of Preachers.

THE PERPETUAL *PRAEDICATIO*

It is unnecessary to review what has been insistently shown: that the *Praedicatio* of Toulouse in its purpose and method, its legal status and economic program, in its organization and even in its title, ran in a line of continuity with the papal *Praedicatio* of 1207. Let the testimony of one contemporary among many others suffice. William of Puylaurens (no. 10) says:

Having pursued this arduous toil for two years and more, the champions of the good God, powerless to extinguish the fire which continued to burn, saw that the matter required deeper consideration and were constrained to appeal to the Holy See; and in order that the preaching might not be suspended, under the inspiration of the Lord they sought to institute a body of perpetual preachers, and it was for this purpose and for this end that the Order of Preachers was founded under the holy Bishop, the Lord Foulques.(111)

The *Praedicatio* in Toulouse and the Order of Preachers developed directly out of the *Praedicatio* first inaugurated and regulated by Pope Innocent as early as 1204. Naturally, differences and new features evolved, but the single word "perpetual" in William's account epitomizes them all: "De praedicatoribus perpetuis instituendis."

The very break-up of the papal institution had demonstrated the necessity of an organization with permanence. The military overthrow of heresy opened the way for a positive spread of the gospel message among the reconquered people, and it seemed more urgent than ever that the bishops should have a regular corps of helpers to assist or substitute for them in the work of preaching. Only a *Praedicatio* formed on the lines of a religious order could adequately undertake this permanent office of teaching.

A mission, a spirit, a common life: from the beginning these forces, three in number yet profoundly one, constituted the idea of the Order of Preachers. The "mission" was both an end and a law; it was the *officium praedicationis et doctrinae*, the "office of preaching and of teaching," which gave the Order of Preachers, alongside the bishops, its *raison d'être* in the Church and its fundamental legal

status. The "spirit" called for "imitators of the apostles," for an ardent zeal for souls, and for preaching by the example of lives so detached from the world that mendicancy was voluntarily assumed. The "common life" ensured the traditional asceticism of the regular life which had formed the canons regular. As early as 1206, Dominic had discovered or conceived these three forces in the organism designed and directed by Pope Innocent. In his earnest meditations on the Gospel, he had long aspired to imitate the apostles, and this he did with all his energies for proselytism in opposing the teachers of the Cathari,⁽¹¹²⁾ during the preaching mission in Narbonne. Never would he himself withdraw from the mission he had received from the Church, and he would transmit it without interruption to his sons, in the pontifical institution. The "common life" of the clerics regular, which he had embraced from his youth in the chapter of Osma, he recognized as the pressing need of the *Praedicatio* of 1207, if ministers of the word were to be trained, strengthened, and sustained, and if their message was to be unfailingly perpetuated through the ages. While he stood possessed of this threefold spirit, he acquired from the *Praedicatio* in Narbonne an experience and a feeling for humble little details, which he would carry into the work at Toulouse and through it into the Order of Preachers. In its legal form, its place in the Church, its purpose, its mission, and its spirit, even in its title as the Order of Friars Preachers, it is possible to retrace, profoundly modified but recognizable, the essential features of *Sancta Praedicatio* in Narbonne, founded and fostered with so much solicitude by Innocent III.

This conclusion involves a corollary. If the *Praedicatio* in Toulouse and the Order of St. Dominic appeared as a renewal of the enterprise inaugurated by the Pope, is it conceivable that they would ever have been instituted if Innocent had not in some way intervened? It is indeed evident that they would not. But that is a matter for consideration elsewhere.

NOTES

1 Cernai, no. 3.

2 Mansi, XXII, 1069.

3 Cernai, no. 67; Puylaurens, no. 10.

4 Laurent, no. 6.

5 Potthast, no. 2103; PL, CCXV, 273; Villemagne, pp. 73 ff. Villemagne (pp. 49 ff.) is wrong in casting doubt on the instruction accompanying the letter to Berenger in its various editions and in Potthast. These precious notes dispatched with the bull are certainly authentic, because they are taken directly from the Register of Innocent III.

It is not surprising that this letter to Berenger should have served to bring about the inauguration of Cistercian preaching, the precise purpose of which was to remedy the negligence of the religious leader of Languedoc; the two legates are spoken of as those "who are to engage in preaching and teaching." It matters little that there is no mention of other preachers with the two legates before 1206; that the Abbot of Cîteaux was a long time providing them does not prove that the Pope had not asked for them.

6 Villemagne, pp. 41 ff.

7 Whence the protestations of Berenger of Narbonne: "Since the legation was enjoined upon you first only for the overthrow of heresy, in extending the scope of your powers so that the excesses of the

clergy were interpreted as heresy, you have gone beyond the import of the apostolic mandate and have done harm to the Church of Narbonne" (Vaissète, VIII, 509; November 26, 1204).

8 Note this complaint of the legates in 1206: "Whenever they wished to preach to the heretics, the heretics objected to the wicked life of the clergy" (Cernai, no. 20). Therein is echoed the word of Innocent III (December 6, 1204): "since the infamy of their lives is both a scandal to the faithful and the strongest argument used by the derisive heretics" (Potthast, no. 2337; Villemagne, p. 63). What follows in the text of the Pope is most remarkable; in spite of this situation, the Pope forbids the legates to attempt any correction of the clergy, an undertaking which would hinder them from fulfilling their apostolic labors.

9 Villemagne, pp. 60, 78, 103, 115, 127, 144, 225, 230; Potthast, nos. 2224, 2337, 2441, 2814, 2991, 3163.

10 *PL*, CCXV, 274; Villemagne, p. 75.

11 Villemagne, p. 76.

12 Peter III, abbot of Valmagne, often labored as assistant to Peter of Castelnaud; August 6, 1202; May 25, 1205; October 27, 1206 (Villemagne, pp. 31, 194, 131).

13 Potthast, no. 2103; *PL*, CCXV, 274 f.

14 May 28 and 31, 1204; November 17, 1206 (Potthast, nos. 2224, 2229, 2912; Villemagne, pp. 52, 68; *PL*, CCXV, 355, 358, 1024).

15 In fact, it was only after the arrival of Diego and Dominic in 1206 that the program was fully carried out. There is nothing to show that before this date the two legates appealed for the apostolic workers placed at their disposal by the Pope, except perhaps the Abbot of Valmagne. It must not be thought, however, that they waited for this occasion to carry out the preaching mission confided to them. Their preaching could not have left the same documentary evidence as their occasional activity of a reforming or diplomatic nature, yet preaching was their essential business. Cernai proves this when he pictures the position of the legates at the beginning of 1206: "The legates of the Apostolic See were ready to renounce the embassy for the very weariness involved in it, considering that they could do little or no good in preaching to the heretics (Cernai, no. 20). The legates were aware of the opposition between the work of reform and the work of preaching, and they did not feel authorized to sacrifice the latter for the former. "Therefore, if they should attempt to reform the life of the clergy, they would have to desist from preaching" (*ibid.*). Indeed, judging from the trouble involved in the correction of the Archbishop of Narbonne, they would have found the reformation of the rest of the clergy an overwhelming task.

16 Laurent, no. 11.

17 Indeed, we see them undertake the instruction of all the people: "They reclaim a few heretics, they instruct and confirm a few of the faithful lost to the faith." Robert of Auxerre in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, XXVI, 271. "Disputing and preaching, they strengthened in the faith the few there who were Catholics; they confounded the heretics." Cernai, no. 24.

18 Laurent, no. 60.

19 Potthast, no. 2224; Villemagne, pp. 79 f.; *PL*, CCXV, 355.

20 I Pet. 3:15.

21 Potthast, no. 2229; Villemagne, p. 54; *PL*, CCXV, 359.

22 I Pet. 2:15.

23 Potthast, no. 2229; Villemagne, p. 57; *PL*, CCXV, 360.

24 Potthast, no. 2912; Villemagne, p. 70; *PL*, CCXV, 1025.

25 Laurent, nos. 5, 7, 24.

26 *Ibid.*, no. 60.

27 Hefele-Leclereq, V, 1340; Schroeder, Councils, p. 251.

28 "Moreover, concerning those matters about which you lately sought our counsel, namely, against those who . . . since the infamy of their lives is both a scandal to the faithful and the strongest argument used by the derisive heretics, we advise and direct that, pursuing more fervently the business enjoined upon you, you should not investigate other matters that might hinder the work committed to you, lest a work of inevitable necessity meet an impediment through your concern over what is tolerable" (December 6, 1204; Potthast, no. 2337; Villemagne, p. 63; *PL*, CCXV, 472).

29 Berenger went to Rome, after making an appeal from the censures of the legates. On May 9, 1206, the Pope wrote to Raoul and Peter of Castelnau that they should interfere no further with the Archbishop of Narbonne (Potthast, no. 2774; Villemagne, p. 96; *PL*, CCXV, 883).

30 Cernai, no. 21.

31 It was what Jesus prescribed for the twelve apostles (and the seventy-two disciples): "Do not possess gold nor silver nor money in your purses; nor scrip for your journey nor two coats, nor shoes nor a staff; for the workman is worthy of his meat." "He began to send them two and two." "And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they have; for the laborer is worthy of his hire" (Matt. 10:9 f.; Mark 6:7 f.; Luke 10:7).

32 This letter is not a direct approval of the method of preaching in evangelical poverty; it is much more than that. The Pope writes directly to confer the mission on these preachers of good will. Then he describes the type of preaching which the missionaries will practice: "Imitating the poverty of the poor Christ, with modest bearing and an ardent spirit, let them not fear to approach outcasts . . . through the example of their lives and the import of their teaching" (Potthast, no. 2912; Villemagne, p. 70; Laurent, no. 3). Here it is evident that the Pope considers this the official type of mission character; he wishes to see it exemplified in the members of the *Praedicatio*.

33 "We have instituted as preachers in our diocese Brother Dominic and his companions, who in evangelical poverty have proposed to journey religiously on foot and to preach the word of truth according to the Gospel" (Laurent, no. 60).

34 Potthast, no. 2229; Villemagne, p. 55; *PL*, CCXV, 359.

35 St. Bernard had forbidden them to preach. Peter of Castelnau complained bitterly that he was obliged to leave contemplation for a work for which he was not suited (Potthast, no. 2391; Villemagne, p. 64). Now the Pope did not cease to appeal to the Cistercians. The following entry in the statutes of the general chapter of 1213 depicts their attitude: "The matter of the monastic preachers of Tuscany about whom the Lord Pope has written is entrusted to the Abbot of Morimond, who will so conduct the enterprise that it may both satisfy the Supreme Pontiff and yet may not weaken the rigor of our Order" (Canivez, *Statuta Cap. Gen. O.C.*, I, [1933], 414).

36 William of Tudela, an eyewitness, even thought that Diego was also a legate. *Chanson*, stanza II, verses 17 f.

37 *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, XXVI, 271.

38 Robert of Auxerre (*loc. cit.*) writes: "Wherefore on the advice of the Lord Pope, some abbots, about thirteen from the Cistercian abbeys, were assigned, all men of the same rank, well instructed in wisdom and eloquence, prepared to give to all who asked it a reason for the faith, fearing not to lay down their lives also for the faith." The very wording of the letter of May 31, 1204, will be recognized.

39 Potthast, no. 2912; Villemagne, pp. 68 ff.; *PL*, CCXV, 1024.

40 Cf. Robert of Auxerre, *loc. cit.*

41. Cernai, nos. 21, 54.

42 Guy was one of the twelve abbots (Cernai, no. 51). Later in 1212 as bishop of Carcassonne, he summoned from France his nephew Peter, monk of Vaux-de-Cernai, who served as his secretary and assistant (*solatium*) (*ibid.*, no. 300).

43 Cernai, no. 201.

44 In fact, this Abbot continued to preach in 1212 among the Albigenses, far from his abbey (Cernai, no. 298). A monk of Bonnevaux later recounted an incident which happened to one of the abbots at this time (Frachet, p. 8). Evidently it would not prove that this was his own abbot, since the missionaries going down the Rhone had to pass by Bonnevaux. But it is a coincidence.

45 In 1212, the acts of the general chapter of Cîteaux had this entry: "Concerning a monk of Preuilly, called Peter the Hermit, it is commanded that he be recalled at once from the preaching among the Albigenses, nor should he, or any other without license from Chapter, dare to assume the office of preaching" (Canivez, *Statuta*, I [1933], 400). This hermit must have been a lay brother; his presence in the Albigensian country at such a distance from his abbey (Preuilly, Meaux) could be explained if he had been brought by his abbot, like the other Cistercian lay brothers who at this time accompanied St. Dominic in his preaching (Frachet, p. 76; Constantine, no. 55).

46 Balme, I, 471.

47 Potthast, no. 2912; Laurent, no. 3.

48 The crusaders bound themselves for a period of forty days only; this limited service rose out of a feudal custom. It is certain, too, that the preaching was conceived by the Holy See as a kind of spiritual crusade comparable to a military crusade. It is remarkable that the members received the indulgence

for it in the classic formula: *in remissionem vestrorum injungens peccatorum*. Potthast, nos. 2230, 2912; Villemagne, pp. 55, 70; Laurent, no. 77.

49 Cernai, no. 67.

50 Cf. Villemagne, pp. 40, 56, 60.

51 Cernai, no. 24.

52 "The abbots were at once dispersed far and wide by the Cistercian leader, and they were assigned their own field in which they might pursue the work of preaching and engage in arguments" (Cernai, no. 47).

53 Balme, I, 471.

54 Two of these official letters of St. Dominic are extant. Cf. Balme, I, 186 ff., 484. Others, noted by the process of inquisition, have been lost. *Ibid.*, I, 173, 471.

55 Balme, I, 188 (cf. 484) published a *reconstitution figurée* of this seal which he had not seen but of which he had read descriptions in ancient manuscripts. Even in the time of Bernard Guidonis the inscription was hardly legible. A manuscript in Barcelona furnished Balme with the reading which he gives: "*Jesu Christi et Predicationis*." Perhaps the *et* is superfluous. The seal was not a personal seal of Dominic, but the seal of the *Praedictio* which Dominic had the right to use. Dominic made it known that he acted in the name of the legate who had given him charge of it.

56 Laurent, no. 6.

57 The *Sancta Praedictio* is not mentioned in charters issued after the dissolution of the *Praedictio* in Narbonne.

58 Balme, I, 484.

59 Laurent, no. 134.

60 Balme, I, 164.

61 Laurent, nos. 95, 134.

62 Potthast, nos. 2103, 2229; Villemagne, p. 55; *PL*, CCXV, 275, 359.

63 Potthast, nos. 2229 f.; Villemagne, p. 56; *PL*, CCXV, 360.

64 Potthast, no. 2229; Villemagne, p. 57; *PL*, CCXV, 360.

65 Potthast, nos. 2103, 2337, 2391, 2404, 2912; Villemagne, pp. 60, 64, 178; *PL*, CCXV, 274, 525, 1025, 1361.

66 Potthast, no. 2229; Villemagne, p. 54; *PL*, CCXV, 359.

67 Potthast, no. 2391; Villemagne, p. 64; *PL*, CCXV, 525.

68 Potthast, no. 2103; *PL*, CCXV, 275.

69 Potthast, no. 2229; Villemagne, p. 55: "Nevertheless because the harvest is great and the laborers few, with the advice of our brothers, we confer upon you, our son and Abbot, the burden of this enterprise unto the remission of your sins.

70 Cernai, no. 21.

71 *Ibid.*, no. 47.

72 Balme, I, 187.

73 Cernai, nos. 21, 51.

74 Potthast, no. 2103; *PL*, CCXV, 275.

75 Villemagne, pp. 1-31.

76 Cernai, nos. 24, 27. His life came to an end by assassination.

77 In January, 1205, and May, 1206. Cf. Potthast, no. 2391; Villemagne, p. 64; *PL*, CCXV, 523; Cernai, no. 20.

78 Cernai, nos. 51, 67.

79 Cernai, no. 51.

80 *Ibid.*

81 For Robert of Arbrissel, see *Vita* by Baudry (*PL*, CLXII, 1052). For St. Norbert, see Herimannus in *Mon. Germ. hist., Scriptores*, XII, 651, 656; and Guibert de Nogent, *Tropologiae in prophetas*, *PL*, CLVI, 337, 487. For Bernard of Thiron, see *Vita* by Geoffrey le Gros, *PL*, CLXXII, 1405 f.

82 Laurent, no. 70.

83 Laurent, no. 134.

84 For example, note this regulation of the Council of Montpellier (1213): "The [bishop and archbishop] may not receive money for the work of their administration when they do not visit these [churches]." Mansi, XXII, 943.

85 See canon 4 of the Third Lateran Council and canons 33 and 34 of the Fourth. Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1091, 1360 f.; Schroeder, *Councils*, pp. 218, 270 f.

86 Potthast, no. 2224; Villemagne, pp. 78 ff.; *PL*, CCXV, 355.

87 Potthast, no. 2103; Villemagne, p. 76; *PL*, CCXV, 274.

88 Potthast, no. 2226; Villemagne, p. 86; *PL*, CCXV, 360.

89 Potthast, no. 2774; Villemagne, p. 97.

90 "Whenever they wished to preach to the heretics, the heretics objected to the wicked life of the clergy" (Cernai, no. 20). That was the only argument advanced by the heretics in reply to the teaching of the legates, and it must be granted that it was enough. In the case of the legates, it was not that they disedified the heretics, but that they did not edify them sufficiently by a more heroic poverty.

91 Jordan, no. 16.

92 Cernai, no. 48.

93 The *propositum* of the Preachers of Toulouse is defined thus: "who in evangelical poverty have proposed to go about religiously on foot" (Laurent, no. 60). Through the revenue assigned to them from the tithes of the diocese, Foulques agreed to provide "their food and other necessaries"; and particular stipulation was made "for clothing and other necessaries in time of illness or whenever they wished to rest" (*ibid.*).

According to canon law, the tithes or revenues of the diocese had to be divided into four parts: for the bishops, clerics or canons, vestry needs, and the poor. These, last two together could be considered as forming only a single part; the portion for the poor was therefore, only half of this third part of the tithes. It was that part which Foulques assigned to the Preachers. The bishop was free to dispose of the tithes as he thought best. It was taken for granted that religious might be counted among these poor:

"Since whatever clerics have belongs to the poor . . . it should be their special care to distribute out of their tithes and donations whatever they wish and can for the support of cenobites and hospices. For it is permissible to give tithes and offerings and every kind of help to monks and spiritual men who fear and love God . . . having regard not so much to poverty as to religion in the poor."

