significant developments in the mechanics of transmitting ideas. These parallel developments appeared again in the age of printing and the century of Reformation and Counter-Reformation. Indeed, just as the history of the Reformation is inseparable from the early history of printing, in a similar way the history of the evangelical awakening of the twelfth century, with its fulfilment during the following century in the friars, cannot be understood apart from the new types of pastoral literature that the friars, among others, developed.[76] The various handbooks designed originally for use by preachers and confessors were the direct forerunners of the spiritual guides that became available to the secular clergy and that came to be so widely used by laymen in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The friars, then, played a central role both in the cultivation of lay piety itself and in the elaboration of the technical means that fostered lay piety.

12

Urban religious life

The social significance of the friars' programme emerges from an analysis of its message, or content, which included discussion of property, interest, credit, insurance, and moneylending. That same social significance is further clarified by an analysis of the medium used to transmit the friars' message. Preaching and the administration of penance were the principal means of expression used; but why, it must now be asked, were these means considered appropriate and therefore selected?

The dominant members of the urban sector of society were merchants, bankers, lawyers, notaries, school masters, and certain of the landlords who organized production on their lands for the market. They did not make their living by praying, or by fighting, or by 'working', not, at least, by working with their hands. They talked; they argued; they negotiated; they wrote; they entertained; above all, they tried to persuade other people. Such were the defining or characteristic activities of those who prospered in the urban environment.

In order to see how a spirituality, both in its message and in the means used to propagate that message, can be related to the activities of the dominant class of a society, one can refer back to the first feudal age, where society was dominated by those who fought and the leading form of spirituality was that of the black monks. Their characteristic medium of expression was praying, the *opus Dei*. Praying had been part of the Benedictine programme from as far back as the sixth century, but it had changed significantly, coming to occupy a much larger proportion of the monks' waking hours, and developing into an intensely aggressive war carried on by the monks against the devil, a war in which the souls of the Christian faithful were at stake. Further examination of this war has shown that the monks themselves came from the class of fighters and also that their outside support came from that same group. The special virtue cultivated by the monks was patience, which was one of the main forms of humility, in turn defined as poverty, meaning poverty in spirit. The monks had to be able to bear affliction but at the same time inflict no

harm upon anyone else. The ideal they sought to impose upon the laity was of the Christian knight who was strong, who protected the poor (including, among others, the monks themselves), but who, at the same time, did not shed blood. This ideal became a concrete programme in the Peace Movement, where armed strength found its justification in the maintenance of a peaceful order, and ultimately in the crusades. Such was the message of monastic spirituality. The medium of this spirituality was a symbolic war, ritual aggression in the form of liturgy, fought figuratively by spiritual soldiers.

The medium was a form of the very activity against which the monastic message was directed. The medium was fighting (a point noted by their enemies), but not reckless, physically violent fighting in which people got injured and killed; instead it was a kind of aggression that was carefully controlled and made predictable by ritual. The monks in this way confronted the great social problem of their day, namely violence. In the first instance they renounced it utterly for themselves as individuals; secondly they engaged in the same activity but transformed it so as to remove from it the harmful, objectionable elements; and thirdly they elaborated an ethic for the dominant members of society that permitted them to continue in their usual activities but in limited, unharmful, spiritually constructive ways. The connection between monastic spirituality and feudal society is explicable; both the monastic ideal, however traditional, and the monastic means of expression (again, no matter how traditional) were shaped by feudal society, and they in turn had a profound impact (for the very reason that they had been so responsive) upon that same society.[1]

The Benedictines meanwhile did not cultivate talk. While they did not live under a strict rule of silence, they discouraged conversation and set prescribed periods for silence, including those reserved for spiritual reading; after all, they had brought about a major alteration of human behaviour in the West with their invention of silent reading.[2] Neither did the Benedictines cultivate contentiousness; indeed the rule specifically admonishes against it.[3] Nor did they cultivate entertainment; a good sense of humour can be found at nearly every turn in their history, but the rule frowns on levity.[4] Nor did the monks specialize in persuasive discourse. They gave witness by their form of life to a truth they considered established. When they got drawn into the apostolate to the Germanic peoples they accomplished the task by their witness and by miraculous demonstration. Persuasive discourse would have been just as inappropriate for them to use as it would have been unsuited to their audience.

Urban audiences, on the other hand, wanted to hear speakers; they relished amusement and spectacle; they sought to be convinced and

they demanded explanations. We must not exaggerate the new urban literacy, but neither can we deny or ignore its existence as a reality and as a factor in the changing abilities and desires of the laity. Urban society fostered a need for a spirituality that would express itself in speech. Yet at the same time the moral problems being raised in connection with the various urban professions focused upon this very means of expression. The masters, merchants, and lawyers all talked. While the masters lectured and disputed, the merchants hawked. Alan of Lille's model sermon directed to lawyers is entitled *Ad oratores, seu advocatos*; here the *oratores* are not the monks, not 'those who pray', but the lawyers who plead in court.[5] Who could be sure that these people who lived by talking were right or were telling the truth? Who can be sure of the truth when scholars are capable of arguing both sides of a question, when lawyers strive for justice in proportion to the amounts of money they are paid, and when prices that are said to be as low as possible one day are cut by one-third the next? Naturally enough people felt anxious about being manipulated by others. We should not be surprised by the exemplum in which a crafty lawyer gets his tongue pulled out,[6] or the one that tells of a merchant who plies prospective customers with drinks.[7] Less vivid (but more real) is the regulation of the town of Saint-Omer forbidding sellers in a certain market to attract the attention of potential buyers by coughing or sneezing.[8]

But while the arts of persuasion lay under a cloud of doubt, the friars entered upon the scene talking: talking, preaching, or, as Thomas of Spalato said about Francis, 'shouting'.[9] Francis engaged in a sort of street-corner or public-square hawking, a legacy from his pre-conversion days. Everywhere the friars went they talked, and where they encountered opposition they argued. They disputed the arguments of those they saw as heretics, especially in southern France and northern Italy, as well as the arguments of those clerics who saw the advent of the friars as an encroachment. The friars came forward with a new approach to confession and penance; they willingly entered into negotiation with the confessee to determine, through a series of questions and responses, the relative seriousness of the fault and hence the appropriate harshness of the penance. Federigo Visconti, the Archbishop of Pisa, described such an encounter as a battle of wits and words:

> O what a great battle takes place between the friar confessor and the penitent sinner. The sinner says, for instance, 'I will do everything that you wish, but I can in no way whatever give up such a one as my lover, or usury, or hatred, or the grudge I have against so-and-so.' Whence it is fitting that, as one knight fights another powerful, rebellious knight, the friar struggle and do battle with the spears of reason and persuasion against the sinner, that he may conquer him spiritually.[10]

The disciplined contentiousness of the schools served the friars in administering penance as well as in preaching.

The friars were not staid in their public appearances. Francis himself willingly lived in the image of a jongleur,[11] and the friars' use of the exempla was an open attempt to give sermons an immediacy, a recognizable quality, and a humour capable of holding an audience. There was nothing necessarily wrong with the work of the jongleur. How, indeed, had Waldes of Lyons been converted? But shouting and entertaining was not all there was to preaching; it was, as we have seen, a carefully developed art designed to gain a certain effect in listeners. The friars thus indulged in those very activities that were most characteristic of the new urban society, especially the urban élite—those very activities which, by the same token, were the nub of the argument of moral corruption in the new urban professions.

