

**SIMON TUGWELL O. P., *For whom was Prouille founded?*, in «Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum» (ISSN 0391-7320), 74, (2004), pp. 5-125.**

Url: <https://heyjoe.fbk.eu/index.php/afp>

Questo articolo è stato digitalizzato della Biblioteca Fondazione Bruno Kessler, in collaborazione con l'Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum all'interno del portale [HeyJoe](#) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe è un progetto di digitalizzazione di riviste storiche, delle discipline filosofico-religiose e affini per le quali non esiste una versione elettronica.

This article was digitized by the Bruno Kessler Foundation Library in collaboration with the Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum as part of the [HeyJoe](#) portal - *History, Religion, and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe is a project dedicated to digitizing historical journals in the fields of philosophy, religion, and related disciplines for which no electronic version exists.



## Nota copyright

Tutto il materiale contenuto nel sito [HeyJoe](#), compreso il presente PDF, è rilasciato sotto licenza [Creative Commons](#) [Attribuzione-Non commerciale-Non opere derivate 4.0 Internazionale](#). Pertanto è possibile liberamente scaricare, stampare, fotocopiare e distribuire questo articolo e gli altri presenti nel sito, purché si attribuisca in maniera corretta la paternità dell'opera, non la si utilizzi per fini commerciali e non la si trasformi o modifichi.

## Copyright notice

All materials on the [HeyJoe](#) website, including the present PDF file, are made available under a [Creative Commons](#) [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](#). You are free to download, print, copy, and share this file and any other on this website, as long as you give appropriate credit. You may not use this material for commercial purposes. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you may not distribute the modified material.



## FOR WHOM WAS PROUILLE FOUNDED?

BY  
SIMON TUGWELL OP

### 1. *The status quaestionis*

For whom was the monastery of Prouille founded? Two main strands run through the answers which have been given to this question, neither of which has particularly good credentials.

The view which prevailed until the seventeenth century was that Prouille was founded to provide a safe Catholic haven for girls whose parents might otherwise have been constrained by poverty to entrust their education to Cathar households.<sup>1</sup> This whole tradition derives from Ferrandus's interpretation of Jordan; no extra evidence is ever adduced except, from Balme onwards, to illustrate the rôle of heretical households in bringing up children.

Ferrandus was able to add some extra details to the story of Dominic's time in Languedoc: the ways in which the heretics mocked him (§20), his conversion of some heretically inclined ladies by a display of austerity (§22), and his doctrine of 'sancta ypocrisis' (§23); but there is nothing to indicate that he had any independent information about the years 1206-1207: §13-19 follow *Lib.* §19-33 exactly, mistakes and all.<sup>2</sup> It would therefore be rash to take what he says about the founding of Prouille in §16 as anything more than a typical rewriting of *Lib.* §27 (cf. Appendix I 1a and 3a):

*Lib.* §27

Ad susceptionem autem quarundam  
feminarum nobilium, quas parentes  
earum ratione paupertatis erudiendas

Ferr. §16

Erant autem in illis locis nobiles  
quidam qui egestate compulsi filias  
suas tradebant hereticis nutriendas

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix I for relevant texts, with information about manuscripts and editions whose paragraph- or page-numbers I cite.

<sup>2</sup> Ferrandus could no doubt draw on stories reported by Spanish brethren who had been with Dominic in Languedoc; but they had probably joined him when he returned there in 1211, if not even later (on Dominic's absence from Languedoc from the beginning of 1208 until mid 1211, see AFP 73 [2003] 5-69).

et nutriendas tradebant hereticis, quoddam instituit monasterium situm inter Fanum Iouis et Montem Regalem, et nomen loci eiusdem Prulianum

et erudiendas, immo reuera pestiferis erroribus eludendas. Quarum perniciosum miseratus opprobrium dei seruus Didacus episcopus monasterium quoddam ad earum susceptionem instituit in loco qui dicitur Pruillanum.

It is natural to infer from Ferrandus that Prouille was intended to receive the daughters of impoverished noblemen as young girls and provide for their education; but this is not quite what Jordan says. Jordan's text hovers uneasily between two possibilities: *feminarum* implies that Prouille was meant to receive grown women, not girls; however, they were presumably girls when their parents entrusted them to heretics *erudiendas et nutriendas*, so there is a tension between the relative clause and its antecedent. The tension could be resolved in one direction by substituting *tradiderant* for *tradebant* (but no such variant is known); or it can be resolved in the other direction by suppressing the reference to *feminae*, as is done by Ferrandus.