We here note two examples of donations of tithes to religious. From the year 1090, the canons of Pistoia gave part of their tithes to a hospital (Jaffé, no. 5427; *PL*, CLI, 318). In 1157, Adrian IV granted to the monastery of Cosmas and Damian, "in witness of your piety, to you and to your successors, as to the poor of Christ, in the churches named, a fourth part of the tithes, which are due to the poor according to canon law" (Jaffé, no. 10299; Pfluck-Harttung, *Acta Pont. Rom. inedita*, II [1880], 860). The structure of this text runs parallel to that in the deed of Foulques. It would be idle, therefore, to urge the unusual character of the latter. The economic status of the *Praedicatio* of Toulouse had its legal warrant in Gratian's *Decretum*.

94 Laurent, nos. 60 f .

95 *Summa Aurea*, Bk. II, tr. VII, chap. 1. These texts concern the Cathari of Lombardy. Cf. G. Lacombe, *La vie et les œuvres de Prévostin* (1927), pp. 11-13.

96 Potthast, no. 2229; Villemagne, p. 55; *PL*, CCXV, 359.

97 Cernai, no. 20.

98 *Ibid.*, no. 23. Another success was scored in the dispute at Montréal, where one hundred and fifty were converted (Puylaurens, no. 9), and at Pamiers (*ibid.*, no. 6).

99 Robert of Auxerre, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, XXVI 271.

100 "But since the heretics were obstinate in malice and unwilling to be converted, and since little or nothing could be gained by preaching or disputing, when some length of time had elapsed, the preachers dispersed to various places in Gaul" (Cernai, no. 51).

101 Stanza II, verses 24 ff.; cf. III, 12. The five years are probably 1203-8.

102 Cernai, no. 51.

103 Cernai, nos. 154-57, 324.

104 Tudela, stanza XLVI, verse 9 (in 1210 at Toulouse).

105 Cernai, nos. 439, 494. On the mission of Courson, cf. Dickson, "Le card. Robert de Courson," in *Arch. Hist. litt. et doct. M. A.*, IX (1934), 90, 99.

106 "The Bishop of Osma, moreover, wished to return to his own see, that he might set his own affairs in order and from his own revenues provide necessities for the preachers of the word of God in the Province of Narbonne" (Cernai, no. 48)

107 "Bishop Diego devoted himself for two years to this kind of preaching.. Then, fearing lest if he were to delay any longer he might be guilty of negligence in what concerned his own See at Osma, he decided to return to Spain. After he had visited his diocese he intended to raise money and return with it for support of the aforesaid monastery of women; and then, at length, with the consent of the Lord Pope he would ordain certain men suitable for preaching in those districts, whose duty it would be to work always to stamp out the errors of heretics and never to desist in their labor to guard the truth of faith." (Jordan, no. 28).

108 Laurent, no. 10.

109 Balme, I, 171-73, 271 f., 468, 470 f., has published a certain number of extracts from the manuscript of the inquisition of Carcassonne which certify to the reconciliations brought about by St. Dominic, e.g., the letter of reconciliation of Pons Roger (*ibid.*, p. 187). See other accounts of conversion in Jordan, nos. 34f.; *Processus* (Toulouse), no. 23; Ferrand, no. 22; Constantine, no. 51.

110 For the religious of Prouille converted by St. Dominic, see Laurent, no. 7.

111 Following Jordan of Saxony, Dominican hagiographers in general have noted the continuity of the *Praedicatio* of St. Dominic with that of the Cistercian mission, and have traced the first idea of the Order to the Conference at Montpellier.

112 "Imitation of the apostles" was the ideal of the teachers of the Cathari and the Waldenses and of the itinerant Catholic preachers of the twelfth century. Cf. Grundmann, p. 28. If contact with heretics brought the psychological jolt which decided Diego and Dominic to adopt this manner of life, the example would have come from the Cathari rather than the Waldenses. The Waldenses were few in number in Languedoc, where they appeared at a later date (Guiraud, *L'Inquisition*, p. 259) and almost as hostile to the Cathari as to the Catholics. At Fanjeaux and Montréal particularly, Diego and Dominic met only the Cathari. The dispute at Pamiers was an exception.

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

IV

Innocent III, Diego, and Dominic in 1206

WHEN account is taken of the preponderant place held by Pope Innocent III in regard to everything concerning the end, method, and recruiting of the Cistercian *Praedicatio*, and when it is evident further that Diego and Dominic upon their arrival in Rome were enlisted at once for the work of the company, that the Bishop of Osma became one of its leaders, and that the apostolic way of life followed under his direction was but the logical expression of the method prescribed in Innocent's recommendations, we may conclude that such coincidences were not the outcome of mere chance.

The thesis suggesting that there was a preliminary agreement between Diego and Innocent about affairs in Languedoc flows directly from this evidence. True, it gives rise to a real difficulty: that is why, for some years, historians who have maintained it, notably Luchaire (1) and Mandonnet, have met with keen opposition. It seems, however, that the possibility has been too lightly set aside, and that if the objectors had penetrated the apostolic enterprises of Innocent III as thoroughly as these two historians, they would not have spoken as they did. We will try to grasp the problem in its foundations, employing the sources and a critical scrutiny of them.

THE SOURCES

Our knowledge of the origin of the apostolate of Diego and Dominic in Languedoc in 1206 is based primarily on two records, that of Peter of Vaux-de-Cernai(2) and that of Jordan of Saxony;(3) they run parallel, but in their perspective they are vastly different. An anecdote of Stephen of Bourbon contributes another elemental note.(4)

First of all, this is what Cernai wrote, Diego went to the Curia; he wished to be relieved of his episcopal duties that he might preach to the pagans; but the Pope did not accede to his request and ordered him to return to his diocese. At Montpellier the Bishop met the legates, who were completely discouraged because, when they tried to preach, the heretics continually taunted them for the deplorable habits of the clergy. Diego then urged them to redouble their fervor for preaching by abandoning every other care and, in order to close the mouth of the heretics, to confront them with the spectacle of absolute apostolic poverty, by journeying on foot without money. The legates did not have the courage to adopt a practice totally foreign to them; but Diego offered to take the lead. The *Praedicatio* was stimulated to new vigor in this way and, full of zeal, the Abbot of Cîteaux left to seek new recruits at the general chapter of his Order. Soon twelve abbots and other monks arrived; the territory was divided among the preachers. Then Diego returned to Spain to set his affairs in order and to gather funds for the missionaries, intending to return as soon as possible.

In his account Jordan mentions a journey to Cîteaux immediately after the visit to Rome. According to him the meeting with the papal preachers occurred at Montpellier at a council where there were assembled all the prelates of the Province of Narbonne, the twelve abbots, and a legate who presided; the discussion turned to the best apostolic method. Diego was asked to give his advice; he showed concern over the attitude of the heretics and then spoke of the luxurious retinue of the abbots and prelates. "It is impossible," he said, "under these conditions to edify men who care more for example than for words; such a display exercises only a destructive influence. The poverty of Christ is what you need." He then advised them to do as he would; he dispatched his baggage to Osma and declared he would remain in the country to preach the gospel. The *Praedicatio* began. After two full years Diego

returned to his diocese in order not to be accused of negligence. His intention was to return, after a short campaign, with men and subsidies.

Stephen of Bourbon states he learned from the first disciples of St. Dominic that one day when Diego and his companion, in all the pomp of prelates, wished to preach to the heretics, the latter made of this luxury their best argument against the Bishop's discourse. Realizing this, the Bishop began to preach in poverty. That was the initial step in the institution of the Order. Stephen recounts also, on the testimony of the first friars of Provence, the same unpleasant experience as having happened to the thirteen Cistercian abbots, on whom it had a contrary effect; they decided to abandon their apostolate.⁽⁵⁾ The details in these texts will be examined.

CERNAI AND JORDAN

The first question about the accounts of Peter and of Jordan concerns their relation. The first part of the *Historia* dates from 1216 at the latest;⁽⁶⁾ the *Libellus* from 1233-34. If a literary dependence is not evident in the two texts, are there not at least some parallels? A close comparison of the two narratives shows that the problem is not chimerical.

First, an introductory remark is in order. The general structure and the main facts about the *Praedicatio* in Narbonne are the same in both accounts. In the one as well as in the other, through texts constantly parallel runs a little cycle which we have called the cycle of the mission, because it comprises a complete exposition, with prologue and conclusion, of the whole history of the *Praedicatio* of 1206-8. It begins with Diego's visit to the Pope, his request that he be permitted to resign, the Pope's reply; the meeting at Montpellier, the conference with the Cistercians, the sending away of the baggage; the twelve abbots, the apostolate, the disputes, and, in detail, the miracle of the book of St. Dominic, three times rejected by the fire; the departure of Diego, his plan to return; his death; the withdrawal of the twelve abbots; the beginning of the crusade. So thoroughly parallel is the cycle in the two authors, that if the texts are arranged, the one opposite the other in two columns, a continual correspondence is notable in spite of editorial variation or difference of detail.⁽⁷⁾

Cernai records a certain number of disputes⁽⁸⁾ in which St. Dominic was not a participant; these are not in Jordan. Jordan, in the main, adds to Cernai only the note on the journey to Citeaux⁽⁹⁾ and certain information about Prouille.⁽¹⁰⁾

The parallelism in the accounts will be attributed perhaps to this, that both writers drew on the same history, the facts alone serving as a common source. But that explanation would be too simple. Two thoroughly independent narratives present no such agreement. This can be verified by reference to other documents dealing with the *Sancta Praedicatio*, this time quite independent of Cernai: Robert of Auxerre,⁽¹¹⁾ William of Puylaurens,⁽¹²⁾ Stephen of Bourbon,⁽¹³⁾ William of Tudela.⁽¹⁴⁾ In the two accounts we see what a difference and what variation in points of view and arrangement can mark the work of two authors so close to the scene of events as were Robert and Cernai (Robert wrote about 1211, five years before Cernai), whose information is equally valuable. The same is true in the case of Puylaurens, whose details happily supplement those of Cernai and are not at all a repetition.

One feature emphasizes the significance of the parallelism of the *Libellus* and the *Historia*. The cycle of the mission ⁽¹⁵⁾ holds an important place in the *Libellus*: sixteen paragraphs, nearly half of the text that Jordan devotes to the life of Dominic up to the time of the Lateran Council. The matter of that cycle dispatched, apparently Jordan found nothing to be treated in greater proportion; only four paragraphs⁽¹⁶⁾ are given the eight years after the death of Diego, two to the institution of the preachers of Toulouse,⁽¹⁷⁾ five to the founding of the Order of Preachers.⁽¹⁸⁾ If we consider the sources open

for Jordan's investigation, the contrary might be expected. For the Languedoc period of St. Dominic's life, the principal informants would be the sisters at Prouille and the first companions of St. Dominic,⁽¹⁹⁾ neither of whom were on the scene of events before 1207. Thus they were witnesses for the year following the years of the *Praedicatio*. Normally speaking, Jordan should, therefore, have had little information about the beginning of the mission in Narbonne, very much less than about the foundation of the Preachers. Therefore the length of the mission cycle in the *Libellus* brings into singular relief the parallelism between this account and that of Cernai.

In the face of these facts, what should we conclude? First, it might be suggested that a single source furnished the matter of the mission to Cernai as well as to Jordan. The Cistercian, we know, was not an eyewitness of the events be recounted; he did not arrive in Languedoc, it seems, until 1212.⁽²⁰⁾ But his work was, for the most part, composed on the basis of what he had gathered from the reports of direct or associated witnesses. He heard the story of the miracle of fire, for example, from the very lips of St. Dominic.⁽²¹⁾ Consequently what forms the mission cycle did not exist prior to the *Historia Albigensis*. It is, therefore, an extract from it.

JORDAN'S SOURCES

We cannot say, however, that Jordan himself borrowed the excerpt. The structure of this passage in the *Libellus* manifests no decisive trace of literary dependence. What is more, the incidents at Montpellier and the miracle of fire, among others, show that they were greatly modified before their inclusion in Jordan's text. For instance, Jordan has the twelve abbots assembled at Montpellier, and their meeting is called a council. Such an error, which seriously distorts the history of the mission, would not have been possible had Cernai's text been accessible for his use. Moreover, the clear probity of the Preacher forbids our supposing that he would have permitted himself such a departure from his source. If it were a question of finding traces of his own style in the narrative, certain spiritual notes reveal it slipping in here and there.⁽²²⁾ A delicate amplification by way of comment or analysis characterized the writing of Jordan who was a psychologist (very rare among writers of the epoch; see the beautiful story of the soul of Brother Henry).⁽²³⁾ This touch affected the details about the conference at Montpellier, where the recital runs freely and unfolds with much psychological finesse. In short, it was rather in improving the logic of a narrative or perhaps in obviating some contradiction, that Jordan did his particular work. Undoubtedly in this way he did the best he could with the cycle of the mission as he received it. We do not think he composed it, making the selection himself from the *Historia*. Who, then, were responsible for the passage borrowed, and who transmitted it to him?

Perhaps they were certain Preachers of Provence or sisters at Prouille.⁽²⁴⁾ Indeed it seems highly improbable that one or other of these first friars should not have been acquainted with the *Historia Albigensis* and the person accountable for the parallelism noted. Prouille was born among Cistercians. Until 1215 the apostolate of the first companions of St. Dominic was not distinct from that carried on by the sons of St. Bernard then working among the Albigenses. Peter of Vaux-de-Cernai was one of these Cistercians. For twelve years, from 1212 to 1223,⁽²⁵⁾ he lived only a few miles from Prouille, at Carcassonne where his uncle, Guy de Cernai, had become Bishop. It was probably there, in 1213, when St. Dominic was exercising the duties of vicar-general at the request of Bishop Guy, that Peter of Cernai knew the Preacher. There he composed the *Historia*, to which Humbert⁽²⁶⁾ also gave the title: *Geste de Simon de Montfort*. Would there have been no one among the first Preachers, with the friars and sisters of Prouille bound by so many ties to the Bishop of Carcassonne and Count Simon, who would have read the work of the Bishop's secretary, to add to or to constitute the prologue to the early history of their own Order, much of which was unknown to them? We do not wish to advance anything on this particular point. But let us reread Cernai's text. Evidently a Preacher, intent on finding, in the book written by the Cistercian, points relative to St. Dominic, would center his interest on the little

passage dealing with the mission cycle. Spread and popularized among the sons of St. Dominic, that story would have progressively developed up to the year 1233-34, when Jordan would have made it his own and used it in the best way possible.

INDIRECT DEPENDENCE

That it seems, is the probable and almost certain explanation of the indirect dependence of Jordan in reference to Cernai. We shall not insist further on the comparison of the mission cycle in the *Libellus* and the *Historia*. We shall not attempt here to analyze which of the divergences or novelties in Jordan rose from changes in the legend as it evolved, or from original and characteristic notes contributed by the Master of the Preachers. It is sufficient to have traced in the measure possible, within the limits of method, that all of Jordan's information cannot be regarded a priori as absolutely independent of that of Cernai, and when similar to it, as capable of contributing some new viewpoint.

Our interest now narrows to only a part of the cycle, its preamble and its conclusion, which constitute the basic elements in the problem of our study: the origin of the apostolate of Diego and Dominic in Languedoc. We shall pause for an examination of the two texts of Peter and of Jordan.

| <u>Cernai</u> | <u>Jordan</u> |
|--|---|
| No. 20. In the year of the Incarnate Word, 1206, the Bishop of Osma, Diego by name, a man great and renowned, came to the Roman Curia, desiring with great desire to resign his episcopal see, | No. 17. Moreover, coming to Innocent, the Lord Pope, he at once begged, if possible, the favor of resignation, alleging again and again his own insufficiency and the immense dignity of the office as beyond his strength. |
| that he might be able more freely to devote himself to the cause of preaching the Gospel of Christ to the pagans. | He revealed also to the Supreme Pontiff, that it was the desire of his heart to spend himself in the work of converting the Cumans (Saracens) if his resignation were acceptable. |
| But Innocent, the Lord Pope, was unwilling to grant the desire of the holy man; | The Pope did not at once accede to the demand, |
| rather he commanded him that he should return to his own see | but neither did he wish to offer an indulgence to him who sought (or to enjoin it unto the remission of sins) to go as a bishop to preach in the country of the Cumans (Saracens), the will of God being hidden, who provided the labors of so great a man to bear rich fruit for the salvation of others. No. 28. Diego tarried two years in the exercise of preaching, and after that, |
| No. 48. Moreover, the Bishop of Osma wished to return to his diocese that he might attend to business at home (<i>domui</i>) | fearing lest he might be charged with negligence in regard to his <i>domestica ecclesia</i> at Osma, if he were to prolong his stay further, he decided to return to Spain, proposing, after he had visited his church, |

| | |
|---|---|
| and that he might provide necessary funds from his own possessions for the preachers of the word of God in the Province of Narbonne. | to collect money for the completion of the monastery for women, and to return; |
| After this the bishop of Osma set out for his episcopal see, firmly resolved to return as quickly as possible to propagate the faith in the Province of Narbonne. | then, at last, with the permission of the Lord Pope to select certain men suitable for preaching in those places, whose duty it would be to war always against the errors of heretics and never to fail the faith, in the zeal for truth. |

First, it is remarkable how easily these texts fall into corresponding columns. That is a proof of the parallelism spoken of; here it is shown phrase by phrase. The curious expression, *domesticam ecclesiam*, employed by Jordan to designate the bishopric of Diego seems to be explained only by the word *domui* in Cernai. At first sight the text of Jordan apparently contains scarcely anything more than is found in the text of Cernai, unless it is that the pagans are there called Saracens (or Cumans) and that in the mention of the financial interests of the Bishop and his plans to return, the sisters at Prouille take the place of the preachers of Narbonne. Yet certain little differences give to each of the texts a very different perspective.

The Pope's refusal of the Bishop's request in 1206 was accompanied, according to Cernai, by a formal order to return to Osma. As will appear later, this order has greatly embarrassed historians. For in fact, it is in brutal contradiction to all the later conduct of Diego as depicted in detail by Cernai. Not only did Diego decide to stop among the Albigenses.⁽²⁷⁾ but he even stayed on there. He remained for eighteen months without any anxiety. Further, when he decided at the end of that time to return to Osma, it was only to set his affairs (his *domus*) in order, to collect money for the missionaries, and to come back as soon as possible.