The friars further reflected the society they entered by their frequent use of a marketplace vocabulary, a practice that gained authority and impetus from that one-time cloth merchant, Francis of Assisi.[12] Starting around 1240, the biographies of St Dominic included a parody of legal practice and commercial language in the mention of a will he was purported to have made out to his followers: 'Have charity,' he is supposed to have told them, 'keep humility, and possess voluntary poverty.'[13] There is an early Franciscan allegorical work on poverty entitled *The Holy Commerce* (*Sacrum Commercium*), or, as a fourteenth-century writer once called it, *The Business of Poverty* (*Commercium Paupertatis*).[14] The sermons of Anthony of Padua were laced with references to the types and places of work familiar to his hearers: pharmacists, shops in the square, usurers, mercenaries, metalworkers, and merchants.[15] St Bonaventure, too, occasionally used a commercial vocabulary, as when he argued for the usefulness of the friars, characterizing them as trustees for the Christian people, who are like debtors, and whose debt the friars try to pay off, or at least reduce.[16]

In justifying the itinerancy of the preaching friars, Humbert of Romans cited the example of the Apostles but by passing first via a mercantile image. Worldly trade offered the example of those who, because they were eager to amass fortunes, never ceased to travel about in the world seeking profits. 'And the Apostles also did thus, travelling through various provinces making a fortune in souls.'[17] Humbert still again used a variant of this same image where, in a long string of metaphors, he called preaching 'a business that increases a householder's goods'.[18] Humbert proposed for preaching the standards usually applied to coinage:

> In money, one takes into account the metal, the stamp, and the weight.... The doctrine is the metal, the example of the Fathers that the preacher follows is the stamp, and humility is the weight. Whoever turns aside from duty is no longer precious metal, but only a worthless piece of clay; where formerly he had the sound of pure metal, now he produces no sound at all.[19]

Another Dominican writer explained the system of indulgences, which came into more frequent use around 1230, as transactions with the church's Treasury of Merits. For a cash payment the penitent person could get credit against his penitential debt from the store of supplemental merit and good works on deposit there from the lives of Christ, Mary, and the saints.[20] From such examples we can see that the friars employed an idiom that was unmistakably urban, just as their behaviour reflected, in a formal sense, the behaviour of the urban professions.

The friars would not have seen or described what they were doing as buying and selling and pleading and negotiating, but the point did not altogether elude their critics. Matthew Paris reported without comment some of the epithets applied to the friars in the university battle of the 1250s, such as 'hypocrites', 'false preachers', and 'vagabonds'.[21] Matthew was less restrained in observing how, at the time when the Dominicans were building a comfortable home for themselves at Dunstable (1259), everyone was amazed to see these poor brothers, who professed voluntary poverty, spending so much money.[22] Matthew was at his sharpest when he likened the friars' traffic in indulgences to the sale of sheep on the wool market.[23] The cult of St Francis grew in the thirteenth century, and it seemed to stimulate a proportionate growth of opposition. In 1289 a priest at Dieppe drew a sharp rebuke from the pope for something he had said and done during a sermon. The priest had apparently been preaching angrily against St Francis; then from the pulpit he gestured irreverently at a representation of the saint in a window and denounced Francis as an avaricious merchant.[24] And finally there was William of Saint-Amour, the friars' chief antagonist at Paris, who gave special emphasis to their facility of speech and their ability to seduce by means of swindling, double-dealing talk.[25]

Like the Cluniacs who had once been insultingly called soldiers and described in military dress with their swords and lances and helmets, the Franciscans and Dominicans were correspondingly denounced for their avarice, their wealth, their merchandizing, their bargaining—in short, for their similarity to merchants. In a way that recalls the tie between the monks and feudal society, we have seen how the friars confronted the chief problem of the new society, namely money-making. In the first place, they rejected money-making for themselves, turning instead to the recently matured ideal of voluntary poverty. Secondly, however, they persisted in the linguistic and formal mode of the money-makers, while avoiding the spiritually harmful

aspects of such people's work. And thirdly, having themselves demonstrated part of the way, they provided for the leaders of urban society a revised moral theology that approved of money-making in certain, carefully defined circumstances. The friars' spirituality was both determined by, and a determining factor within, the new urban society.

The case of the Benedictine monks and that of the Franciscan and Dominican friars are not merely two random cases chosen from two different historical periods. They are consecutive cases; one leads into the other. The experience of the monks was present as a factor during the formative period of the friars; the development of the friars' spirituality inevitably contained a more or less conscious reaction against that of the monks. Humbert of Romans, always an exceptionally astute and self-conscious observer, pictured the spirituality of preaching not only as a positive good (for numerous reasons, some of which have been cited above) but also as something better than a spirituality of liturgical intercession:

> Others consecrate themselves to the praises of God following assiduously in church the Divine Office, but the laity do not usually comprehend the words that are recited in the Office, whereas they do understand the language and instructions of the preacher. By preaching, too, God is extolled more manifestly and clearly than by these Offices ... [26]

Humbert's central criterion, we should note, is how well the message gets through to the laity. He emphasized that the sacraments are of no benefit to people who are not sufficiently informed and properly disposed to receive them; yet preaching can supply the information needed and can foster the right disposition. Since knowledge and good will can be obtained without the aid of the sacraments through preaching alone, preaching is to be thought preferable to the sacraments.[27]

In a related argument, Humbert goes beyond the usual practice of citing apostolic authority for preaching to specify that that authority stands behind preaching more solidly than it does behind liturgy.

> The second reason that should lead us to prefer preaching is found in certain examples that recommend it. Jesus Christ, in the whole time He spent upon earth, celebrated mass but once, at the Last Supper; moreover, it is not said that He heard one confession. He administered the sacraments rarely and to a small number. He never devoted himself to the recitation of the canonical Office, and one can make the same observation about all the rest, except for preaching and prayer. It is also worthy of note that when He began to preach He spent more time in that than in prayer.[28]

Humbert cites the example of St Paul to the same effect, and then widens the focus.

> Did the other Apostles and disciples of the Lord, throughout the world, devote themselves to any other task more than they did to preaching? 'They went forth', says St Mark, 'and preached everywhere' [Mark 16:20]. And so for our instruction there is the example of Our Lord, of St Paul, and of all the Apostles and disciples of Jesus Christ.[29]

A new, comprehensive approach to the spiritual life was being worked out by Humbert and Bonaventure and other leading friars in the middle of the thirteenth century. Many of the particular points of newness had made an appearance decades before, but when that had happened they had been unacceptable because they were perceived as too radically upsetting and threatening. By 1250, such changes could be looked at calmly, evaluated, accepted, justified, and—on the part of the friars and their most enthusiastic backers among the laity—truly assimilated.

Townspeople responded to the friars with material support. St Francis had warned his followers, in the *Testament*, against having recourse to regular, wealthy patrons.[30] The steady support that such patrons could supply would compromise the friars' vow of poverty and their self-imposed material instability. Still, Bonaventure figured that the margin of urban wealth in general was sufficient to support the friars, and he was apparently right.[31] In other words, the sociological fact was that just by staying in cities the friars were fairly well assured of support. Stephen of Bourbon taught that while all alike shared an obligation to support the poor, this obligation fell particularly upon the rich.[32] Moral considerations aside, Stephen was probably also right; the same point, moreover, confirms the aptness of the warning given by St Francis.

The friars' material support did indeed come from the rich, much of it from the royal and aristocratic rich who had supported the monks all along. The exception among European monarchs in this regard was the Emperor Frederick II.[33] While he chided clerics about their wealth and their involvement in secular affairs, holding up to them an ideal in fact very similar to that of the friars, he looked upon the friars, understandably, as agents of his political enemy, the pope.[34] For James I of Aragon and Catalonia, though, as well as for Ferdinand III of Castile and Leon, the friars served as advisers, confessors, and crusade (*reconquista*) preachers.[35] They also played a role in the occupation of newly conquered Valencia. Two Franciscans, John of Perugia and Peter of Sassoferrato, had gone to preach in Valencia while it was still under Moslem control; they were publicly executed there in 1228.[36] During the siege of Valencia (1236–8), there were friars in the entourage of King James; and before the city fell, he granted them sites for their convents.[37] With the king as a witness, the sister of one of the great barons of Aragon willed 100 shillings to the house of

the Friars Minor that was to be established after the Christian victory.[38] The queen later willed 100 shillings to each of eight Franciscan convents in the kingdom, and King James bore the posthumous reputation of having laid with his own hands the cornerstones of all of the mendicants' convents in his kingdom.[39] Both orders had representatives in the cortes of Aragon as early as 1236, and when the same body assembled in 1262 to consider the king's drive for higher crusade taxes, the meeting was held in the Dominican church of Zaragoza, with both the Franciscans and the Dominicans supporting the king.[40] The relatively thorough records for England show that Henry III made 300 grants to the Franciscans, three-fourths of which were gifts in kind: wood for fuel, timber for construction, clothing, and food. He made similar grants to the Dominicans. Henry supported the provincial chapter meetings for both orders in 1240 and 1241, and was the principal benefactor of the Franciscan convents at Norwich and Shrewsbury.[41]