It is possible that the information which Jordan received did not give him a clear picture of Diego's intentions, and that his text was a deliberate compromise between two different interpretations; but if we take it at its face value he appears to be saying that Prouille was meant to provide a Catholic establishment to which upper-class women could move as adults after being forced by their parents' poverty to spend their childhood in Cathar households.<sup>3</sup>

The whole tradition of Prouille being founded as a place where girls could receive a Catholic upbringing is thus called into question by the very source from which it ultimately derives.

A rather different story appears in the seventeenth century, given currency by Jean de Rechac in his *Vie de saint Dominique* (henceforth 'VD'), Paris 1647.

By the time Rechac visited Fanjeaux and Prouille in November–December 1642 (VD 118, 194bis) he had presumably completed most of his huge *Vie* (the first censors' reports are dated

<sup>3</sup> By implication this suggests that Prouille was intended for women who wished to devote their lives entirely to God and who, as things stood (since their parents were too poor to afford a dowry), had little choice but to do so by remaining in a Cathar household as 'perfects'; Prouille gave them the opportunity to become Catholic nuns instead.

8 and 10 Oct. 1643); this explains the discrepancies in his accounts of the founding of Prouille. The long section devoted expressly to Prouille (VD 193bis-241) was based on the discoveries he made there; but he must already have written something on the subject at the appropriate point in the life of Dominic, and it is easy enough to recognize in VD 118-120 a revised version of this older text.

His chief mentor was 'le Docte Maluenda' (VD 2), and he fairly obviously started with Malvenda's account of Prouille's origins (Appendix I 37a and 43a). It is expressly from Malvenda that he quotes the relevant text from Gui's *Cat. mag.* (Appendix I 16) in VD 249, with the wrong date which Malvenda attached to it (1207) and Gui's false identification of 'Petrus Amelii' as the archbishop of Narbonne who supported Dominic's projects; the motive given for the foundation of Prouille in VD 118-119 is precisely that which Malvenda reports in the words of Surius's version of Dietrich (Appendix I 33a).

However, during his visit to Prouille, Rechac's attention was drawn to Gui's transcription of Archbishop Bérenger's gift to Prouille (Appendix II), in which the archbishop's initial was wrongly filled out as 'Bernardus'; when he revised his text he accordingly substituted 'Bernard' for 'Pierre d'Ameille' as the archbishop who assisted Dominic (VD 119).<sup>4</sup> In VD 197 'Bernard' is explicitly mentioned as one of the benefactors whose gifts enabled Prouille to be founded: 'Ainsi dans peu de tems, il y ût moyen d'y receuoir des Filles, pour donner commencement à cet Euure'. Since Rechac was aware that the archbishop's gift was made in 1207 (VD 119), this implies that he followed Malvenda's dating of the foundation of Prouille to 1207; but he was also shown evidence at Prouille that the monastery was founded in 1206, which is the date he gives in VD 119, 184 and 197.

Continuing the story of Dominic, Rechac proceeds immediately to his conversion of nine Fanjeaux matrons (whom Rechac here calls 'femmes') with the help of a terrifying vision of a hell-cat (VD 120-121, Appendix I 43 b1). We shall consider his sources later; here it is sufficient to note that the story ends in the traditional way, with *some* of the converts becoming nuns at Prouille.

The 'treatise' on Prouille contains a significantly different account (Appendix I 43 b2). The Fanjeaux converts (called 'dames'

---

<sup>4</sup> Presumably on a later occasion Rechac was able to transcribe another version of the same deed giving his name, rightly, as 'Berengarius' (VD 201).

in VD 197) are now connected with the supposed list of the eleven first nuns of Prouille, which is presented as comprising 'deux Damoiselles'—by implication, they were not converted from heresy, and they are elsewhere identified as 'les deux premieres Filles de Saint Dominique' (VD 216)—and all nine of the women converted by the vision of the hell-cat, who 'se resolurent d'être les premieres Filles de ce nouveau Monastere'. Together with the two 'Damoiselles' they entered Prouille on the feast of St John the Evangelist 1206 (VD 197-198).

Rechac did not jettison the traditional belief that Prouille was founded for girls who were at risk of being brought up by heretics, and he places Dominic's plan to found a monastery and his choice and acquisition of a site before the conversion of the Fanjeaux ladies. To ease the transition from a monastery founded for 'filles' to a monastery most of whose first members were 'femmes' or 'dames', he refers to the 'filles' in VD 196 as 'ieunes Damoiselles', calls the first two recruits 'Damoiselles' (VD 197), and designates the nine converts 'Damoiselles' when he repeats their names in VD 216 and when he summarizes the episode in VD 184.