In Jordan's text this contradiction does not occur. Of the four passages that have been juxtaposed with the corresponding passages in Cernai, three are absolutely identical except for one spiritual note. The fourth so formulates the Pope's final response that the apostolate in Languedoc is not in contradiction to it. According to the variant added in a second edition of the *Libellus*,⁽²⁸⁾ it might even be thought that the Pope was satisfied simply to refuse Diego the classic indulgence granted to missionaries (*in remissionem peccatorum iniungere*). And when Diego decided at Montpellier to remain among the heretics, it was by an inspiration of the Holy Spirit.⁽²⁹⁾ He was anxious about his diocese, fearful that he might be accused of negligence, and it was to visit his *domestica ecclesia* (and no longer his *domus*) that he returned to Osma. Finally, his plans to return and institute the preachers were expressly dependent on the permission of the Pope: *cum assensu domini papae* ("with the consent of the Lord Pope")

A MORE LOGICAL RECORD

Jordan's version is undeniably more logical: this does not mean that it is more historical than Cernai's. Which should be accepted? Did Innocent III, as a result of the interview in Rome, command Diego to return to Osma, or did he merely refuse to let him go to labor among the pagans? If, in the matter of documents, we were guided only by the strength of probability, a selection would be made in favor of Jordan. But history has other criteria.

A careful consideration of Jordan's text on the definite and precise point at issue makes it difficult to think that he had recourse to any information independent of the mission cycle in Cernai's book (except what relates to Prouille). The name given to the pagans, as the object of the apostolic desires of Diego and Dominic, would not suppose a new document: in the interval between the two editions of the *Libellus*, Jordan did not come to a decision for the Cumans or for the Saracens. Evidently both were a priori equally possible: for Jordan knew that the two missionaries were Castilians, neighbors of the Saracens, and also that, at least at the close of his life, Dominic was perpetually concerned about the Cumans.(30) As for the new form of the last reply of the Pope on which the two editions of the *Libellus* are not in complete accord, might not its origin be accounted for in a desire to attenuate the difficulty raised by the papal reply as recorded by Cernai? It seems difficult to admit such an explanation. Moreover, Jordan is not necessarily responsible for this change. Perhaps it was embodied in the story of the mission cycle as he received it. On this point we shall see how the hagiographers subsequent to Jordan have continued to modify this answer, and the process still goes on.

Considering things as they are in this problem, we do not think Jordan can be preferred to Cernai regarding the precise point on which they are at variance, nor that we can accept his word as a confirmation on points where they agree. Ultimately it is on Cernai's text that, even though it may be necessary to criticize it, conclusions must be almost exclusively based.

DIEGO AND INNOCENT III

The great value of the details recounted by Cernai must be acknowledged. Although it seems that the Cistercian chronicler did not arrive in Languedoc until 1212,(31) he minutely investigated all the episodes that he relates with great precision, and it has been possible to verify the details with exactitude. His interpretations alone require caution, for the Cistercian monk was inclined to be somewhat narrow when he was not impassioned and partial.

We shall, then, accept as a whole the body of facts recounted by Cernai: the Bishop's journey to Rome; his return (to which we shall append the visit to Citeaux as inserted by Jordan); his meeting the legates at Montpellier; the sending away of the baggage.

THE POPES ORDER

Diego's discourse and his presentation of the apostolic method became a tradition which passed on among the preachers of the pontifical mission.(32) It was in this roundabout way that Peter arrived *in obliquo* at his knowledge of the apostolic intention which took the Bishop to Rome, of his hope of resigning his see, and of the answer of the Pope. Since the expression employed by Cernai to state the Pope's reply opens many questions, it will be interesting to note to what extent Cernai's information was indirect. No one of the Cistercians interrogated by the chronicler was present for the interview in Rome. His principal informant, Guy of Cernai, was not even at Montpellier,(33) and of course Peter was not. Under these conditions and in face of the difficulties raised by the short sentence, *Immo precepit ei ut ad sedem suam propriam remearet* ("He commanded him that he should return to his own see"), should the text be rigidly adhered to, or may we see in it an erroneous personal interpretation of the chronicler, or even simply unskillful wording? It is indeed evident that Innocent did not accept Diego's resignation in 1206; but did he terminate the audience with a peremptory command to Diego to return to his diocese? Was it truly chance alone that brought about the apostolate of the Bishop in the papal mission?

It has been noted that in Jordan's account there is no mention of this alleged command of the Pope, which is in open contradiction to the later conduct of the Bishop of Osma. Biographers of Diego and

Dominic have not always been satisfied to abide by the position of the *Libellus*. In the seventeenth century, for instance, the Acts of Diego, published by J. Tamayo,(34) declared that, after the conference of Montpellier, "the legates having urged it, apostolic permission was given him." Jean de Réchac,(35) having recounted the Pope's rejection of the Bishop's first proposal, states: "The favor they obtained was to labor for two years for the conversion of the Albigenses in the region of Toulouse and Languedoc." In our own day, Scheeben, who wrongly reduced the apostolate of Diego to some seven months,(36) would make the sojourn simply part of a return voyage to Spain, taken slowly. But this solution was not at all satisfactory to Grundmann,(37) who persisted in finding a serious contradiction in the text of Cernai; he was inclined to disregard the chronicler's unfortunate affirmation to suppose, like Luchaire and Mandonnet, that the Pope had commissioned the Bishop to carry certain instructions to his legates in Languedoc.

What shall we say? The modern critic should be more scrupulous than Jean de Réchac and exact definite evidence before changing anything in the testimony available in the unique source of this history. But it seems that he possesses such evidence. If the declaration made by Cernai is viewed in the concrete circumstances of the time and place, at Rome, or at Montpellier, the order pure and simple to return to Osma seems improbable. The situation itself, in fact, seems to require another solution.

In that hour Innocent's hope was centered in the *Praedicatio* of Narbonne. He wished to have many workers. Two years before, he had called for men from Cîteaux, but, though his appeal was urgent, only his three legates were as yet laboring in the field. He knew that for a year Peter of Castelnau was on the verge of abandoning his post. In May, 1206, he had to reprimand the legates and order them to desist from their attempts to correct the Archbishop of Narbonne, a case in which they had gone too far. Then it was that Diego appeared to offer his services; to place at the command of the Pope not only an apostolic soul rarely found among the bishops of the age, but experience rich in the knowledge of conditions attending the preaching of the gospel in southern France, and perhaps also, if Stephen of Bourbon can be relied upon, a method of preaching by a life of evangelical poverty in "imitation of the apostles," a plan which simply carried out fully and precisely the apologetic designs of the Pope.

Some days later, unmindful of his fatigue after his long journey in the Scandinavian countries, Diego, instead of proceeding to Spain, went up into Burgundy, to Cîteaux, the center from which the great mission of abbots started forth. Near Montpellier he joined Arnold, Raoul, and Peter. Himself a simple prelate, he induced the papal legates to reverse their habits and to live by begging, whatever their legitimate repugnance in the face of it;(38) he set things in motion once again. Arnold, who for two years had temporized in complying with the desires of the Pope, suddenly decided to seek helpers at Cîteaux. Diego was then made head of the *Praedicatio* in Languedoc; he established himself there and helped the preachers to organize their program. In the following year, when he left the mission temporarily, the plan he proposed was to settle his affairs in Osma and return as soon as possible with subsidies for the support of the apostles in Narbonne.

IMPROBABILITIES

Considering these things, it does not seem likely:

1. That the Pope entertained no idea or desire of employing the zeal and learning of Diego for the *Praedicatio* in Narbonne, at that time critically affected by discouragement. The temporary mission of a bishop in a neighboring diocese was then a normal procedure;(39) Diego had himself been entrusted by the Pope with a mission in the diocese of Astorga on January 12, 1204.(40)

2. That the harmony in the apostolic methods of the Pope and those of Diego was a pure coincidence. As has already been observed several times, this accord extends even to the words, as may be noted in a parallel view:

| <u>Innocent</u> | <u>Diego (Cernai)</u> |
|--|--|
| Further . . . against those who . . . resist every correction of the legates . . . since the infamy of their lives is both a scandal to the faithful and the strongest argument used by the derisive heretics, | No. 20. As often as they attempted to preach to the heretics, the latter upbraided them with the wicked life of the clergy, and thus, if they expected to correct the life of the clergy, it would be necessary to refrain from preaching. |
| we advise and direct, that, pursuing more fervently the business enjoined upon you, you should not investigate matters against those who might hinder the progress of the task committed to you, lest a work of inevitable necessity meet an impediment through your concern over what is tolerable. (Dec. 6, 1204; Potthast, no. 2337; Villemagne, pp. 62 f.; 62-63; <i>PL</i> , CCXV, 474). | No. 21. Moreover, the illustrious Bishop gave sound advice in their perplexity, advising and counseling them to forget about other things in order to devote themselves more ardently to preaching; |
| Therefore, we will and advise you to proceed so that your modesty may be known to all, that it may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men, and that in word or deed there may appear nothing in your conduct to which even a heretic might take exception. (May 31, 1204; Potthast, no. 2229; Villemagne, p. 57; <i>PL</i> , CCXV, 360). | and that they might give the lie to wicked tongues, they were to proceed to their work in humility, |
| We command you to seek out unto the remission of sins, men approved . . . who, imitating the poverty of the poor Christ, with modest bearing and ardent spirit, fear not to approach the outcast. . (Nov. 17, 1206; Potthast, no. 2912; Villemagne, p. 70; <i>PL</i> , CCXV, 1025). | doing and teaching according to the example of their holy Master, going about on foot, without gold or silver, in imitation of the apostles. |

3. That the unexpected stop at Cîteaux was, as Jordan maintained,⁽⁴¹⁾ a pilgrimage of devotion and that the Cistercians who accompanied him to Montpellier as a result of the visit, were intended, again according to Jordan, to introduce into the see of Diego the Cistercian form of life, which was already perfectly established there.⁽⁴²⁾ Here we may recall the journey of Foulques de Neuilly to Cîteaux some years earlier, when he was commissioned by Innocent to recruit preachers.

4. That Diego would have taken it upon himself to speak as he did to the papal legates if he were in the position supposed by Cernai, and that he could have made them decide to adopt a program which was so foreign to ecclesiastical and regular customs; that he could have reversed their psychology of defeat, and induced the Abbot of Citeaux to provide the preachers up to that time withheld.
5. That in such circumstances Diego would have been installed as head of the papal *Praedicatio*, equal in rank with Raoul of Fontfroide,⁽⁴³⁾ official legate of the Holy See.
6. That he would have settled so calmly in Languedoc if the Pope had formally ordered him to return to his diocese.

In an earlier study, attention was called to the way Innocent employed his personal authority in directing the *Praedicatio* of Narbonne, and notably in selecting the preachers and outlining their method. How, then, can we suppose that the principal episode, that which changed the fortune of this institution, was an affair of pure chance, as well as an act of disobedience to the command of this same Pontiff?

True it is that Cernai is not aware of the false position in which he places the Bishop and thinks the affair one of chance. It is precisely in that regard that his perspective reveals itself as shortsighted and erroneous. Because he only half knew what happened in Rome and looked only at the outward aspects of the events in Montpellier in the new method and changed psychology which was effected there, he thought the conference only a chance meeting and concluded that Diego was on the way toward Spain according to the order of Innocent. It is understandable that a chronicler too near events, in perceiving only one aspect of them, may posit a false historical sequence, which perspective alone can re-establish, and he may consider as a coincidence of fortune what history can reveal as owing to a more profound and more necessary cause.

AN OFFICIAL MISSION

It is not in our province to declare that the Pope conferred on Diego an official mission comparable to that of Arnold, Peter, and Raoul. Although William of Tudela,⁽⁴⁴⁾ who judged only from appearances, maintained that the Sovereign Pontiff made Diego a legate, it seems certain that he did not do so. But it also seems almost beyond question that the Pope discussed with him the serious question of the apostolate in Languedoc; that he agreed with him on the necessity of endowing the preachers in Narbonne with the power of conquest conferred by "imitation of the apostles," a program known well to both in its concrete detail and its contemporary success; that the Pope officially commissioned the Bishop to explain this method to his legates, to renew their courage, and, in case of need, to give them the difficult example of voluntary poverty, and finally to animate Arnold to provide the required recruits. Diego went first toward Citeaux, perhaps because he thought he might find Arnold there, and might at once engage some preachers. At Montpellier, the meeting with the Cistercians gave him the opportunity to fulfill his mission. With these guiding thoughts in mind, a review of the table outlining the events of the summer of 1206, and particularly of Cernai's accounts and even of Jordan's, will throw new light on the whole question.

Such is the hypothesis that would appear quite probable on this point. Further, the full agreement between Diego and Innocent III is a matter for hypothesis, only in regard to the moment at which the Bishop of Osma first entered the papal *Praedicatio* (May-June, 1206). Their complete accord is, on the contrary, a matter of absolute certitude from November 17, 1206, the date of the letter in which the Pope officially consecrated the apostolic method developed by Diego with the legates at Montpellier. We have already spoken of this letter: it does not concern the Bishop, but it imposes on certain religious who participate in the papal *Praedicatio* the practice of evangelical poverty as the official

method of the company. The Pope considers as definitively adopted the tactics proposed some months earlier by the Spanish Bishop. It manifests his unqualified accord.

NOTES

1 Luchaire, pp. 90 f.

2 Cernai, nos. 20-27, 47-54.

3 Jordan, nos. 16-32.

4 Bourbon, no. 83.

5 Bourbon, no. 251.

6 As the dedicatory letter to Innocent III shows.

7 Cernai, nos. 20 f., 26 (which should be combined with 54), 48 f. Jordan, nos. 17-32.

8 Nos. 22-25.

9 No. 18 which probably belongs to the Castilian cycle of the journey of Diego and derives from it.

10 Nos. 27-29.

11 *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, XXVI, 271.

12 Puylaurens, nos. 8-10.

13 Bourbon, nos. 83, 251.

14 Tudela, III and IV.

15 Nos. 17-32.

16 Nos. 34-37.

17 Nos. 38 f.

18 Nos. 40-44.

19 The sources for his early history of the order are accounted for by Jordan thus, long investigated and gathered to ether by these same (primitive) brothers, who lived in the founding period, and who saw and heard the venerable servant of Christ. . . . It seemed to me that I should commit to writing the things which I personally saw and heard, and which I learned from the first brethren, and from certain other persons also, concerning the life and miracles of St. Dominic, as the occasion arose to store such things in my memory" (nos. 2 f.).

It seems that Dominic himself had said nothing about past events. He did not relish talking about himself. That explains why the few details known about his youth are attributed to other witnesses.

20 Cernai, no. 300.

21 No. 54.

22 Nos. 17 f., 21, 25.

23 Nos. 67-85.

24 Before Jordan undertook his work, an effort was made among the first brethren to collect some documents.

25 That is what seems likely from the date of the death of his uncle, the Bishop of Carcassonne. Cf. Cams, p. 528; Eubel, p. 166.

26 No. 17.

27 Cernai, no. 21.

28 Cf. Scheeben's introduction to the edition of the *Libellus (Monumenta Ordinis, XVI, 15 f.)*.

29 Jordan, no. 20.

30 *Processus* (Bologna), no. 43; cf. no. 12.

31 Cernai, no. 300.

32 Cernai, no. 47.

33 *Ibid.*, no. 51.

34 Tamayo-Salazar, *Anamnesis sive commemoratio omn. sanct. Hisp.*, I, 67.

35 *La vie du glorieux patriarche S. Dominique*, p. 183.

36 Scheeben, p. 51. Elsewhere (p. 68) Scheeben surmises a letter of the Pope granting Diego the permission which he had refused some months previous. That is the explanation given by Tamayo.

37 Grundmann, p. 103.

38 Canivez, *Statuta cap. gen. O. Cisterc.*, I, 340, 385: prohibition of begging in the Order in 1207 and 1211. Mansi, XXII, 828: prohibition of begging for religious in northern France, at the Council of Paris in 1212.

39 Zimmermann, *Die päpstliche Legation in der ersten Hälfte des XIII. Jahrh.*, pp. 219-22.

40 Potthast, no. 2087.

41 Jordan, no. 18.

42 Balme, II, 19.

43 Cernai, no. 67.

44 Stanza II, verses 17 f.

[CONTENTS](#)

St. Dominic and the Pope in 1215

THE relations of St. Dominic and Innocent III in the institution of the *Praedicatio* among the Albigenses and of the Order of Preachers have been the object in recent years of widely divergent views.

A. Luchaire, finding in a bull of Innocent III to the missionaries of Narbonne what he considered "the exact expression of the current of thought which produced St. Dominic and created the first mendicant order," was led to conjecture an accord between the Pope and the future Founder as early as 1206.⁽¹⁾

Father Mandonnet was of the same opinion and added that in 1215 the project of Dominic in instituting an order of apostolic preachers not only won full papal approval but even directly realized the express desires of the Sovereign Pontiff.

H. C. Scheeben strongly opposed this thesis: "Such notions can be characterized as merely empty fantasies. They would be possible only through a more than superficial criticism of sources and a bent for combination ruinous in historical research."⁽²⁾ Before the year 1215 the Founder was unknown to the Pope; in 1215 he was disregarded; "then began the tragedy in the life of St. Dominic."⁽³⁾

Quite recently H. Grundmann had the courage to criticize Scheeben and with new proofs to re-establish the general position of Luchaire.⁽⁴⁾ Moreover, he drew almost exclusively on the events of the year 1206;⁽⁵⁾ upon these we in turn have built new arguments which give a quasi-certitude to the conclusions of Luchaire, Mandonnet, and Grundmann.

But the problem concerning the relations of Dominic and Innocent in the proceedings of 1215 is an open one. Was Dominic expected when, accompanied by his Bishop, he proposed his idea of an Order of Preachers to the Sovereign Pontiff? Did his proposal meet approval or disapproval? There can be no doubt that the question is extremely significant; for in its traditional form the Order of Preachers was born of that meeting. It is highly desirable to know whether the Order was a creation which grew out of the perfect accord of the Pope and the Patriarch, or, on the contrary, out of a compromise.

Scholarship can contribute nothing directly toward the solution of this difficult problem. All that is known about the momentous interview is recorded in a brief sentence in Jordan of Saxony: "Having heard their petition, therefore, the Holy Father counseled Dominic to return to his brethren, and after deliberation with them to choose some approved rule with their unanimous consent; (*the Bishop would then assign some church to them*); finally, they would report again to the Pope to receive the confirmation of their work."⁽⁶⁾

Surely there can be no question about the historical accuracy of the Pope's counsel to choose a rule and of the promise of a future confirmation; but evidently these facts call for an interpretation.