King Louis IX was founder and chief patron of the Dominican convents at Rouen, Compiègne, Mâcon, and Carcassonne, as well as of the Franciscan convents at Jaffa and at Paris. He visited and made gifts to the friars of both orders wherever he travelled, and brought gifts to the Parisian friars when he returned home. He paid the expenses of those who travelled with him and willed large payments to both orders and to several individual convents.[42] One of his biographers summed up this munificence by observing: 'In brief, Louis bore the largest part of the expenses of the Franciscans and Dominicans in Paris and in other nearby places.'[43]

Louis' wife founded a convent of Poor Clares outside of Paris, and retired there following his death.[44] The king's brother, Alphonse of Poitiers, with his exceptionally well-organized fiscal administration, left records that show him a steady and generous supporter of the friars, even in years when his resources were strained and he cut his other charitable donations.[45] When the Franciscans came to Mâcon in 1245, they were set up in the palatial town house of the De Feurs family, wealthy bourgeois of Lyons who had become landlords close by Mâcon.[46] The Franciscans were showered with benefactions by various relatives of the Count of Savoy and of the Count of Forez, as well as by many lesser nobles. The Dominicans arrived on the scene in about 1255 and were installed by Louis IX in what had once been the château of the Count of Mâcon, the king having purchased the county in 1239. Their benefactors included a chamberlain of Lyons and a bishop in addition to many of the nobles of the Mâconnais. Virtually every English bishop patronized the friars.[47] In the same way, hardly a will among those that survive from thirteenth-century Valencia does not include a legacy for the friars; moreover, such legacies usually included equal amounts for the Franciscans and

Dominicans. Wealthy cathedral canons and the greater knights of King James' victorious crusading army (one bequeathed his body plus 1,000 shillings) alike remembered the friars in their wills. Bishop Raymond of Valencia left the Dominicans of his diocese the princely sum of 6,000 shillings and endowed the support of one Dominican student at Paris.[48]

The largely new element in benefactions to the friars came from newly rich city dwellers. A case study of the financial support given the friars in Mâcon reveals an overall trend in which the local nobles dominated in benefactions to the friars at first but were gradually supplanted during the later thirteenth century by the bourgeoisie.[49] A register of estimates drawn up to include all properties in the city in 1386 lists the financial obligations attached to every property and building, with beneficiaries and precise amounts included. Nearly every building carried a commitment to yield annually a certain amount of money or percentage of its income to some charitable enterprise; in two-thirds of the cases these were ecclesiastical institutions. Of the some 920 properties in town (held by 720 separate owners), 59 carried obligations to supply an annuity to either the Franciscans or the Dominicans. The arrangement in each case was some form of the *census*, a form of financial transaction that had been denounced and argued against, for example by Henry of Ghent, as usurious, but which, significantly, had found legitimacy in the work of canonists like Hostiensis and theologians like Alexander Lombard in the late thirteenth century. The friars thus did more than give gratuitous support to a social group in search of moral justification; they benefited directly from the very type of transaction that they had been helping to legitimize.

In London the burgesses provided land for the Franciscans and paid for the construction of their convent as well;[50] in Germany there are cases where the friars were brought in at the invitation of town governments and subsequently given help by them.[51] In Valencia, we read that Peter Oller, a draper, gave the Franciscans 100 shillings and the Dominicans 50 shillings in 1249, while William of Jaca, a notary, left the Franciscans 100 shillings and the Dominicans 150 shillings in his will of 1263.[52] Analogous donations could be found in towns throughout Europe. Beyond the reach of detailed, written records are the small, miscellaneous, often-repeated donations given the friars as they went about to beg. No evidence, and no logic either, would suggest that the urban poor, themselves so badly off that they sometimes had to beg, gave alms to the friars.[53] St Francis' warning against sustained reliance on wealthy patrons offers a clearer insight into the source of the friars' support; so, too, does the complaint of the Augustinian canons at Cambridge: 'The friars with honeyed words have procured for themselves the burials, legacies, and alms of

rich citizens, which before their arrival had benefited our community.'[54]

Perhaps the most conspicuous use to which the friars put their income was construction. Like the monks of the past and the bishops of their own time, the friars became great builders.[55] They do not hold one of the key places in the history of style, but in order to meet the needs of effective preaching, they specialized in developing large, uncluttered halls with good acoustics.[56] Their competitors and critics found an easy target in the monumental materiality of church buildings erected by the proponents of poverty. St Bonaventure showed his sensitivity to criticisms by explaining why the friars had large convents and sumptuous churches.[57] There were two main factors: the high price of urban land and the danger of fire. On account of high land prices, it was necessary to use ground space as efficiently as possible, and hence to build high. On that account in turn, and also because of the danger of fire, it was necessary to build in stone. Obviously one could not erect a tall, sound, relatively fire-proof building in a city at low cost. So long as the question did not centre on why friars should have any buildings at all, this was a straightforward answer. It was an earthy, materially sound, coolly analytical answer; it reveals with startling clarity how the world had changed in a century, since Abbot Suger had formulated a mystical theology of light, flighty and ethereal, to justify his building a soaring new church, with vast expanses of glass wall, at the Abbey of Saint-Denis.[58]

The patronage of religious establishments by princes and nobles was not new in the thirteenth century. The friars seem merely to have stepped in as new beneficiaries to an ancient, solidly established tradition. The old-fashioned ways lived on in some benefactions to the friars, complete even to the details of the anniversary banquets, including maundys for the poor, provided by some Aragonese nobles.[59] But, as we have seen, the new element in patronage, not without its twelfth-century antecedents to be sure, lay in the participation of the prospering and influential people of urban society.

These people displayed an eager desire to participate in the religious life. They were able to do so by going to the friars' churches to listen to sermons, to make their confessions, and perhaps ultimately to be buried. Giving alms was also an important means of participating in the friars' spirituality. But for a still closer tie with the friars, short of the total commitment involved in giving up everything and joining one of their orders, the appropriate way was to join one of their lay confraternities.[60]

St Francis, from the early days of his ministry, moved some of his listeners to reform their lives, and he sought to prescribe for people so

moved ways of life appropriate to their respective social conditions.[61] His letter to all the faithful, written in about 1214, shows how he expanded the conception of the religious life to include lay people, even those who were married and who continued to work at their worldly jobs.[62] In 1221 Francis, perhaps with the aid or even at the instigation of Cardinal Hugolino, drew up a rule for groups of lay people. This rule is not extant, but a revised version of it is found in the one promulgated by Nicholas IV in 1289.[63] The principal theme preached by Francis was penance, and those lay people who entered into some sort of formal association with the Franciscans were known as brothers or sisters of penance. There is a papal letter of commendation and privilege from as early as 1221 that refers to such groups at Faenza 'and certain other nearby cities and places'.[64] In 1224 Honorius III granted that exceptions be made in case of an interdict for those many people throughout Italy known as 'Brothers of Penance' (*Fratres de Poenitentia*).[65] The need for papal protection for these groups arose particularly because the men who joined them were not to bear arms or swear oaths, a point that brought them into conflict with municipal authorities. Membership lists were thus drawn up. The list for Bologna in 1252 bears the names of 57 adherents, sometimes with their professions, for example notary, scribe, baker, barber, wood-supplier, and stationer.[66] In the city of Valencia the guilds of shoemakers, tailors, leatherworkers, and potmakers placed themselves under the spiritual guidance of the Franciscan Order.[67]

The Franciscan 'Congregation of Penance' at Brescia, dating from the late thirteenth century, gives some indication of the religious practices of such groups. They were to attend mass together on one Sunday of each month at the Franciscans' church; they were to go to confess their sins at least two times a year (twice the minimum number required of all lay people by Lateran IV); they were to observe the same fasts as the friars themselves observed; and they were to carry out cooperative works of charity.[68]

Since Thomas of Celano referred already in 1229 to what appear to be the three orders founded by St Francis, the notion of a 'third order' seems to date from the early days of Franciscan history.[69] The Third Order of Brothers and Sisters of Penance of St Dominic, based somewhat on the model of the Franciscan Third Order, received papal approbation only in 1406, but it had forerunners during the preceding century and three-quarters.[70] Peter of Verona, the first Dominican martyr, organized a Confraternity of the Faith (or the Faithful) at Milan in 1232.[71] Whereas one of the main interests of St Francis lay in establishing peace among warring civic factions, an interest reflected in the Franciscan confraternities, that of Peter Martyr lay especially in the eradication of heresy. The group he formed was made up of militant Catholics committed to support his

work as inquisitor. Still, these are differences only of emphasis; members of the Confraternity of the Faith attended mass together at the church of the Dominicans on the third Sunday of each month, joined in many of the Dominicans' religious observances, and joined together in works of charity.[72] Other confraternities associated with the Order of Preachers were named in honour of the Holy Virgin; others went by the name Militia of Christ (for which there is a rule dating from 1285); and still others, following that bloody scene on the road between Como and Milan in 1253, under the name of St Peter Martyr.[73]