Not surprisingly, when he came to review his material after his visit to Prouille he found himself confused, and he wrote to the prior of Fanjeaux, Jean Court, asking for clarification on several points. Court's reply (Appendix I 42 b2) arrived while VD was in the press, so Rechac was able to use it in an appendix to confirm that Prouille was founded in 1206 and that all nine Fanjeaux converts (called 'Damoiselles', in spite of Court's 'matrones') entered there as soon as it was opened (VD 1022).

Rechac's perplexity shows that it was not he who turned the Fanjeaux ladies into the founding community of Prouille; on the contrary, he seems to have been unaware of this version of the story until he visited the region.

By good fortune, the original draft of the 'Memoires' which Court sent Rechac on 20 Nov. 1646 has survived (Carcassonne, Archives départementales de l'Aude, H 461).<sup>5</sup> It is not a simple reply

---

<sup>5</sup> I am profoundly grateful to the archivist of Prouille for her unstinting help, and to the director of the Archives départementales de l'Aude for her generosity in furnishing me not only with copies of documents in her keeping but also with a reproduction of the two manuscripts of Cambefort's *Livre* which are now preserved at Prouille (his autograph and the copy made later by Abadie), and for doing so in spite of the upheavals caused by the archives' transfer to a new site.

to particular questions; the original heading (which was crossed out) designates it as 'Actes et memoyres contenant le temps qu'il vint a la ville de FanJaux et les miracles qu'il a faicts en icelle' ('il' being Dominic). Essentially it is a report on four miracles: the conversion of the Fanjeaux matrons (dated 1206), the book which jumped out of the fire when the heretics tried to burn it (dated 1207),<sup>6</sup> the restoration of the tongue of a servant of Prouille which had been torn out by bandits in 1533, and the deliverance of Fanjeaux from a Protestant army in 1584.

There are persistent close parallels between Court's 'Memoyres' and the section on Dominic's Fanjeaux miracles (ff.13-18) in Pierre Cambefort's 'Livre' on the life and miracles of Dominic and the foundation of Prouille (his autograph manuscript is now preserved at Prouille; I cite it as 'LDP'). Their respective texts on the Fanjeaux matrons are edited in Appendix I 42 and 44 b1, and it can be seen at once that they are closely related; as another example we may take the beginning of the 1533 miracle:

Court

Miracle fait par saint Dominique dans la Chapelle dediee a son nom a Faniaux, lequel restitua et remit la langue a George seruiteur de Prouille que les voleurs lui auoint inhumainement arrachee l'an 1533. L'an mil cinq cens trant troys dans la Chapelle de saint Dominique du Conuant des fraires prescheurs de la ville de Fan Jaux fut fait ce grand et signale miracle par le glorieux patriarche saint Dominique, protecteur et patron de ladite ville en faueur de George ...

LDP f.16<sup>v</sup>

Autre miracle fait par saint Dominique dans sa Chappelle a Fan Jaux, lequel restitua et remit la langue a George seruiteur de Prouille que les voleurs luy auoint arrachee l'an 1533. L'an mil cinq cens trante troys dans la Chapelle de saint Dominique du Conuant des fraires prescheurs de la ville de Fan Jaux fut fait ce grand et signalé miracle par le Glorieux saint Dominique, protecteur et patron de ladite ville en faueur de George ...

The frontispiece of LDP contains the date 'Lan M.DC.XLVI', but this cannot be when the actual manuscript was written, or even when it was started. As early as f.6<sup>r</sup> Cambefort quotes from a work which was only published in 1648 (the date is mentioned by

---

<sup>6</sup> Rechac duly noted this date in VD 1022, without commenting on the fact that it contradicts his dating of the miracle to 1206 in VD 184, and his assertion in VD 197 that it was the news of this miracle which began the conversion of the Fanjeaux ladies. Rechac's dating was no doubt inspired by Malvenda 63; Court's date presumably reflects local tradition.