We still hold that this evidence of Jordan, repeatedly carried over in Dominican legends, annals, and histories, stands alone: no other record adds comment on it. The mid-thirteenth century anecdote built around the hesitant concern of Innocent III as miraculously settled by a vision, was purely legendary, and borrowed, moreover, from the cycle of St. Francis; though the legend wove itself into subsequent literature, historians rightly reject it. Nevertheless, failing the support of direct witnesses, we look to

other evidence: the general background and historical circumstances, the causes and the results of this decisive hour in the institution of the Preachers, combine to furnish a sound and eloquent commentary on the facts related by Jordan. To view them in correct perspective and to understand their significance, we think it sufficient to center attention on the leading personalities and the reverberations of their climactic conference: the designs of St. Dominic, the dispositions of Innocent, the historical consequences of the decision of 1215.

THE DESIGNS OF ST. DOMINIC

Jordan, and again he is the sole witness, has thrown light on the designs which led Dominic. to Rome on the occasion of the Lateran Council. He came with his Bishop "to petition the Pope to grant to him and to his companions confirmation of an order which would be called and would be an Order of Preachers and, in addition, to seek the Pope's approbation of revenues assigned them by the Count and the Bishop."[\(7\)](#)

Dominic's application met with success in the following year, when two papal bulls were issued, December 22, 1216. The first was a classical privilege of foundation for the community of St. Romanus at Toulouse, granting protection of its property.[\(8\)](#) The second was entirely original, a confirmation of the Order of St. Dominic.[\(9\)](#) Jordan's text has probably been retouched as regards these two documents; therein lies its worth as well as its weakness; it is beyond us to ascertain whether we are dealing with a conclusion or with direct information. Yet the general value of the evidence cannot be doubted. Our business is simply to avoid a wrong interpretation.

FIRST STEPS

First of all, the order which St. Dominic proposed to Rome as a new project must not be identified with the *Praedicatio* which he had just taken charge of in Toulouse a few weeks before.[\(10\)](#) That was but an instrument for a diocesan apostolate, its direct antecedent being the *Praedicatio* of the Province of Narbonne. To erect the *Praedicatio* into an order, into a perpetual society with a regular common life, meant a voluntary and complete change in its status. The move to effect it had its prelude in the journey to Rome.

Under the circumstances, moreover, it would be a grave error if we imagined that upon his first visit Dominic laid before the Pope a developed and complete project, a plan for an order and a rule conceived in all its details, ready for immediate and definitive confirmation of the Church. Such naivete' can hardly be imagined in Dominic,[\(11\)](#) who, from the year 1206, had been engaged in a *Praedicatio* directed by the Pope and was perfectly aware of the independence of Innocent III in exercising his authority and keeping everything in control. The proposals of 1215 which led to the foundation and confirmation of the first convent of the Preachers were only preliminary. The saint submitted to the head of the Church certain original plans, which they considered together, proposing the little company of preachers in Toulouse as a possible nucleus in their realization.

Dominic's proposal, in this regard, had but a limited resemblance to those proposals which impelled religious founders in earlier centuries to journey to the See of Peter. When religious life was still restricted to the monastic and the canonical order, the problem of a foundation resolved itself into two points: monastic observance and temporal possessions. The petition, therefore, consisted in a request to the Pope to extend his protection or even to free from any other jurisdiction, temporal or spiritual, the goods and the *ordo* (rules and customs) of a religious house already established, at times, even long years before. If the foundation gave evidence of endurance and was canonical -- security about the rule was almost universally guaranteed by the use of the "authentic" *regula* of St. Benedict or St.

Augustine -- neither difficulty nor delay attended the confirmation. In St. Dominic's case history and tradition were repeated in only one circumstance: that was for Prouille, a feminine convent of the classical type already solidly established, for which upon his arrival he obtained a first privilege of protection.[\(12\)](#)

In his projects for the Order of Preachers, on the contrary, the canon of Osma abandoned the company of ancient monastic founders, and took his place in a modern line which had begun half a century earlier to file before the popes with the creators of new institutions or Christian associations. Peter Ferdinand, for example, sought the presence of Alexander III to propose and receive the approval of his Military Order of St. James of the Sword (1175). So it was that St. John of Matha submitted to Innocent III the Order of the Trinity for the Redemption of Captives (1198). The leaders of the converted Lombards were received for the Order of the Humiliati (1201). It was on Durandus of Huesca, Bernard Prim, and their companions that the Pope conferred the office of predicants (1208-10). Innocent authorized the evangelical life of St. Francis and his first friars (1210).[\(13\)](#)

There were immense differences, certainly, among these religious creations. The last three in this enumeration had not developed and at that time had no intention of developing into fully constituted orders, in the true sense of the term. It was simply a question of having the Pope agree to a *propositum conversationis*, a program of life, a special Christian activity.[\(14\)](#) Whatever the divergences, however, certain essential features are common in these negotiations which the head of the Church radically distinguished from classic petitions for confirmation.

NEW ASSOCIATIONS, NEW PROBLEMS

The ancient preoccupations about possessions and a program of religious asceticism were now far from being the only, much less the most important concern. A question that did not suggest itself to the older orders, because it had been solved in advance, sprang to first rank: it determined the purpose, the social type, and the Christian juridical status of the new association. In the preceding ages, religious life, centered in the monastic order, had only one aim and only one milieu: personal salvation in the social organism of the abbey. But each of the modern groups proposed for itself some special end: to care for the sick and pilgrims, to ransom captives, to defend or advance the cause of Christendom, to make converts, or to preach. Their association in groups, or even their presence in society, created an unexpected problem: it was necessary as they appeared to introduce them into the pre-existing structure of the Church, wherein they formed a new type of body or at least a new class. This was not effected without difficulty. Imagine, for instance, the altogether unusual character of the Order of St. James, with some members continuing to live in the married state; or think of what suspicions weighed upon all the societies of "predicants." Nothing but the action of the Pope could stabilize the new institutions in the Catholic order, or correct and guarantee their juridical statutes.

Furthermore, such an organization was not the unique and personal work of a single founder; it was the fruit of collaboration on the part of the future religious and the authorities of the Church, and especially the Pope. The foundations of the orders previously enumerated were in a special sense the work of the Sovereign Pontiffs, notably Innocent III. The history of the Knights of St. James, of the Trinitarians, of the Humiliati, can be traced on the same lines: a small community, full of good will and spiritual ardor, makes an appeal to the Pope. The Pope, after several months or even several years, composes or has some cardinals compose a statute and a rule which are conferred on the new society in a solemn bull of foundation.[\(15\)](#) Whatever part was played by the initiative of the religious, it will be readily seen that the intervention of the head of the Church was instrumental in the orientation which placed the new Order directly at the service of some general Deed of Christendom: military defense, the ransom of captives, struggle against heresy, or preaching. The role of initiator, in this case, consisted principally

in sponsoring and encouraging souls of good will caught up in a powerful spiritual aspiration and carried on by the attraction of an idea partially conceived, by ultimately introducing the group into Christian society in the person of its leader.

Dominic, in turn, came to offer his little group gathered in Toulouse. It was not yet the Order of Friars Preachers nor even the inception of the society that was to be, with its broad lines already drawn. As yet there was no profession; neither was there religious obedience or an organization of community life or an obligatory observance;(16) there was no rule. It was, as we have remarked, a simple *Praedicatio*, a renewal of the Cistercian *Praedicatio* in Narbonne. But it contained within itself the point of departure for the growth of a projected enterprise. It was in Dominic's mind to construct an *ordo praedicatorum*.

AN ORDER OF PREACHERS

The term is carefully chosen: an *ordo praedicatorum*. Jordan of Saxony's statement, "which would be called and would be an Order of Preachers," need not be explained as a projection into the past of a name and a subsequent achievement. The expression was then a common one; it evoked an ideal, a work long dreamed of by the most enlightened guardians of the faith; theologians, monks, and clerics regular had anticipated, predicted, described, and prophesied its character. Among churchmen this idea had awakened the same kind of fervent desire as the idea of an evangelical preaching fraternity had aroused in the lay world, whether faithful or heterodox. The canon of the reformed chapter of Osma had been reared from his childhood in a clerical atmosphere. He had given nine years of his life to preaching in the land of the Albigenses, the scene of the most harrowing crisis for the apostolate. All the while he was in contact with the heads of the diocese, with the councils and the papal legates, and was therefore qualified as no one else was, to weigh the value of these projects and designs and, from the very first, to orientate his plans in a background of ecclesiastical and canonical tradition with a perspective extending far beyond the humble and hidden horizon of its original setting.

It was likewise significant, with import beyond our first penetration, that the *Praedicatio* in Toulouse was instituted at the time when the bishops were preparing to convene in Rome for the Lateran Council, and that Dominic set out almost at once for the Eternal City to confer with the Pope and attend the Ecumenical Assembly of the Church.(17)

The *Praedicatio* in Toulouse formed the foundation for the society of preachers projected by Dominic. All that the Order owed to the diocesan *Praedicatio* has been reviewed. The aim of the Order of Preachers was the same: instruction of the faithful and refutation of error, along with the bishop or in place of him; ecclesiastical status, an official mission from the Church confided to clerics; the spirit, imitation of the apostles; formation of the workers, regular observance of the common life; economy, an establishment supported both by revenues and by mendicant poverty; internal organization, direction by a head, the Master of the Preachers. Here was an institutional program already well defined. Considering this, we note what a difference there was between Dominic and the religious founders with whom the epoch has associated his name. From the converted barons of St. James of the Sword and on even to St. Francis, through the reconciled Waldenses, the instigators of the new religious movements seem not to have possessed actuating ideas for the creation of an institution. Everything shows that, if the papacy had not intervened, they would probably not have developed into what we call orders, solidly established and shaped to fit into the framework of Christendom. On one point only did these founders seem to have precise decision, and it led them to Rome: they did not want to be forced into the classical mold of pre-existing foundations.(18) We can easily account for this difference in the founding projects: these initiators rose either out of lay circles, from among

unlettered men who had little concern for legal forms, or from forces set in opposition to the clergy and the hierarchy. But Dominic was an educated man, and in every inclination of his soul a priest.

For erection as a regular foundation, the *Praedicatio* at Toulouse lacked only a few features indispensable to a life of observance. It was necessary to provide for growth in the membership, for the formation and spiritual training as well as for the common life of these religious clerics; their austerities, their theological studies,⁽¹⁹⁾ and their canonical prayers⁽²⁰⁾ would have to be directed according to a rule.

A CANON REGULAR

On this point no step had yet been taken, but Dominic's fidelity to his heritage as a reformed canon⁽²¹⁾ was again shown in his steps toward the foundation in Toulouse. First of all, he began by procuring in the city substantial and even beautiful buildings ⁽²²⁾ which evidently he had not sought. At the same time he arranged with the Bishop for the security of the temporal interests through a share in the tithes of the diocese.⁽²³⁾ Such moves, at that stage, would have been inconceivable in the program of St. Francis or the Poor Catholics, but they were necessary for the beginnings of a regular foundation of any stability. The rare documents extant mention a house as already established and arrangements for a life of observance under the authority of Dominic.⁽²⁴⁾ From that time on, Jordan tells us, the friars lived in Toulouse in these buildings, and "all those who were with him (Dominic) began to descend the degrees of humility and to conform to the observances of religious."⁽²⁵⁾ As regular clerics, the friars of Dominic could hardly be distinguished in the matter of observance from the canons of St. Stephen of Toulouse, whose revenues they shared.

A permanent episcopal *Praedicatio*, a regular common life -- such were the elements of the *ordo praedicatorum* that Dominic submitted to the Pope. The first part of the program with its note of perpetuity evidently supposed a legal innovation in an unusually restricted sphere. Since Innocent III alone could pass judgment on it and sanction it, Dominic accompanied his Bishop to Rome. The conception was a bold one, yet thoroughly adaptable and capable of immediate execution. Perhaps it was nearer to Innocent's dream than anyone would surmise; at any rate, the work was rich in promise, and its organizer was an experienced leader. In an hour of crisis it proposed a skillfully planned program for the spread of the gospel. How would Innocent receive it?

THE DISPOSITIONS OF INNOCENT III

How could Innocent do otherwise than welcome it? The plight of preaching had been a matter of continual and distressing solicitude for this Pontiff, who, more than any other, carried in his soul a ceaseless "care of all the Churches." The more he had learned during the course of his pontificate to know the true sources of heresy, their Christian forces in aberration, their revolts induced by insatiable and legitimate longings, the more ardently he desired a full recourse to a true and positive remedy, the preaching of the faith:..a dispensing of the food of the word of God."⁽²⁶⁾

THE LABORERS FEW

In 1215 this task seemed more urgent and more necessary than ever. He endeavored to bring to an end the bloody crusade which, after many years of a peaceful apostolate, urged by men and by circumstances, his word had set sweeping through southern France. At his command all had "vowed" peace.⁽²⁷⁾ The hour had come for the mobilization of all spiritual forces in the work of reconciliation.⁽²⁸⁾ But what obstacles there were! The Pope knew only too well the weakness of the forces at command for the apostolate. There was no stir where it could most rightly be expected,

namely, from the clergy as a whole. In his earlier attempts to recruit a band of preachers, he found it necessary to ransack the monasteries and even to draw again and again from the Order of Cîteaux, upon which St. Bernard in his time had rigorously imposed silence. Innocent changed unworthy prelates, the "dumb dogs," who no longer knew how to bark. But did the newly-chosen incumbents understand their role? And what good would be effected by a change of shepherds if the flocks were not also renewed, if the whole clerical body were not touched by a movement, by some spirit reanimating them with zeal for the conquest of souls?

An appeal launched by Innocent in 1215 would have called forth from the clergy, as the traditional preaching body, scarcely any true apostles. Yet "preachers" of good will were at work in Languedoc, Lombardy, France, and the Rhine country. But who were they! Ignorant and even anticlerical laymen, vagabond clerics, heretics and women: all without the pale of the clerical order to which by a traditional mission, constituting one of the offices of the Church, was confided the exclusive right of ordinary preaching and teaching of the faith. Was it not fitting that the consecrators of the Word of God be also the authentic mouthpieces of His message? When bishops and priests obstinately refused the services of ardent lay proselytizers, their attitude may have displayed rancor and intolerance; but their reaction was prompted also by a profound Catholic sense, which the deviations into heresies and schisms as well as the extreme and anarchical spirit of the lay preachers only too often justified. Innocent, nevertheless, appreciated the efficacy of the spiritual arms wielded by these evangelical men; in their imitation of the apostles, their purity of life, and their asceticism he recognized strictly Catholic practices. His esteem for their value is evident in his own attempts to recommend them to those engaged in the orthodox apostolate, and particularly in the institution of the Poor Catholics.⁽²⁹⁾ But here, too, the hopes of the Pontiff were in great part frustrated. In 1215 his voice had already been silent for two years with regard to "his sons the Poor Catholics,"⁽³⁰⁾ though he never relinquished his desire to see the Church rely on the evangelical spirit in her warfare. He encouraged and protected St. Francis, to whom, though a layman, he even granted the privilege of preaching penance.⁽³¹⁾

The position of the Pope, at that date, presented a dual character. He would guard the prerogative of preaching for the clergy, but the clergy were apathetic. He would marshal all the powers of the "apostolic life" in the service of the Church, but these forces, as cultivated by the Cathari and Waldenses, had often worked against Catholicity.

Then it was that Dominic offered to the Church his band of Preachers and his project for preaching "in the poverty of the Gospel." To the Pope, in his concern for souls, it was at one and the same time a response from the clergy and a movement in "imitation of the apostles." That the Pope should not have recognized this is inconceivable. Indeed, it would even seem that the Pope at that date had already in advance partially accepted the proposal and that perhaps he had himself called it forth.

DOMINIC AND THE CURIA

Dominic was not a stranger to the Roman Curia. Innocent had met him first in 1206 in the company of his Bishop, Diego of Osma, who came to resign his see that he might preach the gospel to the pagans. We know the result: Diego and Dominic were enlisted in the papal *Praedicatio* in Narbonne, to which they introduced, as from Rome, the method of mendicant preaching "after the example of the Master."

From then on, Innocent, through the reports of his legates, kept in as close contact as possible with the little band of preachers. After Diego's death and the defection of most of the Cistercian abbots, Dominic had held the field almost alone. For nine years the Pope had kept his eyes on the little corner of Christendom which had caused him such grave anxiety, and he could not but regard with joy this

Preacher, a man delegated, intent and persevering, who had found a way to reap a humble harvest where all others had become discouraged.

The *Praedicatio* of Narbonne had never been officially dissolved. Guy of Vaux-de-Cernai, the last of its "masters," had not returned to his abbey. In September, 1209, the Council of Avignon under the legate Milo had reminded the bishops of their duty to preach, and to procure helpers for the work in case of need.⁽³²⁾ In 1210, immediately after the reconciliation of Toulouse, Foulques and Arnold preached with zeal in the city and the surrounding country.⁽³³⁾ In 1211-12 the simultaneous promotion of Guy to the bishopric of Carcassonne and of Arnold Amaury, the other head of the *Praedicatio* and the papal legate, to the metropolitan see of Narbonne, constituted a fusion of the papal *Praedicatio* and the regular hierarchy. This measure was supported by an extraordinary change in the personnel of suffragan sees. With the exception of Toulouse, all the sees in the province of Narbonne had new appointees between 1211 and 1213; at least three of the changes involved forced resignations,⁽³⁴⁾ and the movement was carried into the neighboring provinces. It seems that at that date and again later on, Dominic was urged to accept the episcopal office, a step that would have completed the process of fusion and would have juridically resolved the problem of ordinary preaching in the most traditional way. Evidently Innocent was the promoter of this great movement.

But in the administration of a diocese Dominic saw more of an obstacle than an aid to his apostolate; he threatened to "take flight with his staff." Learning of his refusal, the Pope could recall how his attitude reflected that of Bishop Diego of Osma in 1206. Once again, the way would have to open toward another solution.

For Dominic was right. Between 1212 and 1215 there was no evidence of great apostolic work accomplished by the Archbishop of Narbonne, the new chief of the ecclesiastical province. Political intrigues and the aftermath of the crusades, along with his own troubles with Simon de Montfort, had been enough to stifle all the concern he might have had for preaching.⁽³⁵⁾ And how could he practice the poverty recommended all along by the Pope to his missionaries when he had to maintain his station as Archbishop and Duke of Narbonne? Dominic, on the contrary, found his true sphere as a preacher in the office of spiritual vicar (*vices gerens in spiritualibus*) of the Bishop of Carcassonne, the duties of which he exercised, it seems in 1213 and in the early part of 1214.⁽³⁶⁾ In the following year his position was more firmly established and with the same orientation: for after the charter of 1215, he was the official vicar of Foulques, the Bishop of Toulouse, responsible with his fellow workers for the work of preaching.

And once again, the solution, we believe, came not without the controlling direction of Innocent III, and that only a few weeks before Dominic set out for the meeting with him in Rome. It is the central point in the history, where everything seems to converge, take shape, gain ground, and finally come to light.