Of particular interest is the Congregation of St Dominic organized at Bologna within the decade following Dominic's canonization. Its statutes are known from a letter of approval directed to the congregation in June 1244 by John of Wildeshausen, at that time the Dominican master-general.[74] Membership in this group, according to these statutes, was open to anyone except a person known or suspected to be in error concerning the faith (*nisi fuerit infamatus aut suspectus de errore fidei*). The members were to attend mass on the final Sunday of each month at the Preachers' church; each person was to donate one *denarius* at that monthly mass (or send it by another person if unable to attend). Similarly they were to attend mass on the Feast of St Dominic and to offer, according to their respective means, a candle in his honour. The leadership was to be put in the hands not of one person but of four, one from each of the city's quarters, precisely as was then being done in some communal governments. Each member was to say the Lord's Prayer seven times a day, and also when one of his confrères or one of the friars in the convent at Bologna died. All were to attend the funeral of a confrère; the congregation was to keep two great candles for use at such funerals and it was to pay the expenses of the funeral and burial of its poorer members. The statutes close with an explicit and concise statement of the friars' new conception of obedience: the confrères were not to be bound in conscience by these rules nor punished for transgressing any of them, a position based on the notion that God prefers a service freely rendered to a servile carrying-out of orders. All of these points appear again in the rule written by a Dominican, Pinamonte Brembate, for the Misericordia of Bergamo, a lay confraternity established jointly by Dominicans and Franciscans in 1265.[75] The first headquarters of the Misericordia was in a vast twelfth-century basilica built and maintained by the communal government and which literally overshadowed the cathedral church of the time. In Valencia, the hide dealers and belt makers became associated with the Order of Preachers by (or before) 1252; a brotherhood in honour of St Peter Martyr was formed by 1269; and by the end of the century there was a social and benevolent confraternity in honour of God, the Virgin,

Peter Martyr, and the Order of Preachers.[76] In the Rhineland there appeared another Order of Penitents, this one established for reformed prostitutes (and hence also known as the Order of Magdalenes); it came to have branches in France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal, and in 1286 it came under the direction of the Dominicans.[77]

The lay fraternities with ties to the mendicant orders do not form, at least for the thirteenth century, a clear historical picture. Nothing would be more misleading than to project on to that period the highly organized, uniformly structured third orders of later times. There had been lay fraternities before the friars, for example, those established by the Benedictines in the eleventh century or by the Premonstratensians in the twelfth.[78] The guilds had long had a religious aspect (group worship, mutual aid, collective charity) which appears to have anticipated the programme of the friars' lay counterparts. The initiative for forming a lay confraternity did not have to come from a convent of friars, for there are cases in which an existing lay confraternity of penance in a given city welcomed and assisted in the establishment there of a convent of friars.[79] Such laymen were thus able, like so many initial investing partners, to become the first and thus crucial patrons of the friars. At Florence, moreover, the Fraternity of Penance owned and administered all goods donated to the Dominicans throughout the thirteenth century, serving a worldly, financial role similar to that of the 'spiritual friends' of the Franciscans.[80]

The most exact and in every way most revealing predecessor of the friars' lay fraternities was the 'third order' of the Humiliati. Here perhaps is the origin of the very terminology of first, second, and third orders, even though the friars used the terms differently from the Humiliati.[81] It may be, then, that the most significant thread of historical continuity to be traced here leads from the Humiliati to the confraternities of penance of the thirteenth century. Another possible source is suggested by developments going on at just this time in the Sūfi orders of Islam. These were brotherhoods of mendicants led by holy men of strong personality and great spiritual authority. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries they spread over the entire Islamic world. Membership was of two kinds: a higher class of initiates and disciples occupied with religious duties in the monasteries, and a large body of lay members attached to the orders and meeting on stated occasions but otherwise carrying on their secular occupations in village or town.[82]

In the period following the establishment of the mendicant orders, from the later thirteenth century until the Reformation, the significant area of development in the religious life was found not in the formally patented religious orders but in the various group manifestations of lay piety. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries

constituted, as Marc Bloch said, 'the golden age of the small lay associations of piety'.[83] The prediction of Joachim of Flora that a new, spiritual age was about to appear, with the friars as its harbingers, an age in which the priesthood would be superfluous, was far from senseless, even if it proved incorrect. St Francis himself, in his enthusiasm for the laity and his ambivalence about a formal religious order, seemed to show an awareness that the main development of the future rested with the laity and that the friars were to be the agents of this development. In this connection, there is weighty meaning as well as gentle humour in the comment of Berthold of Regensburg on the order of married people:

> God has sanctified marriage more than any other order in the world, more than the bare-footed friars, the preaching friars, or the grey monks, who upon one point cannot match holy matrimony; namely, society could not do without the latter. God therefore commanded it, whereas the others he merely counselled.[84]

The intensified religious engagement of lay people is clear in the case of Florence, precocious both in its commercial-industrial development and in its socio-political development.[85] The population in 1278 had reached 73,000 after a three-fold increase in just a century. The people in control of this populace, moreover, were mostly 'men of recent origins'. The power of the old feudal nobility had been drastically reduced, to be taken up by a new; urban nobility, whose fortunes were founded in business. 'If there is any single generalization concerning upper-class bourgeois behaviour in the thirteenth century,' writes Marvin Becker, 'it would treat the alacrity with which the *popolani grassi* sought to participate in religious life.'[86] They controlled one-third of the city's churches; they had long since helped reforming clerics chase out simoniacs; and they were among the first to welcome the friars. The Franciscans were given the hospital of S. Gallo in 1218; the Poor Clares were accommodated in 1221, the same year in which the Dominicans received the church of S. Maria Novella from the cathedral chapter. In 1228 the Franciscans moved to S. Croce, where a modern visitor becomes aware of the 'high rate of religious investment that Florentine burghers made when given an unrivalled opportunity to enter the sacred portals and bury their dead'.[87]

The old religion of the monks, with its daily rounds of prayers and psalm recitations, was partially absorbed into lay spirituality, as the familiar books of hours (for princely patrons) testify. But there were new elements in the ritual observances of the laity; reference has been made already to their multiple recitations of the Lord's Prayer. To

these they joined multiple recitations of the angelic praises of the Virgin, the 'Hail Mary'. A formal pattern combining the *Pater Noster* and the *Ave Maria* was worked out in the thirteenth century to form the Rosary. While the belief that the Rosary was started by St Dominic upon a direct commission from the Virgin is now regarded as a fifteenth-century invention, the Dominicans were mainly responsible for the refinements in length and arrangement of the Rosary as well as for its propagation as a form of worship.[88] Multiple recitations required some sort of counting device, and in the thirteenth century the string of beads, a standard Indic device for keeping track of the number of times a prayer was said, made its appearance in the Latin West. Another Indic spiritual practice, that of holding the hands together in front of oneself when praying, appeared in the West at about this time, eventually replacing the posture in which a person prayed with outstretched arms. Both the counting device and the new gesture for praying might have come, along with the idea of multiple recitations of the Lord's Prayer, via the Cathars.[89]

The new spirituality also inherited and exploited the religious procession, which the friars staged in the squares that were being opened up in front of their convents in the latter half of the thirteenth century. These convents, usually placed strategically by the main city gates, together with their adjoining squares became new poles of attraction for urban activity in addition to, and in certain cases in careful coordination with, the cathedral square and the seat of municipal government. The integration of open urban spaces with the mendicants' churches served particularly well the ostentatious corporate worship of the confraternities, better able to display their numbers and their colours by the light of day. Thus outdoors as well as in, the friars created a dramatic setting for their apostolate.[90]