Among the very few documents touching this period in the life of St. Dominic, no formal text, it is true, affirms the intervention of the Pope. And that is why it could be vehemently denied. But the argument from silence, often has very little value. It is possible also to point out a group of coincidences, that render the Pope's intervention highly probable.

INSTITUTION OF TOULOUSE

The texts which have been cited elsewhere explicitly show how the Order of St. Dominic brought about a revival and development of the papal mission in Narbonne. Would not the renaissance of his first apostolic enterprise have been a work for Innocent himself? Moreover, the Pope's religious policy

in the domain of preaching and the apostolic life was highly and unfailingly ingenious: it was an ever new creation which flowered each year in some unexpected and daring institution, and that in a period when the military and political operation of the crusades among the Albigenses might normally have been expected to absorb all his interest. But the signs of this fecundity came abruptly to a close beginning with 1213.(37) Yet, it was to be the time for its most fruitful expansion. In fact, in 1214, Innocent sent to southern France a new legate, Cardinal Peter of Benevento, with minute instructions for dealing with the spiritual and temporal concerns of the Midi.

In the letter of institution, the Pope recalled the past with sorrow. The cause of all the evil was easy to trace: pastors fed themselves; as watch dogs they barked no longer; a famine spread among souls; a flock was left to the wolves with no one to defend it. Into this misery he sent angels of faith and peace to unite the country, to win souls back to the truth by the teaching of doctrine. Men had not heard their message. Force had to be employed. And now again he was sending his messenger, Cardinal Peter, "who in his name and by his authority would draw up the treaties of peace, cultivate with love a new plantation in the garden of the faith, consolidate orthodox groups, and in a general way destroy and suppress, construct and build, all that he would find necessary, correcting and reforming what seemed to require his attention."(38)

Among all these reforms and constructive enterprises, the reestablishment of the *Praedicatio* among the Albigenses was evidently the most important. If just at that time a group of preachers and defenders of the faith organized a company in Toulouse, the principal city of the region, "notorious as the center and cesspool of all the malice of heretical perversity."(39) was the commissioner of Innocent there for no special reason?

He was present when Dominic became head of the *Praedicatio* in Toulouse. This one official act, sole witness to us of his activity, shows that Dominic was directly under orders from the cardinal legate.(40)

The charter which instituted the *Praedicatio* of Dominic and his companions and endowed it with a share in the revenues of the diocese was, viewed in its totality, an innovation pure and simple; such as it was, it had no precedent in the annals of Christendom. Yet, and the fact is revealing, a few weeks later it was duplicated exactly in the tenth canon of the Lateran Council, set forth by Innocent III and imposed on all the bishops.

The two texts will bear parallel scrutiny; the juridical import is identical. According to the canon of the Lateran Council, the bishop was bound to have auxiliaries to distribute to his people "the bread of the word of God, to hear their confessions, and to attend to all that concerned the salvation of souls." Not one single coadjutor would suffice; he would need a corps of capable men to whom he would confide the office of holy preaching. The powers of these preachers would be valid throughout the whole diocese, which it would be their duty to visit. They were to edify the people confided to them "by word and example," as men "Powerful in word and work." They were to be established, therefore, among the regular clergy of the diocese ("in the cathedral chapters or the other conventual churches."). Finally, the bishop would provide for their needs, lest want should oblige them to abandon their apostolic labor.(41)

THE CHAPTER AND THE CANON OF 1215

Every one of these points had been incorporated in the charter of Toulouse. True, once before, the Council of Avignon had ordered the bishop to provide a substitute for himself in the work of preaching in case of need.(42) Further, though not frequently invoked in practice, the canons permitted the bishop

and his chapter to assign part of the revenues of the diocese to a religious community or some worthy cause. But the institution of a company of collaborators with the bishop, the search for the preachers among the regular clergy, the apologetic purpose which inspired it, and finally the provision of a subsidy for it by the canons who on other occasions had shown themselves "obdurate,"⁽⁴³⁾ made the establishment in Toulouse a unique creation. It would retain its uniqueness even after the Lateran Council, for the tenth canon did not meet the response expected of it. The resemblance of the society of Toulouse to the type of institution almost simultaneously recommended by the Ecumenical Council is, therefore, something to be marveled at. It is so remarkable that, if Innocent's influence on the institution in Toulouse is not supposed, we must conclude that the organization established by Foulques and Dominic influenced the canon of the Twelfth Ecumenical Council.

But why oppose them one to the other? One and the same thought was realized almost simultaneously, but not independently, at Toulouse and at Rome. The successive promulgation of the charters of foundation, the harmonious cooperation of Dominic and Innocent, prepared for through the legation of Peter of Benevento, was followed directly by Dominic's journey to the Lateran Council. This visit occurred immediately after the foundation in the diocese of Bishop Foulques as if it were desirable to have a report on the experiment in Toulouse and to prepare for its universal adoption. An these certain and significant facts forbid our interpreting the simultaneous promulgation of the canonical status of the diocesan missionaries in Toulouse and in Rome as a mere coincidence. Rather they combine for our recognition of a plan premeditated and directed by the same thought, that of Pope Innocent III, shared if not suggested by the Founder of the Preachers.

We now have all the information needed to answer the question raised by this study. In 1215, after the foundation of the Preachers in Toulouse, Dominic could present all his projects to the Pope and be understood; more than that, he would receive a joyous welcome, since he represented the clerical order responding to the appeal of the head of the Church, dedicating its good will and its spiritual powers to the work expected of it, and offering the first fruits of an institution which the Pope hoped to build into the very structure of Christendom through the Lateran Council.

THE PART OF THE POPE

Light is thus cast on more than one detail in the respective work of the Pope and the Preacher. Canon 10 of the Lateran Council, in revealing the personal ideas of the Sovereign Pontiff, enables us to ascertain his part in the future foundation: it was not with the religious order proper, but with the *Praedicatio* of Toulouse. There was a similarity between the organization in Toulouse and the institution called for by the Pope in the Council, and that organization itself was in continuity with the *Praedicatio* of Narbonne, initiated originally by Innocent. As a matter of fact, the *Praedicatio* of Toulouse did not in itself directly constitute the first convent of the Preachers. It was a new division in the hierarchical organization of the Church, an original reform of the ordinary apostolate which the Pope was attempting in vain to impose on all the bishops. We can readily see the Pope's hand in this innovation. At the same time, the organization possessed the foundation and structure of the *ordo praedicatorum*, its ecclesiastical rank, its aim, and even its method, because the mendicant poverty of the apostles already figured large in the official program for the papal *Praedicatio* in 1206.

But Dominic's part is not less important or less characteristic. One word expressed it in the charter of Foulques in 1215: "*religiose proposuerunt incedere.*" In proposing a life of preaching and of "imitation of the apostles" as the end and activity of an order of religious clerics, the reformed canon of Osma recovered, with a more penetrating power than before, the spiritual leaven which had activated the canonical program. Into the ecclesiastical organization in Toulouse he introduced a force of expansion

and development which with prodigious rapidity transformed it into a universal Order of Preachers, with all Christian Europe as its sphere of action.

This regular *propositum*, which had great institutional and spiritual consequences, was not of itself implied in the diocesan *Praedicatio*. But it was not foreign to the desires of Innocent. To confide the office of preaching to exemplary clerics, formed in the traditional discipline of religious life, canonical or monastic, burning with the spirit of poverty and zeal for souls, was indeed the explicit intention of the Pope when he organized the *Praedicatio* in Narbonne. A muted echo of it was perceptible in the canon of the Lateran. That these regular clerics, to ensure their formation, sustain their fervor, stabilize their good purpose, and perpetuate their membership, should unite in a single house which might later on multiply in similar foundations, was something that Innocent would surely applaud. He noted hopefully the first steps of advance toward the institutional stabilization of his own efforts, as they were taken by the ardent and contemplative Preacher, who, during nine years of experience, had learned the difficulty as well as the necessity of the work.

The Pope, it is true, was not alone; some of the prelates assembled for the Lateran Council were not always in accord with his progressive ideas, notably with his initiative in preaching enterprises and apostolic movements. They were prepared to thwart his innovations by passing the thirteenth canon, which contained the following prescription: "Lest too great a diversity of religious orders should lead to grave confusion in the Church of God, we strictly forbid anyone in the future to found a new order, but whoever should wish to enter an order, let him choose one already approved. Similarly he who should wish to found a new monastery, must accept a rule and institution already approved."⁽⁴⁴⁾ Was the Order of St. Dominic to be stifled out of existence before its birth? Impressed by the prohibitions of this canon, many historians have taken them as a proof that Dominic in 1215 was not free to found the Order that he wished.

But Innocent was not the man to let himself be thwarted in advance by the prejudice of bishops, and especially in what concerned the life of preaching. At that very moment he confirmed the little Franciscan society whose first rule, an original one composed by St. Francis, would henceforth be regarded by the Church as authentic. If Dominic had thought it necessary, even before the Council had passed its canon, the Pope would doubtless have authorized him to compose an entirely new rule.

A CLASSIC RULE

But an exact reading of canon 13 shows that Dominic had nothing to fear from it. The word "institution" had reference only to the basic organization of a religious house, with its novitiate, its professed members, its superiors, and its interior appointment:⁽⁴⁵⁾ that stipulation would certainly be enough to strangle the lay eremitical or preaching movements which were then swarming into anarchy. It could in no way hamper the Order of Preachers which, on the contrary, required this minimum of regular institution. On this basis Dominic established what was a new institutional creation, his society for preaching, thanks to the official sanction of canon 10 on preachers. As to the observance of one or other of the classic rules, it was included in his designs.

Dominic, therefore, was authorized to advance the realization of his projects. On the advice of the Pope he was to return to Toulouse and, to comply with the recommendations of the fathers of the Council, he would then establish his regular monastic observances: "in accord with his brethren he would choose one of the rules already approved," which would serve to guarantee the authentic character of his Order.⁽⁴⁶⁾ According to the general custom of the period, he would compose a certain number of supplementary customs to constitute his own legislation, and then submit all this to the Sovereign Pontiff, who promised in advance "confirmation of the whole."

The question of observance having been thus decided, the diocesan preachers of Toulouse could pronounce vows and thus become religious. The first convent of the Order of St. Dominic was born.

A final detail still had to be arranged: this convent of clerics should have a church. But that did not depend on Dominic, or even in a certain sense on his bishop, but on the cathedral chapter. Such groups ordinarily were not disposed in any way to cede their rights over the administration and revenues of parishes by depriving themselves of a church.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Had not the Brothers of St. Stephen already made a sufficient sacrifice in yielding a share of their tithes to Dominic? Up to that time the Preachers had to be satisfied with a dwelling house in Toulouse. But a formal order from Innocent reached the chapter through its bishop. Foulques was to assign a church to Dominic and his friars; indeed, he was to assign him three churches.⁽⁴⁸⁾ This last measure came as a first impulse to the expansion of the Order of St. Dominic. It is remarkable that it left the Order in Languedoc and in a diocesan setting.⁽⁴⁹⁾

Jordan's text, quoted at the beginning of this study, can be read again; our aim was simply to make a commentary; each word has its own significance.

"Having heard their petition, therefore, the Holy Father counseled Dominic to return to his brethren, and after careful deliberation with them to choose some approved rule with their unanimous consent (the Bishop would then assign a church to them); finally, they would report again to the Pope to receive the confirmation of their work."

When he was urging the fathers of the Council to adopt the general decree obliging bishops to obtain official preachers, Innocent III permitted the canon of Osma to work at the foundation of a clerical religious order that would soon furnish those very bishops with preachers "powerful in word and work," men whom they would not otherwise find. Furthermore, the Pope promised in advance the approval of the Church to this order that was not yet born.

In viewing these conclusions as a whole, we find warrant for stating not only that in 1215 the Sovereign Pontiff did not rebuff Dominic, but that he received him with joy, that he understood and fostered his projects, inspired partly by the Pope's own vision, and, finally, that he promised the Order its official consecration.

The friars of Toulouse, informed by Dominic of the results of his visit, cherished the thought of this accord and the memory of this anticipated approbation. One of them, John of Navarro, was a witness to it in the process at Bologna, signaling the year 1215, which saw his entrance into the little diocesan society, in these words: "The year in which the Order of Friars Preachers was confirmed, at the Council of the Lord Pope, Innocent III."⁽⁵⁰⁾ Jordan of Saxony, who was informed by the first friars, wrote of this confirmation, as promised, and granted the following year: "Brother Dominic obtained in its plenitude and in all its import the confirmation of his Order and of all that he had wished to obtain, according to the plan and the organization which he had conceived."⁽⁵¹⁾

These documents, moreover, are not isolated. In reality, the later history of the sons of St. Dominic was a living demonstration which would in itself prove that the primitive ideal and the original plan of their Founder in 1215, far from meeting a reverse, received instead from the papacy the welcome and the impulse which made them develop in all their fullness with an astonishingly rapid growth into the Order of Preachers.

1 Luchaire, p. 89; cf. p. 91. He even thought that the "Poor Catholics," instituted by Innocent III, became a model for the Order of Preachers, so that "the subprior of Osma created nothing original. A forerunner of the Dominicans, the Poor Catholics opened and blazed the trail for the powerful Order of Preachers" (pp. 109, 113). The statement shows exaggeration. Grundmann (pp. 106, 117, 141) demonstrated that the Poor Catholics did not constitute an Order.

2 Scheeben, p. 27.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 379.

4 Grundmann, p. 70.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 103, where there is a refutation of Scheeben.

6 Jordan, no. 41. The italicized words belong to a second edition of the *Libellus*; they are also in the legend of Ferrand, no. 27 (1235-39).

7 Jordan, no. 40. The expression, qui *predicatorum diceretur et esset* ("which would be called [an Order] of Preachers and would be") echoes a New Testament formula in frequent use at that time. Cf. Apoc. 2:9.

8 Laurent, no. 74.

9 *Confirmamus Ordinem tuum....* (Laurent, no. 75).

10 Laurent, no. 60. Only the year is indicated in the document. The charter of April 25, 1215 (Laurent, no. 61), ceding the house of Peter Seila "to The Lord Brother Dominic, to his successors, to the inhabitants of this house both present and future and to their heirs," gives some insight into the start of the little group. But it throws no light on the character of their organization. This fact could be readily understood if the charter instituting the diocesan preachers had not yet been issued. It should be dated June or July. See Balme, I, 517; Mandonnet, *Saint Dominique, l'idée, l'homme et l'oeuvre* (Ghent, 1921), p. 43; Scheeben, pp. 156-58. Jordan likewise suggests this sequence for the two charters (Jordan, nos. 38 f.). The departure for Rome was in September: charter 62 shows that Dominic had already met the Pope on October 8.

11 Was Innocent more tractable when it was a question of according a *propositum conversationis*, that is, a particular mode of life which did not in itself imply any legal status? Perhaps, since it would be of less consequence and would involve neither the welfare nor the law of the Church. But we do not know what corrections preceded the approval of the Poor Catholics. Durandus of Huesca waited a year before receiving the first bull of the Pope; it was another four years before Durandus and Bernard were officially and in writing taken "under the protection of Peter." As to Francis, he obtained only a provisional oral permission in 1210. He had to wait until 1219 for a written sign of approbation for the Franciscan way of life.

12 Laurent, no. 62.

13 Friars of St. James of the Sword, bull of July 5, 1175 (Jaffé, no. 12504; *PL*, CC, 1024); Trinitarians, bull of December 17, 1198 (Potthast, no. 483; *PL*, CCXIV, 444); Humiliati, bull of June 7, 12, 16, 1201 (Potthast, *Dos.* 1415, 1416, 1417; Tiraboschi, 11, 128 ff.); Poor Catholics of Durandus of

Huesca, bull of December 18, 1208 (Potthast, no. 3571; *PL*, CCXV, 1510 ff.); Bernard Prim, bull of June 14, 1210 (Potthast, no. 4014; *PL*, CCXVL 289 ff.).

14 In the Pope's letters to the Poor Catholics, neither "Ordo" nor "Regula" ever occurs, any more than the expression "convent" or "religious profession," but there are words like those in the profession of faith of converts: "Since truly not only upright faith, but good works also are necessary for salvation... we likewise consider the way of life proposed in this writing, the tenor of which is..." (Potthast, no. 3571; *PL*, CCXV, 1512; cf. Potthast, no. 4567; *PL*, CCXVI, 648). It was a program designed for itinerant preachers and "teachers of doctrine." The only houses spoken of were the schools and the homes of seculars, whose direction they assumed on occasion. An attempt was made in 1212 to found an institute of this type at Elne (Potthast, no. 4504; *PL*, CCXVI, 601). It was through these establishments that the movement survived and little by little developed toward the type of regular foundations, and the name "Order of Poor Catholics" was finally conferred in 1256 in a letter of Alexander IV, associating them with the Hermits of St. Augustine (Pierron, pp. 168f.).

In 1210, St. Francis and his companions presented their case in the same way as the Poor Catholics. Grundmann has emphasized this particular phase of the two movements (pp. 106, 117, 130, 133, 140f.).

15 In 1175, Alexander III himself gave to Peter Ferdinand, in his bull of foundation, a certain number of statutes: at the same time he had a rule drawn up in seventy-one chapters (Helyot, *Histoire des Ordres*, II, 263). On his first visit to Rome, St. John of Matha was sent back to Paris to his Bishop and the Abbot of St. Victor; they prepared for Innocent III the plan of a rule which he revised and finally conferred in his bull of 1198, making reference to this origin (*PL*, CCXIV, 444). The Humiliati petitioned Innocent III in 1199. He required them to present their rule to the Bishop of Vercelli and to the Abbot of Locedio, who revised it. He then gave the text to a special commission. It was only in 1201 that the revised rule was granted to the Humiliati (Tirasboschi II, 140; cf. Zanoni, p. 92; Grundmann, p. 76).

In 1204, Innocent had founded a house of Hospitallers at Santa Maria in Sassia and had affiliated it to the celebrated Hospital of the Holy Ghost at Montpellier. In 1213, he had a rule given to the whole Order (*PL*, CCXVII, 1137). At the same time the representative of Innocent, Robert de Courson, imposed in France certain prescriptions of the councils, and thereby initiated the great movement toward a codification of the rule for Hospitallers and a regulation of their life according to the type enjoined in religious congregations, a movement which continued to develop up to the thirteenth century (L. Le Grand, *Status d'Hôtels-Dieu*, Paris, 1901).

16 The first profession recorded, that of John of Navarre, was made in the church of St. Romanus, August 28, 1216 (*Processus* [Bologna] no. 25). This date, however, is much disputed.

17 Jordan, nos. 38, 40.

18 Zanoni (p. 92) regards the Humiliati's lack of enthusiasm in accepting a rule as one of the reasons for the delay in their confirmation. Francis would not be persuaded "to adopt either the monastic or the eremitical life" (I, Celano, 34; Grundmann, pp. 130f.). Grundmann has emphasized the efforts of the popes, and of Innocent especially, to direct the religious "movements" toward a more organized form of life and, if possible, toward an order in the true meaning of the word (pp. 9-11, 43-45).

19 The disputes of the missionaries in Narbonne with the heretics which Cernai (nos. 20-54) distinguishes from ordinary sermons, were theological jousts with a form and a definite technique of which the modern debates give no idea. The public disputation was then the elementary and universal procedure in a theological disquisition, which reduced itself often to a very concrete discussion of texts

from Holy Scripture and patristic authorities: that is what rendered those sacred fencing matches so full of challenge and appeal even for those not scholars. Cernai has described them exactly.

The importance of this public theological exercise in the struggle against heresy can be estimated by the program of the Poor Catholics in 1208: "Moreover, since the majority of us are clerics and nearly all educated men, we have decided to labor by means of sermons, exhortations, instructions, and disputations against all the sects of error. The disputations, however, should be conducted by brethren more learned in the Catholic faith, men confirmed and instructed in the law of the Lord, that the adversaries of the Catholic and apostolic faith may be confounded. Moreover, through the more upright and more enlightened in the law of God and in the writings of the holy Fathers, we have decreed that the word of the Lord ought to be propounded to our brethren and friends in our schools, with permission of the prelates of course, and with due reverence, by brothers qualified and instructed in sacred letters, who will be powerful in sound doctrine to convince an erring people, to draw men back to the faith and to recall them to the bosom of the Holy Roman Church" (*PL*, CCXV, 1513). Evidently Dominic and his companions could not do less than that. This doctrinal exposition of the faith was in their program (LaureDt, no. 60).

It would be easy to find witnesses to the doctrinal culture and apostolate of St. Dominic (Jordan, nos. 6, 15, 22, 23; *Processus* [Bologna], nos. 3, 22, 28, 32, 35; Cernai, no. 54; Frachet, p. 82).

20 There is no reason to suppose that the canonical Office was not included in the projects of St. Dominic in 1215, because it was part of the life of the Preachers from the beginning. On this point the conduct of the saint himself would afford sufficient evidence, for through all the labors of a zealous apostolate he was a contemplative soul.

On almost every page, the process of canonization refers to the praying of St. Dominic, often prolonged through whole nights (*Processus* [Bologna], nos. 7, 18, 20, 31, 36, 42, 43, 47; *Processus* [Toulouse], no. 18), during the day (*Processus* [Bologna], nos. 3, 7, 13, 18, 25, 42), on journeys (*Processus* [Bologna], nos. 3, 7, 13, 41, 42, 46; *Processus* [Toulouse], no. 10), in sickness (*Processus* [Bologna], no. 22). Although, in general, this evidence is for the years subsequent to 1215, it is clear that the spirit which it reflects was habitual earlier. After 1215, Dominic desired to see this spirit of prayer among his brethren. It is also certain that for him and his brethren, therefore as well as after 1215, the major place in their long prayer was reserved for the canonical Office (*Processus* [Bologna] nos. 3, 6, 7, 31, 36, 42, 43). Not until the beginning of modern times did the Church see religious prefer what was formerly called "secret prayer" to the official and social prayer of the Church. A member of the regular clergy in the thirteenth century could never have departed from this universal psychology regarding prayer, when even a parish priest had the Office chanted in his parish (cf. Council of Paris, 1212, can. 1, 2; Mansi, XXII, 819, 847). Jordan was certainly well informed when he pictured the members of the papal mission in 1206 despoiling themselves of all their baggage, with the exception of the books required for the Office, study, and the disputations (Jordan, no. 22). Moreover, the *Praedicatio* was only a temporary association, not a religious order.

21 Dominic was a lover of the common life. The *Praedicatio* at Prouille became at once the center for the common life, as did the *Praedicatio* in Toulouse in 1215. He felt there could be no fruitful apostolate without regular formation, prayer, and study, supported by the esteem which a strict religious life merits. Note these two prescriptions in his future Constitutions: for the novices: "how fervent they ought to be in preaching at the opportune time"; for visitors: "what fruit there will be from the report that the brethren dwell continually in peace, are assiduous in study, fervent in preaching, if there is regular observance in regard to food and other things according to the tenor of the Constitutions" (Denifle, *Archiv.*, I, 201, 219).

22 Laurent, no. 61; *sublimes et nobiles domos*, Jordan, no. 38.

23 Laurent, no. 60.

24 Peter Seila's donation (Laurent, no. 61) makes mention of a "house which the same Master Dominic had established." This *domus constituta* was of a date earlier than April 25. Dominic was its head. He received the donation *pro Petro Seilano, et pro se, et pro omnibus mis successoribus et habitatoribus (dicte) domus*. There is also a reference to *eorum ordinio (sic)*, which signifies their regular successors, their legal heirs.

25 Jordan, no. 38. This picture of a progressive development in humility is taken from Benedictine spirituality. It should be noted that Jordan does not say religious observance, but the observances of religious.

26 Canon 10 of the Lateran Council, Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1340; Schroeder, *Councils*, p. 251.

27 Canons 32-42 of the Synod of Montpellier (January 8, 1215). Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1301 f.

28 Cf. Grundmann, p. 136.

29 Cf. Grundmann, pp. 70-135.

30 The last series of letters in favor of Durandus of Huesca was dated in May, 1212; for Bernard Prim, August 1. Luchaire (p. 113) emphasizes this disappearance of the Poor Catholics in view of the rise of the institution of the Preachers: "The statue finished, why keep the model?"

31 Grundmann (pp. 142-48) has carefully studied the attitude of the Pope toward St. Francis at the time of the Lateran Council; he concluded that Innocent had not then changed his attitude toward apostolic movements. To the arguments of Grundmann might be added the words of Jacques de Vitry in 1216 signaling the "holy institution confirmed by the Lord Pope," as noted by the Franciscans in the Chapter of Pentecost. Boehmer, p. 67.

32 "Wherefore in these places various and damnable heresies have sprung up, and the negligence of the prelates ought to be reprov'd and punished; acting as mercenaries rather than as pastors, they have not fortified themselves as a wall for the house of Israel, nor spread the teaching of the Gospel among the people committed to them: with the approval of the Council we have decreed that the bishop should more frequently and more diligently than has been customary, preach the orthodox faith; when it is expedient, he may delegate other upright and discreet persons to preach" (Mansi, XXII, 785). This canon echoes the pronouncements in the letters of Innocent. Potthast, nos. 2103, 2912; *PL*, CCXV, 274, 1024.

33 Tudela, stanza 46.

34 Narbonne, Agde, Béziers, Carcassonne, Elne, Nîmes, Uzès, are listed by Eubel, I, 76, 137, 166, 238, 356, 360, 510; Gains, pp. 478, 517, 528, 583, 589, 600, 646. The circumstances and exact dates are not noted in full; the whole, however, is conclusive. The Pope had been wishing since 1205 for the deposition in Narbonne and Agde; he had finally waited for the death of Berenger, the head of the Province. The bishops of Carcassonne and Uzès resigned their sees in 1211-12. Only the succession in Narbonne and Agde have been recorded as elective.

35 Luchaire, pp. 244 ff.

36Constantine, no. 55.

37 This strategy of Innocent against the heretics of the South, as much by clerical groups as by evangelical volunteers, is evidenced through a brief résumé: 1199, discrimination between Catholic and schismatic apostles; 1199-1201, institution of the Humiliati; 1203-4, legate preachers among Albigenses; 1204-7, *Sancta Praedicationis* in Narbonne; 1208-10, Poor Catholics; 1210, Saint Francis; summer 1212, Poor Catholics were taken "*sub b. Petri protectione*"; 1205 and 1211-13, change of ordinaries.

On a parallel scale ran the administrative and political episodes in the crusade among the Albigenses, which ended in the victory of Muret in 1213.

38 Bull *Equo rufo* of January 17, 1214 (Potthast, no. 4882; *PL*, CCXVI, 955 f.). No other program than that cited is indicated in the letter. It is a program of peace and reform. Thus the work of the Council of Montpellier, presided over by Peter of Benevento (January 81 1215), was also one of clerical reform (canons 1-31), of peace (32-42), and of measures against disorders and heresy (44-46).

In regard to preaching, it was not so much a question of renewing administrative exhortations to the bishops (already done at Avignon) as of putting the hand to the plow and of realizing something.

39 Letter of convocation of the Council of Montpellier. Mansi, XXII, 951.

40 Balme, I 484. The letter is not dated, and the name of the Cardinal is not indicated. But Toulouse was not actually reopened to the Catholic apostolate until after the occupation of the Château of Narbonne by Foulques in January, 1215, in the name of Peter of Benevento. He alone could have been the one mentioned in this document. The *Praedicationis* was already organized; Dominic called himself *Praedicationis humilis minister*. He had come to a definite decision: "From this time on let the Lord Cardinal more expressly command him or us."

41 Laurent, no. 64; Mansi, XXII, 998; Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1340.

42 In 1212, the Council of Paris (and the Council of Rouen, 1214) also provided for this: "We also ordain that on great feasts they themselves (the bishops) will celebrate the divine mysteries and preach the word of God, or they will appoint someone to preach." Mansi, XXII, 840 and 917. It is a far cry from these texts to those of the Lateran Council! Nothing like them had been issued before 1215 (at least as far back as the ninth century). Moreover, such canons were adopted at the behest of Innocent III and were like an anticipation of canon 10 of the year 1215.

43 It was only in 1211, four years after the foundation, that at St. Dominic's petition the sisters received from the Bishop the abandoned church close to which they were established (cf. *supra*, *The Birth of Saint Mary of Prouille*). No service was imposed on them, but they did not receive the tithes and first fruits (long before the installation of the sisters there had been a suspension of revenue). On May 15 Foulques and his chapter granted the church of Bram to the sisters in their name: upon their death the church was to revert to the diocese (Laurent, no. 9). In the course of 1211, upon a new request from Dominic, the Bishop and his chapter granted with the church of Prouille, an adjacent strip of land, as required by the canons; the tithes and first fruits of the church of Prouille were due to the church of Fanjeaux, but the sisters' possessions were exempt. On May 25, 1214, Foulques canceled the tithes which the sisters owed to Fanjeaux (Laurent, nos. 54f.). Later (1214; Laurent, no. 58), at Dominic's suggestion, he granted them the tithes of Fanjeaux, to which Dominic had a right as its curé. Only in 1221 (April 17) did Foulques cede to Dominic, for Prouille, the church of Fanjeaux with its tithes, first fruits, and offerings, in exchange for the tithes of Toulouse, given up by the Preachers (Laurent, no. 134).

These successive donations were neither very generous nor were they spontaneously made. After the crusade, however, the bishopric of Toulouse had recovered most of its property from the heretical nobles.

44 Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1344; Schroeder, *Councils*, p. 255.

45 This canon has been interpreted with much inaccuracy, particularly in reference to the words *regulam et institutionem*. The best way to know what it signified is to consider how the popes used it in numerous instances in the thirteenth century (1219, Ugolino to the sisters of Italy; 1224, Hospital of Ditiaco; 1228, Brothers of St. Blaise of Britton; 1231, Hermits of the Diocese of Siena; 1235, Friars of St. Eulalia (Mercedarians); 1237, Poor Catholics; 1249, Servites (confirmation of a rule granted in 1240); 1253, Bonites (withdrawal of earlier grant); 1257, Servants of the Virgin Mary of Marseilles). An examination of these documents leads us to the following conclusions:

1. In spite of an apparent similarity, the phrase *regula et institutio*, which was used in the canonical texts (privileges of foundation *Religiosam vitam* and in canon 13), is quite different from the phrase *regula et institutiones*, used in certain formulas of profession. The latter applies to two different things, the two types of texts which in the thirteenth century composed religious legislation: the Rule and the Constitutions. The Rule was a text authorized by the Church (in the texts the words *regula*, *observantia*, *ordo*, and *religio* are equivalent; these four terms are frequently substituted for one another in this period); the Constitutions included private supplementary laws. The phrase *regula et institutio* designates the rule and the institution corresponding to it, that is, the fundamental organization of the religious house as it was practically guaranteed by the great Privilege *Religiosam vitam*; novitiate, profession, election, interior order, etc. (the *institutio* is generally established by the Rule; the Benedictine institution or the Augustinian institution; its meaning might be extended to designate a particular religious family: the institution of Prémontré or of St. Victor).
2. Consequently, what canon 13 required was that all future foundations of religious houses (at that time canon law did not yet know the centralized orders as subjects with rights) take a rule approved by the Church, that is, an authorized text; in nearly every case that we have met, it was the Rule of St. Augustine. It was likewise required (even though not expressly stated) to adopt the organization of the religious house in harmony with this rule or form of regular life.
3. Never was a new society required to borrow, in whole or part, the constitutions of a society already in existence. On the contrary, members were expressly ordered at times to draw up their own constitutions. These constitutions were private laws, with which Rome still only rarely interfered in the thirteenth century, and only on the petition of the religious themselves. It might happen that these private laws which supplemented the authorized Rule would be at variance with it on a particular point. Such was the case with the formula *vitae* added by Ugolino to the Rule of St. Benedict, which he granted to some religious in Italy in 1219 (cf. following note).

46 If there is any doubt about the liberty which the choice of the Rule of St. Augustine left for the formulation of Dominican laws, consideration need only be given to the role which Cardinal Ugolino, friend and protector of St. Dominic, gave to the Rule of St. Benedict in 1219, in assigning it as the first part of the formula *vitae* of the Poor Clares: "We give you the Rule of St. Benedict to be observed in all those things in which it is not contrary to the formula of life drawn up by us for you" (Sbaralea I, 264).

Let us add that the Rule of St. Benedict is much more detailed than the legislative remnant called the Rule of St. Augustine.

47 Difficulties for a church with the Archbishop of Narbonne and the monks of St. Hilaire, Laurent, no. 5, 7, 80, 89, 94. Difficulties for the Church of St. Jacques of Paris, Laurent, no. 99, 101, 117, 120.

48 Jordan, nos. 43 f.

49 Nothing indicates that Dominic had at this date conceived of anything more than the foundation of a regular house of the canonical type on Albigensian soil, capable ultimately of expansion, The universal horizon of his Order was only indirectly assured by his relations with Innocent III. Canon 10 of the Lateran Council opened to eventual developments the whole field of Christendom within the framework of the dioceses. It was only in the communications of Dominic and Honorius in the following year that there appeared the trend toward the supradiocesan universalism of the Order of Preachers.

50 *Processus* (Bologna), no. 25.

51 Jordan, no. 45.

[CONTENTS](#)

From: *St. Dominic and His Work*, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

VI

Domini Canes by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.

HISTORIANS of art and numerous critics have studied the architecture of the ancient chapter room in the Dominican convent of [Santa Maria Novella in Florence](#), and they have shown even greater interest in the great paintings there. Considering the architectural monument of Jacopo Talenti, Ruskin marveled "that human daring ever achieved anything so magnificent";⁽¹⁾ and Louis Gillet, describing the frescoes on the walls of the vast nave, called them "the most celebrated in Florence."⁽²⁾ The Spanish Chapel, as the ancient chapter room of Santa Maria Novella is commonly called, is, in fact, a unique work.

The symbolism of the frescoes of Andrea of Florence⁽³⁾ holds a particular fascination for critics. Much has been written on this subject, and the last word has not yet been said for every detail. Meanwhile a rather common error should be rectified in regard to one motif in the great fresco entitled "The Mission of the Preachers in the Church."



At the lower right of this vast painted allegory, St. Dominic appears, holding the rod of the master, ready to disperse throughout the world the black and white dogs who are attacking wolves in the act of ravaging a flock of sheep. Everyone sees the Friars Preachers in the dogs of the color of the Dominican habit, the heretics in the wolves, and the faithful of the Catholic Church in the sheep. The symbolism is so transparent that the discovery deserves no merit. Many critics have found the use of the dog for Dominicans so clearly appropriate that, like Taine, they have not hesitated to trace its origin to a pun, or like Louis Gillet to a play on words.⁽⁴⁾ The idea is, indeed, quite general with contemporary writers who treat of the frescoes in the Spanish Chapel. Yet it has no basis whatever. This study will attempt the proof, in order to explode a tradition without solid origin, and particularly to demonstrate how the dog was used in the later centuries of the Middle Ages to represent the preacher in general and the Friar Preacher in particular.

The writers who recognize a pun or a play on words in the use of the dog to designate the Friar Preacher do not explain clearly what they mean. But evidently they are thinking of a connection between "dog" and "Dominican" (in Latin, *Dominicanus*, *Dominicani*). In relating the words *canis* and *canes* to the preceding names, they get a pun or play on words. Ordinarily they join the word "*Domini*" to "*canis*" and thus make *Domini canis* or *Domini canes*, the dog or dogs of the Lord, or even, the dogs of Dominic, *Dominici canes*, which they consider substitutes or equivalents of *Dominicanus* and *Dominicani*. Reasoning thus, they sense a play on words. Questionable as such a relation would be in itself, a symbolism with no other basis for its justification would be amazingly poor. But it does not figure in the symbolism at all. Men of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries who were the inspiration

of Andrea of Florence had no thought of such a verbal relationship; it is the fabrication of our own contemporaries and endures only through ignorance of philology and history.

Philologically, neither in form nor in meaning can *Domini canis* be related to *Dominicanus*. *Dominicanus* comes from *Dominicus*,⁽⁵⁾ the name of St. Dominic, and its formation is philologically very regular. To the base Dominic has been added the inflexion *-anus*, resulting in the substantive *Dominicanus*, which signifies a religious of the Order of St. Dominic. Only those unfamiliar with Latin would think of splitting *Dominicanus* into *Domini* and *canus*. Clerics of the Middle Ages, even in speaking a vulgarized Latin, were careful to preserve the spirit of the language in forming words. Moreover, *canus* is not *canis*. The first form has no meaning. The relation is as formally excluded by denotation as by philological laws. *Dominicanus* no more means "the dog of Dominic" or "the dog of the Lord" than *Franciscanus*, which is similar in formation, means "the dog of St. Francis." The confusion stirred up by our contemporaries would not have been possible in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, for the reason that *Dominicanus*, the word now current, did not exist or was scarcely heard of at all in those times. It could not, therefore, have given rise to a play on words.