Usury went right on being one of the leading concerns of this apostolate; attacks against it remained a principal theme of Franciscan and Dominican preaching.[91] The condemning tone of the Third Lateran Council (1179) did not fade in the thirteenth century; it reappeared with greater intensity at the Second Council of Lyons (1274). The former council decreed (canon 25) 'that notorious usurers are not to be admitted to the communion of the altar, nor, if they die in that sin, to receive Christian burial'.[92] The latter council in turn decreed (canon 26) 'that the canon of the Lateran Council against usurers be inviolably observed under threat of divine malediction'. Stern punishments were promised to any who cooperated with non-local usurers, for example by renting offices or houses to them. Whole territories in which foreign usurers were tolerated ran the risk of an ecclesiastical interdict. The succeeding canon of the Second Council of Lyons affirmed:

> Even though notorious usurers have made definite or general provision in their wills regarding restitution in the matter of illegally charged interest, church burial shall nevertheless be denied them until full satisfaction has been made to those to whom it is due, if they are available; in case of absence, to those who are authorized to act for them [often local clerics].[93]

The usurer could thus be put under some spiritual sanction and obliged to make payment of restitution, either directly to those from whom he had taken usury, or, in their absence, to some church official. In addition he faced the possibility that secular authorities might bring him to court for his activities.[94]

The combination of the moralists' constant harping on the theme of usury with the sanctions that secular and ecclesiastical governments could impose suggests an unhealthy climate for business. Yet the economic history of the thirteenth century suggests otherwise; in fact the taking of interest for *damnum emergens* was being explicitly written into ledgers and notarial acts from the middle of the century on.[95] What was once deviant behaviour, which by definition is marginal, was here becoming standard practice and thus simultaneously, from an official point of view, increasingly difficult to define as deviant, particularly as more and more of those in positions of authority had mercantile backgrounds.[96] This is self-evident in the case of the urban patriciate, but it was also true of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.[97] Even the strong language of the conciliar decrees specified only the 'manifest' or 'notorious' usurers (*usurarii manifesti*). In 1208 Pope Innocent III wrote to the Bishop of Arras urging him to be moderate in applying the decrees of the Third Lateran Council.[98] And Thomas Aquinas, too, spoke warmly of moderation in the same area:

> Human laws leave certain sins unpunished because of the imperfection of men; many useful things would disappear, in fact, if all improper operations were rigorously forbidden. This is why civil legislation has at times tolerated usury, not because usury is thought to be just but so as not to hinder the advantages that so many derive from it.[99]

Civil authorities in the thirteenth century were indeed licensing moneylenders, just as Thomas had said.[100] Some ecclesiastical authorities, too, readily accepted offerings from moneylenders and made no further mention of usury. In one case the Bishop of Metz was accused by priests of his own diocese of retaining restitution payments for his own use.[101] More than once were Franciscans accused of absolving wealthy usurers without requiring them to make restitution to the victims of their malpractice; they were also accused, like the Bishop of Metz, of benefiting improperly from usurers' payments made in lieu of proper restitution.[102] Such complaints indicate a significant shift in the behaviour of the wealthy from restitution to philanthropy. Analysis of the wills of wealthy Italian merchants and bankers shows a sharp decline in restitution in the early fourteenth century.[103] Businessmen wanted their work to be seen in the most favourable light possible and so preferred to be honoured for spontaneous generosity than to be forced to make amends for immoral behaviour. Consistent with general scholastic theory on the efficacy of good works, philanthropy thus held one of the keys to the justification of profit-making. The small-scale, local pawnbroker continued to be harassed by officials, but the merchant-bankers were well on their way to assuming their role as patrons of charity. The proliferation of various types of hospital is one of the leading manifestations of the new style of philanthropy.[104]

Beyond a favourable moral ethic, new forms of worship, and the encouragement of charitable donations, the friars supplied city people with what may justly be called an urban ideology. They enhanced the setting of the new philanthropy and spirituality with honourable associations, biblical and historical.[105] Around the year 1260, Albert the Great preached a cycle of seven sermons at Augsburg during a week-long festival in honour of St Augustine.[106] He opened and closed the cycle in the Dominican church, preaching elsewhere during the interval, for example to the Dominican sisters and to the cathedral canons. To the canons he spoke in Latin, to his other audiences in German. The text for the entire cycle came from Matthew 5:14, 'A city upon a hill cannot be hidden.' He set out to ask why the Fathers of the church can be compared with a city, especially a city upon a hill, and why it cannot remain hidden. Albert observed that the sacred doctors share the qualities of a city that, following Plato's definition, is well ordered: security, urbanity, unity, and liberty. He discussed in turn the roles played in maintaining the social order by the monarch, by the aristocracy, and by the wealthy. The aristocrats were in a sense extensions of the monarch; they gave him advice and they rendered justice in his courts. 'These will have to be men of such virtue that in no way whatever could they be corrupted by money or made to abandon justice for fear, hatred, or favour.'[107] But no matter how powerful a king or how virtuous and wise an aristocracy a city had, it would be nothing without riches. Thus a stable city must have rich people; it should have a government (*thimocratia*) in which magistrates are chosen on the basis of the property they own. In a time of emergency, these rich people would be the ones who would keep the city going, supplying arms if necessary but especially food to the shoemakers and the menders and the day labourers, who otherwise could not survive.[108] 'We see this in many cities, that some who are very powerful and rich are able to maintain a thousand men in time of war.' This was true, he said by way of example, in Rome and Milan and in other cities.[109]

Albert reminded his audience that not every way of acquiring riches was acceptable, condemning those who lie, commit fraud, use false weights and measures, and cheat 'in a thousand other ways'.[110] This message would seem to have fallen harder on the petty, local merchant than on the big-time, cosmopolitan merchant. But the city itself with its wealth and its wealthy was glorified by Albert for its light, its beauty, its erudite culture, and its dense population.[111] Above all in these remarks it is the friendly and favourable tone employed by Albert that reveals the significant change taking place, a change of sensitivity and of attitude, essential elements both in a change of spirituality.

In 1288 a Milanese Franciscan named Bonvicinus of Ripa wrote a pamphlet *On the Marvels of the City of Milan*.[112] It includes descriptions of the streets, buildings, houses, churches, shops, and convents of Milan as well as the various trades (300 bakers, 440 butchers, 150 hostelries that gave 'hospitality to strangers for profit') and professions (1,500 notaries) of the Milanese. Literary conventions notwithstanding, Bonvicinus clearly loved the city: 'How could the people not thrive where it is so glorious to live?' His tone throughout is positive, even exuberant. And no one understood better than this Franciscan the enduring rule of big-city life: 'After what has been said, it is evident that in our city, life is wonderful for those who have enough money.'[113]

The crown of any spirituality is made up of its saints. Saints Francis, Dominic, Peter Martyr, Raymond of Peñafort, Anthony of Padua, Bonaventure, Albert the Great, and Thomas Aquinas give sparkling testimony to the successful establishment of the mendicant orders, their steadfast opposition of heresy, and their spectacular achievements in law, preaching, and theology. The great Dominican collector of saints' lives, James of Voragine, was himself venerated as a saint in Genoa and its environs, both for his patronage of the poor and for his role as a peace-maker.[114] All of these friar-saints though, have something traditional about them, namely that they took up religion full-time as a profession. While their particular style of religious life was new, the religious life as such was not new; and thus the test of newness comes with those saints who emerged from the new professions.

Reference in this context is sometimes made to Godric of Finchale, a man from Lincolnshire whose life spanned the first three-quarters of the twelfth century.[115] Drawn away from his peasant background by the attractions of a pedlar's life, already as a young man he was well versed in making profit from buying and selling. After four years of making the rounds of markets and villages in Lincolnshire, he expanded his operations northward into Scotland and southward to the Continent, eventually reaching as far as Rome. He rose to become

a major figure in the commerce among the countries bordering the North Sea. His travels often took him to Lindisfarne and there, under the impact of that holy place and the still vivid presence of St Cuthbert, he began to yearn for solitude and to feel discontent with his highly successful career as merchant. He sought spiritual solace in making pilgrimages and being so well-to-do was able to visit the greatest sites of all, Rome, Jerusalem, and Saint-James of Compostella. When at last he resolved his spiritual crisis, he sold all his possessions and distributed the resulting income among poor people. He then became a hermit in the forest near Durham, where one Reginald served as his confessor and also wrote for posterity his biography. The problem with this life is that Godric does not at all appear to qualify as a merchant saint; on the contrary his sanctity derives, just as that of St Francis, from his having ceased to be a merchant.