"FRIARS PREACHERS"

The canonical title of the Order founded by St. Dominic was that of Friars Preachers, or Preachers for short. This title, signifying the most eminent office in the ecclesiastical order, was so honorable that the Friars Preachers would have allowed no other to be substituted for it.⁽⁶⁾ It is true that the Preachers of Paris were popularly called the Friars of St. Jacques, and those in Bologna were called Friars of St. Nicholas, from the names of the convents in the two principal centers of the Order in the Middle Ages. But the Preachers themselves repudiated the names, and only the first persisted, particularly in France.

The fifth master general of the Order, Humbert of Romans (d. 1277), who protested against these appellations,⁽⁷⁾ would not have recognized the word "Dominican." It certainly did not yet exist. If it occurs exceptionally later, at the end of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, still it is exceedingly rare and does not represent common usage.⁽⁸⁾ The dog, then, as a symbol of the Friar Preacher, did not originate through the belated term "Dominican." The symbol was created and was employed quite generally long before this name began to be current. Even several centuries before the foundation of the Preachers it was used to designate preachers in general. The dogs, therefore, in the fresco of Santa Maria Novella are there not by reason of a play on words, but by a perfectly symbolic right, since in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the dog was the figure or metaphor regularly used to refer to preachers in general and to the Friars Preachers in particular. That is the fact about to be established. The symbolism of the dog in the fresco of Andrea of Florence is common to many works of art, and we shall have occasion to refer to them. Thus also the sheep and lambs represent the faithful of the Church, and the wolves and foxes represent the heretics.

In general, religious symbolism in the thirteenth century was excessively elaborate. This might have been owing to the growing intensity in religious life and the amount of ecclesiastical literature produced in that period.

The images used to represent the preachers grew in luxuriance. Humbert of Romans, whose work richly reflects the temper of the thirteenth century, made a collection of the figures employed in ecclesiastical books to refer to the preachers of the Gospel. They proceeded ultimately from Scripture through the medium of the gloss ⁽⁹⁾ in which the meanings were related to the preachers, as Humbert states in introducing his enumeration: "In regard to the figures for the preachers, it must be noted that Holy Scripture presents almost innumerable images to signify the preachers, as shown in the glosses."⁽¹⁰⁾ The reader will be spared the list. It is enough to indicate, for example, that preachers

were represented as the mouth of the Lord, angels, stars, clouds, precious stones, fountains, eagles, and so on. We hardly need to say that they were also represented as dogs. Isaias 56:10, "Dumb dogs not able to bark." Gloss: To bark means to preach. The preacher, therefore, is spoken of as a dog, and, like a hungry dog, he ought to run hither and thither to swallow souls into the body of the Church, according to the words of psalm 58:7, "They shall suffer hunger like dogs, and shall go round about the city." In his enumeration, Humbert of Romans makes no comment on the symbols most frequently used, but he leaves no doubt that the symbol of the dog was most popular.

Apparently Gregory the Great (d. 604) was the first who used the symbol of the fox to signify the heretic, and that of the sheep and the dog to signify the faithful and the preacher. It was in his *Exposition on the Canticle of Canticles* that he explained the figures in reference to the text: "Catch us the little foxes, that destroy the vines" (2:15).

"The foxes stand for the heretics, and the vines for the various churches.... The foxes are caught by holy preachers... who at times are referred to as dogs, because their assiduous preaching, like troublesome barking, forces the adversaries, whoever they may be, to abandon the flock of sheep."[\(11\)](#) At the close of the sixth century, the whole pattern of symbolism was already woven, as found seven or eight centuries later in the fresco of the Spanish Chapel: the foxes, the sheep, and the dogs. With Gregory, however, the heretics were compared to foxes and not to wolves.

I pass over the symbolism of the Carolingian age and the feudal period. Information is available in the material collected by Cardinal Pitra and referred to in a preceding note. Thus we come to the twelfth century. In his *Fragmenta*, Geoffrey of Auxerre (d. 1176) recalls the prophecy of a religious to St. Bernard's mother when she carried him in her womb. In saying that her son would be a great preacher, he says that her son will be a splendid dog and a perfect preacher.[\(12\)](#) The use of this term by one of the historians of St. Bernard is proof that the symbol was not infrequently used. With the repression of heresy and the development of preaching, and especially with the founding of the Order of Preachers, the thirteenth century imparted new life to these old symbols. They were already familiar to Innocent III, who, in his letter of March 25, 1199, brought foxes, wolves, sheep, and dogs together in two lines.[\(13\)](#)

The symbolism is complete in the following example. It is a sermon of Foulques, bishop of Toulouse. Here the heretics are wolves, the faithful sheep, and Simon de Montfort, who conducted the crusade against the Albigenses, a good dog.[\(14\)](#) Montfort in the war against heresy defended the Church; thus his friend, Foulques of Toulouse, compared him to a dog since, like the preachers, he had defended the Catholic faith, though by other means.

THE PREACHER'S USE OF THE SYMBOL

The same vein of symbolism runs through the work of Jacques de Vitry (d. 1240). It might be expected, for the Bishop of Ptolemais was pre-eminently a popular preacher, and his language was marked by images. So it was when he related the old fable of the shepherds and the wolves, in which the latter agree to leave the sheep to the shepherds, provided the shepherds gave up their dogs. The moralist reflected: "The infernal wolves know very well that if they could triumph over these dogs, namely, the preachers, they would easily strangle the sheep."[\(15\)](#)

Gregory IX, in his letters dealing with heresy, continually employed these symbols. The heretic, in particular, was frequently represented as a fox.[\(16\)](#) But he was also called a wolf, as in the Constitutions of Frederick II.[\(17\)](#) That was true in a particularly interesting passage in the letter of October 21, 1233, in which the Pope asked the German bishops to excommunicate the assassin of

Conrad of Marburg, prosecutor of the heretics (July 30, 1233). "Who was the dog of the Lord whose tongue frightened the dangerous wolves with most powerful barking?"[\(18\)](#) Note here, not only the use of the word "dog" to refer to the zealous preacher, Conrad of Marburg, but even the expression "dog of the Lord," *dominici canis*. If any allusion were traceable to the word *Dominicanus*, it might be thought to be this. But it would not be authentic. The word "Dominican" certainly did not exist in 1233, and Conrad of Marburg was not a Dominican but a secular priest,[\(19\)](#) a fact that removes any foundation to the possibility of a play on words.

We need not pile up texts to show that the dog was a specific symbol for the preacher in the thirteenth century. But a few more may be added. The Friar Preacher, Moneta of Cremona, in his celebrated *Summa* against the Cathari and the Waldenses written in 1240, addressed the heretics thus: "You are not supporting the persecutions like sheep and lambs, but like wolves, under the guise of shepherds and dogs."[\(20\)](#)

Commenting on psalm 58:7, "They shall return at evening, and shall suffer hunger like dogs, and shall go round about the city," Hugh of St. Cher declares: "This prophecy, it seems, refers to this Order of Preachers." Then he enumerates the reasons why the Preacher is called a dog: "On account of his barking, his keenness of scent, his healing tongue, his continual hunger, his fidelity to his master, his hatred of wolves, his guarding of the flock, his hunting, his reserving for his master what he takes in the hunt, his thirst for blood, because it is the tongue that feels thirst."[\(21\)](#)

During the course of the thirteenth century, the preachers of course knew and employed this symbol. "We are watchdogs of the Lord," they said, "charged with barking in his house."[\(22\)](#) And in the language of the time a preacher thought of himself as, "The good dog, the good preacher, who barks and watches for wolves and robbers."[\(23\)](#)

Instituted in the early thirteenth century[\(24\)](#) under the title of Preachers and for the special office of preaching, the Order of St. Dominic was not slow in making particular use of the already existent symbol of the dog. Many of the texts here cited come from writers in the Order, and there are still others in which the reference is more direct. This fact does not imply that the Order of Preachers ever officially and exclusively adopted this symbolism. It was simply a question of popular usage; but it was precise and constant, and complete enough to throw light on the historical problem under consideration.

The symbol of the dog has been applied particularly to St. Dominic, the Founder of the Preachers, to signify his mission as Preacher par excellence. His first historian and successor, Jordan of Saxony, in the biography written just before the canonization (1233), recorded the vision which the mother of Dominic had before his birth. She saw the child under the form of a dog, holding in his jaws a flaming torch and setting fire to the world. Jordan explains that this signified what an illustrious preacher Dominic would be, for by the barking of sacred wisdom he would awaken souls from the slumber of sin and pour out upon the entire world the fire which our Lord Jesus came on earth to kindle.[\(25\)](#)

The second historian of St. Dominic, Peter Ferrand, who wrote shortly after the canonization, included the same fact in his account and developed the symbolism more explicitly. Among other things, he declared that Dominic would put to flight, and drive off the wolves from the flock by the barking of his incessant preaching.[\(26\)](#)

Later still, Stephen de Salagnac (d. 1290), after reference to the vision, added by way of reflection: "Indeed it is by dogs that we designate the Preachers, of whom Dominic is the father and the leader."

In the fourteenth century, a writer of legends, Peter Calo, O.P. (d. 1348), for his own account, took the note and reflection of Stephen de Salagnac and inserted them in his biography of St. Dominic.[\(27\)](#)

It is the memory of this vision, symbolizing the personal influence of St. Dominic and that of the Order he founded, which accounts for the picture of a dog with a burning torch in the coat of arms of the Order. The use of this image, as far as can be determined, does not occur before the seventeenth century.[\(28\)](#) At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the arms of the Order consisted of a fleur-de-lis cross of silver and sable.[\(29\)](#)

THE PAPAL LETTERS

By the privileges and the approbation which it repeatedly conferred on the Order of Preachers in the thirteenth century in assigning to it the office of preaching and the defense of the faith against heresy, the Church gave the warrant for all the symbolism employed in the frescoes of the Spanish Chapel. The letters of Gregory IX, to cite only those addressed to the Archbishop of Reims, February 1, 1234, and on the fourth of the same month to the Archbishop of Sens and to their suffragans, seem in themselves like the libretto later translated by Andrea of Florence into his frescoes: "The Mission of the Preachers in the Church." There we read of the foxes that plunder the vineyard of the Lord or set fire to his harvest as do other enemies. The Friars Preachers, who have the zeal of God and are powerful in work and word, have received the apostolic mission to catch these foxes and break the jaws of those who tear the Church of Christ. They must carry the sheep on their shoulders to the sheepfold, and by the file of their preaching cleanse the souls encrusted with rust, in order that these, having been purified, may enter the sanctuary of God and their heavenly country. Preachers are so much the more fitted to convince heretics as their life and their teaching are in harmony.[\(30\)](#)

Toward the close of the thirteenth century, a pious Dominican visionary, Robert d'Uzès (d. 1292) called the Friars "the sons of the spotted dog," that is, the sons of St. Dominic.[\(31\)](#)

CONCLUSION

In his letter in favor of the Friars Preachers (1317), William, Cardinal of St. Cecilia, speaks of those who would like to impose silence on these divine dogs who preach the truth, for if they were silenced, it would be possible to penetrate into the sheepfold to devour the sheep of the Lord.[\(32\)](#)

We could cite other such texts and witnesses. Those chosen are enough to demonstrate what we have affirmed. The use of the dog in the frescoes of Santa Maria Novella was not suggested by a play on words, occasioned by the word "Dominican," which did not then exist. The symbol of the dog was already long established as signifying preachers in general and the Friars Preachers in particular. It ranked in a class with the fox or the wolf to designate heretics, and the sheep to represent the faithful of the Church.

Two remarks may be added in consequence of what has just been established.

Following the lead of Vasari, those who write about the animals that attack the sheep in the fresco of Santa Maria Novella generally call them wolves. Indeed that identification seems natural enough. Hettner, however, the first to my knowledge, identified them as foxes.[\(33\)](#) Perhaps the truth is that they are both. In spite of the indecisive anatomy of these animals, it cannot be denied that those who have a plumelike tail are foxes. According to the tradition which, as we have seen, applied the symbol of the fox and the wolf to heretics, the painter, or rather whoever inspired him, sought to conform to the historical and traditional evidence in keeping the two types of animals.

Lastly, the fact which we have established regarding the symbolism of the dog as the specific representation of all preachers and of the Friar Preachers in particular, seems to limit the interpretation of a passage of the *Divine Comedy* on which there has been much writing and discussion.⁽³⁴⁾ It is the question of "Veltro," the greyhound.

In the first canto of the *Inferno*, when Dante comes out of the dark forest, he finds himself successively in the presence of three wild beasts who bar his way: the panther, the lion, and the she-wolf, symbols of pleasure, pride, and ambition. Dante is stopped especially by the wolf, whose hunger is insatiable, in which regard, wrongly it seems to me, most of the commentators have seen avarice, whereas it clearly designates cupidity, that is, an immoderate desire for earthly goods, or ambition limited to the senses thus indicated. Virgil, who comes to the aid of Dante, describes the manners of the she-wolf. He observes that she forms an alliance with a great number of animals, meaning social categories, and that others of the kind will appear. But he adds that it will be thus only until the Greyhound comes who will make her die harshly. He will nourish himself neither upon earth nor pewter, nor upon terrestrial goods nor silver, but upon wisdom, love, and virtue, and his nation will be between Feltro and Feltro.

A library would be needed, said Scartazzini, to house the works written to determine who Veltro is.⁽³⁵⁾ The most unlikely opinions have been expressed. But, as far as I can judge, there is no doubt that "Veltro" designates the person of a pope or an emperor, being symbolic also of the papacy or the empire. Many interpreters have identified the Greyhound who killed the she-wolf as Pope Benedict XI (1303-4) of the Order of Preachers. Benedict's politico-religious attitude and his holiness (he is "Blessed") would make him pleasing to Dante. Naturally enough, he may be the one to whom allusion is made, especially if the words "Feltro and Feltro" are taken to be a geographical reference, as the most obvious meaning seems to require.

We need not list here the reasons favoring the comparison of the Greyhound to Benedict XI. After what we have said about the symbolism of the dog to designate preachers in general and the Friars Preachers in particular, the supposition that Dante turned from the universally accepted significance of the symbol of the dog and applied it to a temporal ruler, would present serious difficulties. It is quite otherwise if we suppose that, by his use of "greyhound," Dante meant to designate a Dominican Pope, such as Benedict XI. In the fresco of Santa Maria Novella at the foot of the papal throne, occupied by Benedict XI, there are sheep and lambs representing the faithful of the Church. They are guarded, even here, by two black and white dogs. Here the drawing is very exact. One is a watch dog, and the other a greyhound.

NOTES

1 *Mornings in Florence*, p. 123.

2 *Histoire artistique des Ordres mendiants* (1912), p. 145.

3 Since the time of Vasari, these frescoes have generally been attributed to Simone Memmi. They are really the work of Andrea Bonaiuto of Florence (d. 1377), the creator of the Story of St. Regnier in the Campo Santo of Pisa (*Il Rosario*, 1916, p. 404).

4 Taine, *Voyage en Italie* (3rd ed.), II, 124, and L. Gillet, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

5 The adjective *dominicus* from the substantive *Dominus* occurs frequently in ecclesiastical literature, for example, *dominicum sacramentum* (the Eucharist), and easily lends itself to relation with the name

Dominic, as in *Dominici canes*, "the dogs of the Lord," or "the dogs of Dominic." There is a curious echo of this in a text of St. Augustine speaking of Christ: The Son of Man, therefore, was first visited "*in ipso homine dominico*," ("in the very man of the Lord") born of the Virgin Mary (*Enarrat. in psal.*, 8, no. 11; *PL*, XXXV1, 114).

6 Prior to the foundation of the Friars Preachers (1206-16), preaching was the office of prelates: of the bishop in his diocese, of the abbot in his abbey, and of the provost in his collegiate church. All those who *ex officio* devoted themselves to the apostolate of the word were considered as forming an *Ordo Praedicatorum*. This title passed by right and by the will of the Church to the Order founded by St. Dominic.

7 "Rightly reprehensible are the brethren who call themselves or allow others to call them Friars of St. Jacques or of St. Nicholas, or by titles of that kind; and more reprehensible are the prelates who do not take counsel against that error" (Humbert, *De vita regulari*, II, 39). "Let our brethren be called Friars Preachers and not by any other names." General chapter, Paris (1256), *Acta capitulorum generalium*, I, 81.

8 The only example I know comes from the Council of Rouen (1292), which recorded: "Since grave difficulties have arisen among us, the Friars Minors and the Dominicans... ." Marbot, *Metropolis Remensis Historia*, II (1679), 580. This lesson appears problematic. The Florentine poet, Antonio Pucei (d. 1373) in one of his sonnets wrote: "Dominican Friars do not eat meat" (Carducci, *Rime di Cino da Fistoia e d'altri del secolo XIV*, p. 464).

9 In the texts cited farther on there will be a certain number of references to Holy Scripture, especially in what concerns the symbolism of the dog; the symbolism of the fox to designate the heretics comes from Judg. 15:4; Cant. 2:15; for the wolves, Matt. 7:15; 10:16; for the sheep, John chap. 10 and 20:17. J. B. Pitra has published two volumes of texts on symbolism in the Middle Ages, *Spicilegium Solesmense* (1855), Vols. II and III.

10 Humbert, *De vita regulari*, II, 409. An index of the symbols used to designate preachers will be found in *PL*, CCXXI, 11-19, with a reference to the authors who employed them.

11 "The heretics are symbolized by the foxes, the churches by the vines. But the foxes tear down the vines; because through heretics the churches are drained of the vigor of the right faith. These little ones are thus well designated because, though they may swell in pride against truth from within, they are dried up without while simulating humility in words. These, then, are brought under the power of holy preachers when their altercation stops and they are convinced by the thoughts of truth. Holy preachers, indeed, are spoken of as dogs, at times in similitude: for by their assiduous speaking, as by importunate barking, they exert themselves in keeping all adversaries away from the flock of sheep. Those dogs catch the foxes for Christ; because, while they follow their leader faithfully, laboring for His love, they lead the groping heretics from the confusion of questions as from dark caverns to the light of truth" (*PL*, LXXIX, 500).

12 "You have a prize dog in your womb, and he who will be born of you will be an excellent preacher, nor will he be like many dogs, unwilling to bark" (Vacandard, *Vie de Saint Bernard* [1895], I, 9).

13 "Lest... we... seem neither to catch the wolves demolishing the vine of the Lord, nor to keep the wolves from the sheep, for this we may merit to be called dumb dogs not able to bark." Incorporated in the Decretals of Gregory IX, these letters must have contributed to the spread of this symbolism.