The case of Omobono of Cremona was different.[116] Omobono was a second-generation merchant active during the latter half of the twelfth century. He married but never had any children of his own. He was intensely devout, attending mass daily and reciting the divine office in the manner of a monk. Furthermore, his home served as a centre for dispensing charitable aid. He took care of abandoned children, fed poor people, and otherwise offered help to those who did not know where else to turn. But despite this piety and charity, Omobono never ceased to be a merchant. He worked, he made a profit, and he used this profit to support himself, his wife, and his life of religious devotion and service. Omobono maintained a strong and highly favourable reputation, so that shortly after he died, his story was brought to the new pope, Innocent III, by the Bishop of Cremona, along with a request for canonization. Pope Innocent replied early in 1199 with a formal declaration of Omobono's sainthood. The new saint in turn became the patron of Cremona, and in the early fourteenth century a full-sized statue of him was placed next to a statue of the Virgin and Child above the main entrance to the cathedral church.

Omobono qualified as a merchant saint. Cremona yielded an artisan saint as well. Facio of Cremona was born in about 1200 at Verona.[117] He became a leading gold- and silversmith in his native city, but was driven out by political troubles in the late 1220s. He settled at Cremona and continued his work there, at the same time maintaining a rigorously pious life. The claim of his biographer is that Facio made eighteen pilgrimages to Rome and eighteen to Compostella. He gained admittance to the Society of the Holy Spirit, a confraternity whose members included all the nobles and merchants of Cremona (*in quo consortio erant omnes nobiles Cremonenses et mercatores*).[118] He subsequently took leave of this group, very likely because of its aristocratic character and pro-imperial leanings; shortly afterwards

he was to organize, with papal approval and support, his own Order of the Holy Spirit, a lay fraternity that became successfully established in Cremona and in several other cities of Lombardy. At his own home Facio made a hostel for poor pilgrims. He carried on with his work, using proceeds from it to help poor people. He also made pious donations of his handiwork, such as the silver cross in the cathedral treasury, at the base of which stands a representation of St Omobono. His charity included a special concern for poor people who were ashamed to beg, a category difficult to identify, referring perhaps to people once well off who had lost their fortunes and social positions.[119]

In Brittany there appeared a lawyer saint, Ivo Hélory (1253–1303), who studied theology at Paris—apparently under some disciples of Bonaventure—and law at Orléans.[120] He became a priest, and therefore did not earn his living by practising law as such, but specialized in organizing legal aid for those poor who could not pay lawyers' fees. He preached, he enlisted lawyers in his scheme, and he set up lay confraternities. While St Ivo was far more priest than lawyer, his later designation as patron of lawyers suggests that his reputation stressed the novel aspect of his career.

The friars did not ordinarily press for the canonization of those who did not belong to their respective orders. One exception was King Louis IX, whom they tried to associate as closely as possible with themselves.[121] Their main effort, however, went into the canonizing of their own confrères, and especially into the continual re-defining and re-writing of the saintly spiritualities of Francis and Dominic.

The appearance of urban saints in addition to the beginnings of an urban ideology marked the coming of age of Europe's commercial economy. The leading practitioners of voluntary poverty, themselves city-dwellers, formulated an ethic that justified the principal activities of the dominant groups in urban society. The need for scapegoats subsided, and accordingly the English and French kings replaced 'their Jews' with Christian bankers. Edward I expelled the Jews from England in 1290 and Philip IV did the same in France sixteen years later. Even with this maturation of Christian Europe's profit-oriented commercial economy, gift-economy behaviour, as we observed at the outset, did not altogether vanish. On the contrary, the very ones who had been most concerned about profit-making and most successful at it poured huge sums of money into religious movements and institutions; their reversion to the gift-giving mode became notably intense as they awaited the approach of death.[122]

That the *pauperes Christi* should have served the profit economy in such direct and elemental ways remains a paradox, and a paradox that has not been perceived exclusively by modern eyes. We would not have thought to call Francis of Assisi, as urban a saint as any, a merchant saint. And yet, during the 1260s, the Archbishop of Pisa

presented a quite different view when preaching at the Franciscans' church in his city on the feast of St Francis.[123] Preaching in the vernacular because his audience included lay devotees of the saint,[124] Federigo Visconti told them how, through God's grace, he had stood some four decades earlier in a crowded square in Bologna and seen and even touched the blessed Francis himself.[125] Federigo generally made a point of denouncing usurers and those who traffic in arms with the Moslems, for they drag down the reputation of the Pisan merchants, known throughout the world as good Christian men.[126] Consistently he praised these merchants, just as he usually reminded the congregation that Francis had been a wealthy merchant.[127] Then, in one of these annual sermons, the archbishop exclaimed: 'How pleasing it must be for merchants to know that one of their cohorts, St Francis, was a merchant and was also made a saint in our time. Oh, how much good hope there must be for merchants, who have such a merchant intermediary with God.'[128] Pisa, 1261: St Francis of Assisi had become the patron and protector of merchants.

the *Biblia pauperum* and was at one time attributed to St Bonaventure and included in *Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, ed. A. C. Peltier, VIII (Paris, 1866), 483–642.

57. Welter, *L'exemplum*, pp. 233–6. For still other collectors of exempla, see ibid., pp. 236–89, and S. L. Forte, 'A Cambridge Dominican Collector of Exempla in the Thirteenth Century', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XXVIII (1958), 115–48.
58. *Liber Exemplorum ad usum praedicantium*, ed. A. G. Little, British Society of Franciscan Studies, I (Manchester, 1908); cf. Welter, *L'exemplum*, pp. 290–4.
59. J. T. Welter, *La 'Tabula exemplorum secundum ordinem alphabeti': Recueil d'exempla compilé en France à la fin du XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1926); cf. Welter, *L'exemplum*, pp. 294–7.
60. P. Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique et manuels de confession au moyen âge (XII–XVI siècles)*, Analecta mediaevalia namurcensia, XIII (Louvain, 1962).
61. Thomas of Chobham *Summa*, ed. Broomfield, pp. XII–XVII; cf. G. LeBras, 'Pénitentiels', *DTC*, XII1, 1160–79.
62. Thomas of Chobham *Summa*, ed. Broomfield, p. 3.
63. Thomas of Chobham *Summa*, ed. Broomfield, pp. 240, 346–53, 504–18.
64. ibid., p. XXV, where the editor exaggerates the 'popular' nature of this work.
65. *Summa de Poenitentia*, ed. Benedictine Fathers, Bibliotheca Casinensis, IV (Monte Cassino, 1880), 191–215.
66. Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique*, pp. 24–6; P. Mandonnet and M.-H. Vicaire, *Saint Dominique, L'idée, l'homme et l'oeuvre*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1938), I, 249–69.
67. *Summa de poenitentia* (Rome, 1603).
68. Bloomfield, *Seven Deadly Sins*, p. 124. On Raymond's influence, see A. Teetaert, 'Quelques *Summae de Poenitentia* anonymes dans la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris', in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, II (Vatican, 1946), 311–43.
69. Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique*, pp. 39–40.
70. ibid., p. 36.
71. ibid., pp. 40–2. On Adam, see F. Valls Taberner, 'La *Summula Pauperum* de Adam de Aldersbach', in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens*, VII (1938), 69–83.
72. On John of Freiburg's career, see M.-D. Chenu in *DTC*, VIII, 761–2 or W. Hinnebusch in *NCE*, VII, 1051. Cf. L. Boyle, 'The *Summa Confessorum* of John of Freiburg and the Popularization of the Moral Teaching of St. Thomas and of some of his Contemporaries', in *St Thomas Aquinas, 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies*, 2 vols. (Toronto, 1974), II, 245–68.
73. ibid., and Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique*, pp. 44–50.
74. Boyle asserts that the author was Guy of Evreux, 'The *Summa Confessorum* of John of Freiburg', p. 260, and cites, n. 49, an article of Michaud-Quantin (see above, n. 50) published in 1950. But Michaud-Quantin in his book, *Sommes de casuistique*, p. 48, published in 1962, says that beyond the name Guy and his membership in the Order of Preachers the author remains unidentified.
5. Boyle, 'The *Summa Confessorum* of John of Freiburg', p. 258, says: 'it may prove not to be an exaggeration to state that the *Summa confessorum* was the most influential work of pastoral theology in the two hundred years before the Reformation.' Cf. Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique*, pp. 52–7.
76. Reflection on these matters should take into account the studies being carried on by E. L. Eisenstein. Her persuasive arguments on behalf of the revolutionary significance of printing need eventually to be integrated with the findings of Rouse, so that one could gain a coherent view of the propagation of written material over the period 1150–1600. See E. L. Eisenstein, 'The Advent of Printing and the Problem of the Renaissance', *Past and Present*, no. 45 (1969), 9–89; 'The Advent of Printing in Current Historical Literature: Notes and Comments on an Elusive Transformation', *American Historical Review*, LXXV

(1969–70), 727–43; 'L'avènement de l'imprimerie et la Réforme', *Annales E. S. C.*, XXVI (1971), 1355–82.

Chapter 12: Urban religious life

1. For the monks in the first feudal age, see B. H. Rosenwein, 'Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression', *Viator*, II (1971), 129–57; for a parallel argument concerning the monks and the friars, see B. H. Rosenwein and L. K. Little, 'Social Meaning in the Monastic and Mendicant Spiritualities', *Past and Present*, no. 63 (1974), 4–32.
2. P. Riché, *Education et culture dans l'Occident barbare, 6e–8e siècle*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1967), pp. 158, 517–18.
3. See above, chap. X, n. 2.
4. *Regula monachorum* vi.8 (*CSEL*, LXXV, 39).
5. Alan of Lille *Summa de arte praedicatoria* xli (*PL*, CCX, 187–8); cf. *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish sources*, ed. R. E. Latham (London, 1965), pp. 9, 324.
6. J. T. Welter, *Un nouveau recueil franciscain d'Exempla de la fin du XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1930), p. 52.
7. *Fasciculus Morum*, MS, Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 332, f. 254r.
8. Ibanès, *Doctrine de l'Eglise*, p. 74.
9. Thomas of Spalato *Ex historia pontificum Salonitanorum et Spalatensium* (ed. Boehmer, *Analekten*, p. 106).
10. R. Davidsohn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte von Florenz*, IV (Berlin, 1908), 85.
11. *Scripta Leonis, Rufini, et Angeli, Sociorum S. Francisci* xliii, ed. and tr. R. B. Brooke (Oxford, 1970), pp. 166–7.
12. M. D. Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty: The Doctrine of the Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order, 1210–1323* (London, 1961), p. 39.
13. Peter Ferrand *Legenda sancti Dominici* i, ed. M.-H. Laurent in *MOPH*, XVI, 248.
14. *Sacrum Commercium S. Francisci cum Domina paupertate* (Quaracchi, 1929); the reference to it as the *Commercium Paupertatis* is in the *Chronica XXIV Generalium*, *AF*, III (Quaracchi, 1897), 283.
15. Anthony of Padua *Sermones dominicales*, ed. A. M. Locatelli, 3 vols. (Padua, 1895–1907), I, 28–32, 57; II, 18, 30, 114–16; III, 4, 98, 313.
16. Bonaventure *Defense of the Mendicants* xii.6, tr. J. de Vinck in *The Works of Bonaventure*, IV (Paterson, 1966), 260.
17. *De eruditione praedicatorum* xxxii (Berthier, II, 452).
18. ibid., iv (Berthier, II, 383).
19. ibid., xx (Berthier, II, 429–30).
20. J. H. Crehan, 'Indulgences', *A Catholic Dictionary of Theology*, III (London, 1971), 84–90.
21. MP, V, 599.
22. ibid., p. 742.
23. *Historia Anglorum*, ed. F. Madden, 3 vols., *RS*, XLIV3, 51–2.
24. A. Vauchez, 'Les stigmates de saint François et leurs détraceurs dans les derniers siècles du moyen âge', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, LXXX (1968), 614.
25. Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour*, pp. 223–5, where the author analyses William's *De periculis novissimorum temporum*.
26. *De eruditione praedicatorum* xxi (Berthier, II, 432–3).
27. ibid., p. 432. Cf. *Expositio super constitutiones* ix (ibid. p. 32).
28. *De eruditione praedicatorum* xxi (ibid. 433).
29. *De eruditione praedicatorum* (ibid., p. 383)

30. *Testament* v (ed. Boehmer, *Analekten*, pp. 37–8).
31. See above, chap. XI, n. 19.
32. *Anecdotes historiques* (ed. Lecoy de la Marche, p. 124).
33. Frederick was, though, a close friend of Brother Elias; see T. C. Van Cleeve, *The Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, Immutator Mundi* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 438–9. Also, there was some collaboration between Frederick and the friars where heresy was concerned from 1221 to 1245, the latter being the date of Frederick's second excommunication, when Innocent IV engaged the friars in his campaign to destroy the Hohenstaufen; see Freed, *The Friars and German Society*, pp. 138–50.
34. Letter sent by Frederick in 1246 to his fellow princes of Christendom, ed. J. Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia Diplomatica Frederici Secundi*, VI1 (Paris, 1860), 391–3.
35. F. D. Swift, *The Life and Times of James the First of Aragon* (Oxford, 1894), pp. 109, 164.
36. R. I. Burns, *The Crusader Kingdom of Valencia: Reconstruction on a Thirteenth-Century Frontier*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), p. 199.
37. ibid., p. 197.
38. ibid., p. 200.
39. ibid., pp. 200, 198.
40. Swift, *James the First*, pp. 109, 164.
41. A. G. Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History*, pp. 35–9.
42. L. K. Little, 'Saint Louis' Involvement with the Friars', *Church History*, XXXIII (1964), 134–5.
43. *HF*, XX, 94.
44. ibid., XXIII, 426.
45. L. K. Little, 'Saint Louis' Involvement', p. 135.
46. A. Guerreau, 'Rentes des ordres mendiants à Mâcon au XIVe siècle', *Annales E. S. C.*, XXV (1970), 956–65.
47. J. Moorman, *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1946), p. 371.
48. Burns, *Crusader Kingdom*, pp. 200–1, 205–6.
49. See above, n. 46.
50. C. L. Kingsford, *The Grey Friars in London: Their History with the Register of their Convent and an Appendix of Documents* (Aberdeen, 1915), pp. 27–35, 145–50.
51. Freed, *The Friars and German Society*, p. 46.
52. Burns, *Crusader Kingdom*, pp. 200–1, 205–6.
53. Cf. Guerreau, 'Rentes', p. 965.
54. Quoted by Southern, *Western Society and the Church*, p. 247.
55. G. Meersseman, 'L'architecture dominicaine au XIIIe siècle. Législation et pratique', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XVI (1946), 136–90.
56. R. Branner, *Gothic Architecture* (New York, 1961), p. 43.
57. *Determinationes quaestionum crica regulam fratrum minorum*, pars I, qu. VI, in *Opera Omnia*, VIII (Quaracchi, 1898), 341–2.
58. *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of Saint-Denis and Its Art Treasures*, ed. and tr. E. Panofsky (Princeton, 1946). Cf. Brentano's analysis of the contrasts between 'twelfth-century' and 'thirteenth-century' historians in *Two Churches*, pp. 327–32.
59. Burns, *Crusader Kingdom*, pp. 200–1.
60. G. G. Meersseman, *Ordo Fraternitatis: Confraternite e pietà dei laici nel medioevo* 3 vols., Italia Sacra, Studi e documenti di storia ecclesiatica, 24–6 (Rome, 1977).
61. *1 Cel.* xxxvii (*AF*, X, 30).
62. *S. Francisci Opuscula, Bibliotheca Franciscana Ascetica Medii Aevi*, I (Quaracchi, 1904), 87–98.
63. *Bullarium Franciscanum*, IV (Rome, 1768), 94–7.