14 The Bishop of Toulouse preached publicly to the Christians: Beware of false prophets, etc., saying that the heretics were wolves, the Christians sheep. And there rose up right in the midst of the sermon a certain man whose nose and lips had been cut and his eyes dug out by order of the Count de Montfort because he was thus treating the Christians, and he said: "You have heard that the Bishop said that we are wolves, you, sheep. Have you ever seen a sheep which would thus bite a wolf?" The Bishop replied: "As the Cistercian abbey does not hold all in the abbey but has farms with sheep which dogs defend from wolves, so the Church does not have all Christians at Rome; but in many places and here especially she has her sheep, and to guard them from wolves she has sent one good and brave dog, forsooth the Count de Montfort, who has thus bitten this wolf, because it was eating the Christians, the sheep of the Church" (Bourbon, p. 23).

15 "Moreover, we read that the shepherds and the wolves had a great conflict, because the wolves wished to devour the sheep, but the shepherds hindered them. After a long controversy the wolves said: 'Let us make peace on this condition; you may have the sheep only give us the dogs.' For the infernal wolves know that if the dogs, that is, the preachers, can be brought under their sway, they will easily be able to strangle the 'sheep'" (T. F. Crane, *The Exempla of Jacques de Vitry*, 1890, p. 17).

16 Letters of February 3, 1232 (Potthast, no. 8859); May 26, 1232 (*ibid.*, no. 8932); April 20, 1233 ("It is permitted to catch small wolves, namely, heretics", *ibid.*, no. 9153); July 3, 1234 (*ibid.*, no. 9485 *bis*).

17 "These (Patarines) are rapacious wolves within, pretending the meekness of sheep, to the end that they may creep into the sheepfold of the Lord" (*Monumenta Germaniae historica, Leges*, II, 327).

18 Potthast, no. 9316.

19 There was formerly much discussion about whether Conrad was a Dominican. But there is no doubt that he was a secular priest. Kaltner, *Konrad von Marburg und the Inquisition in Deutschland* (1882), pp. 78 f.

20 *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque* (1743), p. 509.

21 *Commentaria* (1732), II, 148.

22 Langlois, "L'éloquence sacrée au moyen Age," *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Jan. 1, 1893), p. 190.

23 Lecoy, P. 38.

24 The first institution of the Order dates from 1206, and the solemn confirmation from 1216.

25 "It was shown to the mother before she had conceived, that she would bear a dog in her womb who carried a flaming brand in his mouth, and coming forth from the womb would set fire to the world. By this it was prefigured that an illustrious Preacher would be conceived by her, who by the sacred bark of learning would rouse minds from the sleep of sin to watch; and he would spread over the universe the fire which the Lord Jesus came to cast upon the earth" (Jordan, no. 5).

26 "His mother, before she had conceived, saw herself in sleep bearing a dog, brandishing a flaming brand in his mouth, which having come from the womb was seen to enkindle the whole world. Therein it was prefigured that the matchless preacher was to be born who would carry the torch of fiery eloquence vehemently to inflame the charity grown cold in the hearts of many, and, by the barks of

preaching, to drive off the wolves from the flocks and also awaken souls sleeping in sin to watch in virtue. And events proved it. For he was a wonderful purger of vices, a foe of heresies, and a most diligent champion of the faithful" (Ferrand, *Legenda Sti Dominici*, no. 3).

27 "For in the dogs are symbolized the Preachers, whose leader and father he himself is" (Mamachi, *App.*, p. 338). On Peter Calo, see *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXIX (1910), 5-116.

28 In the *Processionarium Ord. Praed.* (1494) there is a full page engraving of the arms of the Order. The shield is of sable and silver, with a crucifix extending over the whole surface; but in the middle base point there is a dog carrying a flaming torch. St. Dominic stands below the shield.

29 These arms are included in the inscriptions on the tombs of the two Dominican cardinals, Thomas de Vio Cajetan (d. 1534) and Nicholas of Schönberg (d. 1537) close to the entrance of the Church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva in Rome. They are explained by this devise: *Ordinis Praedic. insigina haec sunt*. They are reproduced in J. J. Berthier, O.P., *L'Église de la Minerve, à Rome* (1910), p. 409, and on the title page.

30 "It being formerly understood that now they rose up in array and laid open snares for the Catholic faith, small animals which secretly demolished the vine of the Lord, and openly burned the Lord's harvest with torches bound to their tails; we have addressed apostolic letters to the Brethren of the Order of Preachers, zealous for God and powerful in word and work, that for the purpose of crushing the head of these reptiles, catching the little wolves, and holding with bit and bridle the jaws of those who lacerate the Church of Christ, they should rise up and bring back on their shoulders the sheep wandering from the fold; by the file of their preaching they should cleanse the persons infected with the rusty scab, so that purified they may be worthy to enter the sanctuary of God and the heavenly country.... Moreover, these brethren are the more apt to confute the heretics for the reason that their life vivifies their teaching, and their teaching informs their life, while that which can be read in their manners is explained in their sermons; we think it useful in the defense of the faith that you should call on them for extirpating the errors of the perverse, as you see it to be expedient" (Potthast, nos. 9386, 9388; Fredericq, *Corpus inquisitionis Neerlandicae*, I, 94 f.).

31 "Tel the sons of the spotted dog" (Echard, I, 449).

32 "O grief! This is evidently the poisonous purpose of the ancient serpent and the work of the future Antichrist, endeavoring to impose silence on the divine dogs preaching the truth, so that when they are silent they may lead others to the ford to devour the Lord's sheep" (*Die Chronica Novella des Hermann Korner*, ed. J. Schwalm, p. 41).

33 Hettrier, *Italienische Studien* (1879), pp. 118 ff.

34 *Inferno*, I, 49 f.

35 Scartazzini, *Enciclopedia dantesca* (1896-99), pp. 2090 f.

From: **St. Dominic and His Work**, by Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.,
Translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis/London, 1948.

Bibliography

Acta capitulorum, generalium ordinis Praedicatorum (Vol. I, 1220-1303, ed. Ben. M. Reichert).
Monumenta O.P., Vol. III, Rome, 1898.

Acta Sanctorum. Venice, 1734 sq.

Alanus de Insulis. *Contra Haereticos libri quatuor*. In *PL*, CCX, 377 sq.

Albert, I. R. *Die Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland bis Luther*, 3 vols. Gütersloh, 1892-1896.

Altaner, Berthold. *Der Heilige Dominikus*. Breslau, 1922.

Amort, Eusebius. *Vetus Disciplina canonicorum regularium et saecularium*. . . . Venice, 1747.

Analecta sacri Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum. Rome, 1893 sq.

Andreas. *Vita altera B. Roberti de Arbrisselles*. In *PL*, CLXII, 1057 sq.

Année Dominicaine, ou vie des saints ... de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs. Lyons, 1883 sq.

Archivum Franciscanum historicum. Quaracchi, 1908 sq.

Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, Rome, 1931 sq.

Balme, Lelaidier, and Collomb. *Cartulaire ou histoire diplomatique de S. Dominique*, 3 vols. Paris, 1893, 1897, 1901.

Baudry. *Vita B. Roberti de Arbrisselles*. In *PL*, CLXII, 1043 sq.

Boehmer, H. (ed.). *Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi*, 2nd ed. Tübingen, 1930.

Bourbon, Étienne de *Anecdotes historiques, legendes et apologues* (ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche). Paris, 1877.

Bourgain, L. *La chaire française au XII^e siècle*. Paris, 1879.

Bullarium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum. In Works of Thomas Ripoll, O.P. (ed. Antonio Brémond, O.P.). Vol. I, Rome, 1729.

Castillo, Hernando del, and Lopez, Juan. *Historia general y vida de Santo Domingo y de su Orden de Predicadores*, 2 vols. Madrid and Valladolid, 1584-1592.

Cernai, *Pierre des Vaux de Historia Albigensis*. Paris, 1926.

Constantine Urbevetani. *Legenda Sancti Dominici* (ed. H. Scheeben). *Monumenta O.P.*, Vol. XVI, Rome, 1935.

- Constitutiones antiquae ordinis fratrum praedicatorum* (ed. H. Denifle). (Archiv, I, 193-227).
- Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*. Vienna.
- Cruel, R. *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter*. Detmold, 1879.
- Denifle and Chatelain. *Chartularium universitatis parisiensis*. Paris, 1889 sq.
- Denifle, H. O.P., and Erhle, F., S.J. (eds.). *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*. Berlin, Freiburg in Breisgau, 1885 sq.
- Devic, Dom Cl. and Vaissète, Dom J. *Histoire générale de Languedoc*. Toulouse, 1869 sq.
- De vita vere apostolica*. In *Patrologia latina*, CLXX, 609 sq.
- Dialogus inter Cluniacensem et Cisterciensem monachum* (ed. Martène).
- Anecd.*, V, 1569 sq.
- Die Constitutionen des Fredigerordens in der Redaction Raimunds von Peñafort* (ed. H. Denifle). *Archiv*, V, 533-564.
- Du Cange. *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*. Paris, 1840 sq.
- Echard and Quétif. *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 2 vols., Paris, 1719-21.
- Empoli, L. *Bullarium ordinis Eremitarum S. Augustini*. Rome, 1628.
- Endres, I. *Honorius augustodunensis, Beitrag zur Geschichte des geistigen Lebens im 12. Jahrhundert*. Kempten-Munich, 1906.
- Eubel, C. *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*. Vol. I, Wnster i. W., 1898.
- Ferrand, Petrus. *Legenda Sancti Dominici* (ed. Laurent). *Monumenta O.P.*, Vol. XVI. Rome, 1935.
- Fliche, Augustin. *La réforme grégorienne*. Louvain, 1924-1925.
- Foncaude, Bernardus, O. Praem. *Adversus Waldensium sectam Liber*. In *PL*, CCIV, 793 sq.
- Frachet, Gerard de, O.P. *Vitae Fratrum ordinis Praedicatorum necnon chronica ordinis ab anno 1203 usque 1254* (ed. Reichert). *Monumenta O.P.*, Vol. 1. Louvain, 1896.
- Galbraith, G. R. *The Constitution of the Dominican Order, 1216 to 1360*. Manchester, 1925.
- Gallia Christiana*, new ed., Paris, 1870.
- Gams, P. B. *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae*. Ratisbon, 1873.

- Gratien, P., O.M.Cap. *Histoire de la fondation et de révolution de l'Ordre des freres Mineurs au XIII^e siècle*. Paris-Gembloux, 1928.
- Greven, Joseph. *Die Anfänge der Beginen*. Mijenster, 1912.
- Grundmarm, Herbert. *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*. Hist. Stud., 267. Berlin, 1935.
- Guignard, P. *Les monuments primitifs de la règle cistercienne*. Dijon, 1878.
- Guiraud, Jean (ed.), *Cartulaire de Notre Dame de Prouille*, 2 vols. Paris, 1907.
- Guiraud, Jean. *Histoire de l'inquisition au Moyen Âge*. Vol. I, Paris, 1935.
- Hauck, A. *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (5th ed.). Leipzig, 1925.
- Hefele, Charles J. *Histoire des Conciles*. French translation, with critical notes, by Dom H. Leclercq. Paris, 1907--38.
- Heijman, Hugo T. *Untersuchungen über die Präemonstratensergewohnheiten*. In *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, IV-VI (1926-1928). Tongerlo, 1928.
- Heimbucher, Max. *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, 3 vols. (2nd ed.). Paderborn, 1907-1908.
- Heintke, Fritz. *Humbert von Romans*. Hist. Stud., 222. Berlin, 1933.
- Helyot, Pierre Hippolyte. *Histoire des ordres religieux et militaires*, 8 vols. Paris, 1792.
- Hermans, Cornelius Rudolfus. *Annales canonicorum regularium S. Augustini Ordinis S. Crucis*, 3 vols. 1858.
- Herding, Ludwig. "Die Profession der Kleriker und die Entstehung der drei Gelübde." *Zeitschrift für kathol. Theol.*, LVI (1932), 148-74.
- Hertling, Ludwig. "Augustinusregel und Augustinerorden." *Ibid.*, LIV (1930), 335-59.
- Humbert of Romans. *Legenda Sancti Dominici* (ed. Walz). *Monumenta O.P.*, Vol. XVI, Rome, 1935.
- Humbert of Romans. *Opera de Vita Regulari*, 2 vols. (ed. J. J. Berthier). Rome, 1888, 1889.
- Jaffé, P. *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2nd ed. (ed. Wattenbach et al.) Leipzig, 1885.
- Jordan of Saxony, *Die Briefe Jordans von Sachsen* (ed. Berthold Altaner) Leipzig, 1925.
- Jordan of Saxony. *Libellus de principiis ordinis Praedicatorum*, (ed. Scheeben). *Monumenta O.P.*, Vol. XVI, Rome, 1935.
- Laurent, Hyacinthus. *Historia diplomatica: S. Dominici*. *Monumenta O.P.*, Vol. XV, Paris, 1933.

Lecoy de la Marche, A. *La chaire française au moyen âge, spécialement au XIII^e siècle*, 2nd ed. Paris, 1886.

Levi, Guido. "Documenti ad illustrazione del Registro del Card. Ugolino d'Ostia" in *Archivio della R. Soc. Rom. di storia patria*, XII (1889), 241-336.

Loperraez, J. *Descripción histórica del obispado de Osma*. Vols. I-III, Madrid, 1787-1788.

Luchaire, Achille. *Innocent III, La croisade des albigeois*. Paris, 1905.

Mamachi, Thomas, et al. *Annalium Ordinis Praedicatorum*. Rome, 1756.

Manitius, Max. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3 vols. Leipzig, 1911, 1923, 1931.

Manrique, Ange. *Cisterciensium ... annalium*, 3 vols. Lyons, 1649.

Mansi, J. D. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*. Venice, 1759 sq.

Martène, E. *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus libri tres*, 4 vols. Venice, 1783.

Martène, Edmond, and Durand, Ursmer. *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, 5 vols. Paris, 1717.

Martène, E. and Durand, U. *Veterum Scriptorum et monumentorum . . . amplissima collectio*, 9 vols. Paris, 1724-1733.

Martigny, J. H. *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes*. Paris, 1877.

Migne, Jacques Paul (ed.). *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina*, 221 vols., Paris, 1844 6 .

Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores.

Monumenta Ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum, historica. Louvain-Rome-Paris, 1896 sq.

Mortier, A. *Histoire des Maîtres généraux de l'Ordre des frères Prêcheurs*, 8 vols. Paris, 1903-1920.

Percin, J. *Monumenta Conventus Tolosani Fratrum Praedicatorum*. Toulouse, 1693.

Pfeiffer, Nikolaus. *Die ungarische Dominikanerordens-Provinz, von ihrer Gründung 1221 bis zur Tartarenverwüstung 1241-1242*. Zürich, 1913.

Pierron, J. B. *Die Katholischen Armen*. Freiburg in Breisgau, 1911.

Potthast, Augustus. *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2 vols. Berlin, 1874-1875.

Processus canonizationis S. Dominici (at Bologna), ed. Walz. *Monumenta O.P.*, Vol. XVI, Rome, 1935.

Processus canonizationis S. Dominici (at Toulouse). *Ibid.*

Puylaurens, Guillaume de. *Historia albigensium* (ed. Beyssier), in *Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres*, Vol. XVII, Paris, 1904.

Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens in Deutschland. Leipzig, 1907-.

Quétif and Echard. *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 2 vols. Paris, 1719, 1721.

Réchac, Jean de. *La vie du glorieux patriarche S. Dominique ... avec la fondation de tous les monastères ... de France et des Pays-Bas*. Paris, 1647.

Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France. Vols. XVIII and XIX, Paris, 1879, 1880.

Salanhac, Étienne de. *Tractatus brevis de quatuor in quibus Deus praedicatorum ordinem insignivit*, in Altaner, *Der heilige Dominikus*, pp. 239-49.

Salimbene degli Adami. *Chronica* (ed. Holder-Egger). *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, Vol. XXXII. Leipzig, 1913.

Soulier, Peregrino, and Morini, Augustino. *Monumenta Ordinis Servorum S. Mariae*. Vols. I and II, Brussels, 1897-1898.

Sassen, J. H. H. *Hugo von S. Cher, seine Tätigkeit als Kardinal 1244-1263*. Fribourg in Switzerland, Bonn, 1908.

Sbaralea, J. H. *Bullarium franciscanum*. Rome, 1759, sq.

Scheeben, H. C. *Der heilige Dominikus*. Freiburg in Breisgau, 1927.

Schreiber, George. *Kurie und Kloster im XII Jahr.*, 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1910.

Schroeder, H. J., O.P. *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*. St. Louis: Herder, 1937.

Schroeder, Paul. "Die Augustinerchorherrenregel," in *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, 1926, pp. 271-306.

Simon, André. *L'Ordre des Pénitentes de Ste-Marie-Madeleine en Allemagne au XIII^e siècle*. Fribourg in Switzerland, 1918.

Thomas of Celano. *S. Francisci Assisiensis Vita et Miracula (Legenda prima et Legenda secunda)*. Ed. Edouardus Alenconensis. Rome, 1906.

Thomas of Eccleston. *De Adventu fratrum Minorum in Angliam*. Ed. J. S. Brewer (*Monumenta Franciscana*, in *Rerum Britannic.*, M. A. Scr.). London, 1858.

Tiraboschi, Hieronymo, S.J. *Vetera Humiliatorum Monumenta*, 3 vols. Milan, 1766-1768.

Tudèle, Guillaume de. *La Chanson de la croisade albigeoise*. Ed. and trans. from Provençal by E. M. Chabot. Vol. I, Paris, 1931.

Van Moe, E. "Recherches sur les Ermites de S. Augustin entre 1250 et 1350." *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, CXVII (1932), 275-316.

Villemagne, A. *Bullaire du Bx Pierre de Castelnau* (ed. Montpellier), 1917.

Vitry, Jacques de. *(Liber) alter (qui) occidentalis Historiae nomine inscribitur* (ed. Fr. Moschi Niugellatis). Douai, 1597.

Von Deutz, Rupert. *Altercatio monachi et clerici quod liceat monacho praedicare*. In *PL*, CLXX, 537 sq.

Von Deutz, Rupert. *Epistola ad Everardum*. *Ibid.*, 541 sq.

Walter, Johannes von. *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*. Leipzig, 1903.

Walter, Johannes von. *Neue Folge: Bernard von Thiron, etc....* Leipzig, 1906.

Wirges, J. *Die Anfänge der Augustiner-Chorherren und die Gründung des Augustiner-Chorherrenstiftes Ravensburg*. Betzdorf, 1928.

Zanoni, Luigi. *Gli Umiliati, nei loro rapporti con l'eresia....* Milan, 1911.

Zimmerman, Benedictus. *Monumenta historica carmelitana*. Lérins, 1907.

[CONTENTS](#)