64. ibid., I (Rome, 1759), 8.
65. ibid., p. 20.
66. M. Bihl, 'Elenchi Bononiensis Fratrum de Poenitentia S. Francisci, 1252–88', *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, VII (1914), 227–33, especially 229–30; cf. Moorman, *History of the Franciscan Order*, pp. 216–25.
67. Burns, *Crusader Kingdom*, p. 201.
68. P. Guerrini, 'Gli Statuti di un'antica congregazione francescana di Brescia, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, I (1908), 544–68.
69. See above, n. 61.
70. *NCE*, XIV, 93–6.
71. G. Meersseman, 'Etudes sur les anciennes confréries dominicaines, II: Les confréries de St-Pierre Martyr', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XXI (1951), 58.
72. ibid., pp. 91–2.
73. G. Meersseman (as in n. 71), III: 'Les congrégations de la Vierge', ibid., XXII (1952), 5–176; and IV: 'Les milices de Jesus-Christ', ibid., XXIII (1953), 275–308.
74. G. Meersseman (as in n. 71), I: 'Les confréries de Saint-Dominique', ibid., XX (1950), 5–113. The text of the letter appears on pp. 65–6.
75. MS, Bergamo, Biblioteca Civica, MIA, XL, 937, ff. 1r–12r.
76. Burns, *Crusader Kingdom*, pp. 201, 206.
77. *NCE*, IX, 57–8.
78. H. E. J. Cowdrey, 'Unions and Confraternity with Cluny', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XVI (1956), 152–62. On the advice of St Norbert of Xanten to Count Theobald of Champagne about how the latter might live a spiritually valid existence without abandoning his secular condition, see *Vita Norberti Archiepiscopi Magdeburgensis* xv (*MGH*, *SS*, XII, 688).
79. G. Meersseman, *Le dossier de l'ordre de la Pénitence au XIIIe siècle*, Spicilegium Friburgense, VII (Fribourg, 1961), p. 11.
80. ibid., pp. 180–7.
81. ibid., p. 38.
82. H. A. R. Gibb, *Mohammedanism*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1975), pp. 103–4.
83. M. Fougères (Marc Bloch), 'Entr'aide et piété: Les associations urbaines au moyen âge', *Mélanges d'histoire sociale*, V (1944), 106.
84. *Bertholds Predigten*, ed. F. Göbel (Regensburg, 1905), p. 282.
85. M. Becker, 'Towards a Renaissance Historiography in Florence', in *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*, ed. A. Molho and J. A. Tedeschi (Florence, 1971), pp. 143–71.
86. ibid., p. 151.
87. ibid., p. 152.
88. W. Hinnebusch, *NCE*, XII, 667–70.
89. L. White, jr., 'Medieval Borrowings from Further Asia', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, V (1971), 17–18. Bernard Gui describes how, in the ceremony of the melioramentum, the believer kneels and clasps his hands together; *Manuel de l'Inquisiteur*, ed. and tr. G. Mollat, 2 vols., *Les Classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen âge*, VIII, IX (Paris, 1926–27), I, 20–1. While some argue that the new posture came into use earlier and came from the ceremony of homage, the histories of liturgy indicate that the new way gained general currency only in the thirteenth century. Thus the Indic thesis is as plausible as the homage thesis; neither is proven. See L. Gougaud, *Dévotions et pratiques ascétiques du moyen âge* (Paris, 1925), pp. 20–9; and G. Ladner, 'The Gestures of Prayer in Papal Iconography of the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries', in *Didascaliae: Studies in Honor of Anselm M. Albareda*, ed. S. Prete (New York, 1961), pp. 245–75.
90. E. Guidoni, 'Città e ordini mendicanti: Il ruolo dei conventi nella crescita e nella progettazione urbana del XIII e XIV secolo', *Quaderni medievali*, no. 4 (1977), 69–106.

91. See for example A. Vauchez, 'Une campagne de pacification en Lombardie autour de 1233: l'action politique des ordres mendiants d'après la réforme des statuts communaux et les accords de paix', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, LXXVIII (1966), p. 534.
92. *COD*, p. 223.
93. ibid., pp. 328–30.
94. G. Le Bras, 'Usure—Sanctions', *DTC*, XV2, 2365–71.
95. Ibanès, *Doctrine de l'Eglise*, p. 25.
96. K. T. Erikson, *Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York, 1966), pp. 3–29.
97. Le Goff, *Marchands et banquiers*, p. 95.
98. Ibanès, *Doctrine de l'Eglise*, p. 94.
99. *Summa theologiae* 2a 2ae, q. 78, art. 1, ad 3, in *Opera omnia*, III (Parma, 1853), 279–80.
100. Ibanès, *Doctrine de l'Eglise*, p. 95.
101. J. Lestoquoy, *Les villes de Flandre et d'Italie sous le gouvernement des patriciens (XIe–XVe siècles)* (Paris, 1952), p. 210.
102. B. J. Nelson, 'The Usurer and the Merchant Prince: Italian Businessmen and the Ecclesiastical Law of Restitution, 1100–1500', *Journal of Economic History*, VII (1947), Supplement, pp. 104–22.
103. ibid., pp. 115–17.
104. Lestoquoy, *Les villes*, pp. 204–11.
105. Humbert of Romans *De modo prompte cudendi sermones* i.72, ed. Despont, *Maxima bibliotheca*, XXV, 491–2.
106. J. Le Goff, *FEH*, pp. 78–9, 100; the text discussed by Le Goff is found in J. B. Schneyer, 'Alberts des Grossen Augsburger Predigtzyklus über den hl. Augustinus', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XXXVI (1969), 100–47.
107. ibid., p. 112; cf. p. 116.
108. ibid., p. 112; cf. p. 118.
109. ibid., p. 118.
110. ibid., p. 123.
111. ibid., pp. 135, 141, 145.
112. Bonvicinus de Ripa *De magnalibus urbis Mediolani*, ed. F. Novati in *Bulletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo*, XX (1898), 67–114.
113. Bonvicinus *De magnalibus* iv.18 (ibid., pp. 113–14).
114. *The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine*, tr. G. Ryan and H. Ripperger, 2 vols. (New York, 1941), I, vi.
115. Reginald of Durham *Libellus de Vita et Miraculis S. Godrici, Heremitae de Finchale*, ed. J. Stevenson, *Surtees Society*, XX (London, 1847).
116. *Bibliotheca sanctorum*, IX, 1173–5.
117. A. Vauchez, 'Sainteté laïque au XIIIe siècle: la vie du bienheureux Facio de Cremone (v.1196–1272),' *Mélanges de l'Ecole Française de Rome, Moyen Age-Temps modernes*, LXXXIV (1972), 13–53.
118. ibid., p. 37.
119. ibid., p. 39.
120. *Bibliotheca sanctorum*, VII, 997–1001.
121. Little, 'Saint Louis' Involvement', pp. 125–48.
122. P. Ariès, 'Richesse et pauvreté devant la mort', in *Etudes sur l'histoire de la pauvreté (Moyen Age-XVIe siècle)*, ed. M. Mollat, 2 vols. (Paris, 1974), II, 524; P. Veyne, 'Panem et Circenses: l'évergétisme devant les sciences humaines', *Annales E. S. C.*, XXIV (1969), 804–5; J. Le Goff, 'Les mentalités: une histoire ambiguë', in *Faire de l'histoire*, ed. J. Le Goff and P. Nora, 3 vols. (Paris, 1974), III, 78; and Duby, *Warriors and Peasants*, p. 259 (although note that the key phrase, 'at the approach of death', is omitted in the translation).

123. Davidsohn, *Florenz*, pp. 81–9.
124. ibid., pp. 84, 87.
125. Brentano, *Two Churches*, p. 195.
126. These remarks came from sermons preached elsewhere; cited by D. Herlihy, *Pisa in the Early Renaissance: A Study in Urban Growth*, Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, LXVIII (New Haven, 1958), p. 167.
127. Davidson, *Florenz*, pp. 85, 87.
128. ibid., p. 87.

Conclusion

1. *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, col. 520.
2. Caesar of Arles *Sermones* ccxxxiv, ed. G. Morin, *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*, CIV (Turnhout, 1953), 993; Peter Damian *Ep.* vi.3 (*PL*, CXLIV, 374); Anselm of Canterbury *Ep.* iii. 102 (*PL*, CLIX, 140); William of Malmsbury *De gestis pontificum anglorum* iv (*PL*, CLXXIX, 1612–13); Nicholas of Clairvaux *Sermo in festo S. Nicolai* v (*PL*, CLXXXIV, 1058).
3. Brentano, *Two Churches*, p. 337, n. 159.
4. MP, II, 511; IV, 346; V, 529.
5. Petrus de Bosco *Summaria brevis et compendiosa doctrina felicis expedicionis et abreviacionis guerrarum ac litium regni francorum*, ed. H. Kämpf, *Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, IV (Leipzig and Berlin, 1936; photo reprint, Stuttgart, 1969), 50.
6. Scheneyer, 'Alberts des Grossen Augsburger Predigtzyklus', p. 146.
7. Davidsohn, *Florenz*, pp. 86–8.