Cambefort himself); and right from the outset there are borrowings from VD, which did not appear until 1647. LDP proper begins with Dominic's genealogy and family (f.1), whose source is undoubtedly VD 6-19; even before this, the 'avant-propos' on heresy on Languedoc, most of which is pieced together from various parts of G.Catel, *Histoire des Comtes de Tolose, Toulouse 1623*,<sup>7</sup> contains a reference to Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernai's account of the Albigensians which was certainly taken from Rechac:<sup>8</sup>

## VD 115

Pierre de Valsernay rapporte en detail leurs reueries, par léquelles il est manifeste qu'ils ne croyoient rien du tout, et auoient de tres abominables sentimens contre nos mysteres, comme d'appeller la sacrée Vierge vne putain, le Dieu du vieux Testament vn menteur,

## LDP f.b'

Pierre de Valsernai, en l'histoire des Albigeois, leurs reueries (*sic*), et quilz auoient de tres abominables sentimens contre nos Mysteres, comme d'appeler la sacree vierge une putain, le dieu du vieux testament un menteur, bourreau, cruel et sanguinere, saint Jean

<sup>7</sup> In LDP ff.39<sup>v</sup>-40<sup>r</sup> Cambefort cites the beginning of *Religiosam vitam* (MOPH XXV no. 77) from Catel, *Histoire des comtes de Tolose* 238, as evidence of Honorius III's confirmation of the gift of Saint-Romain to the Dominicans. Catel only quoted the incipit of this bull; the complete text would have provided far more convincing evidence, so presumably Cambefort did not have access to it at the time. However, in LDP ff.64<sup>r</sup>-65<sup>v</sup> he copies the complete text, manifestly from Rechac (VD 286-292). This shows that he used Catel before VD, and it strongly suggests that he started compiling material for LDP before VD came his way. Cf. also LDP f.10<sup>r</sup>, where the spurious bull of confirmation is cited as evidence for Dominic being prior of Saint-Romain in 1216, but not in the form in which it is found in LDP f.67<sup>r</sup> (where the text comes from VD 285, including the misprint *professoris* for *professuris*), but in the form found in Catel 238.

<sup>8</sup> Rechac here paraphrases part of Malvenda's version of Cernai (*Hystoria Albigensis*, ed. P.Guébin-E.Lyon, Paris 1926-1939, §10-11; Malvenda 52); his dependence on Malvenda is particularly clear in 'bourreau, cruel et sanguinaire', which translates 'carnificem, sicarium, sanguinarium' in Malvenda's retroversion from A.Sorbin rather than Cernai's plain *homicidam* (which Sorbin himself simply rendered 'meurtrier', *Histoire des Albigeois*, Paris 1569, 3'). The first 'abomination' does not come from Cernai at all, but from Guillaume de Nangis, '... et beatae Mariae exprobrantibus in hunc modum, Ha meretrix sancta Maria' (*Chronica*, ed. H.Géraud, I, Paris 1843, 135; cited and paraphrased in Malvenda 54 §37). Cambefort plainly had no idea who Malvenda was, and such knowledge as he appears to have of him derives entirely from Rechac; this is clear from LDP f.97<sup>r</sup> where, misinterpreting what Rechac says in VD 329, he calls Malvenda 'un des plus anciens Auteurs de la vie de saint Dominique'. In any case, the statement that Christ 'abusoit de sainte Magdelaine' manifestly comes from Rechac (Cernai's original text has 'quod Maria Magdalena fuit eius concubina', which Sorbin, loc. cit., rendered 'que Marie Magdalaine estoit sa concubine', which Malvenda turned back into Latin as 'quod Maria Magdalena erat eius concubina').



bourreau, cruel et sanguinaire; S. Iean Baptiste vn des grans diables d'enfer, tous les Peres de l'ancien Testament des damnez, qu'il y auoit deux Iesu Chrit, dont celuy qui a tant souffert étoit mechant et abusoit de sainte Marie Magdelaine, et mille autres horribles et epouuentables blasphemes que l'Enfer quasi n'oseroit vomir.

Baptiste un des grands diables d'enfer, touts les peres de l'ancien testament des damnez, quil y auoit deux Iesus Christ dont celuy qui a tant souffert estoit meschant et abusoit de sainte Magdelaine, et mille autres horribles et espouuentables blasphemes que l'Enfer quasi n'oseroit vomir.

I have found no evidence that Cambefort was given a preview of VD when Rechac visited Fanjeaux; in any case, there can be no doubt that he had the published book before him when he was compiling LDP: some notes of his on VD are preserved in Arch. dép. de l'Aude H 461, beginning with a précis of Rechac's fanciful elaboration of a story explicitly taken from Janssenius;<sup>9</sup> as Cambefort indicates, it is found on page 35 of VD ('ful. 35'). Cambefort incorporated the précis into LDP on f.12<sup>v</sup>, but use of his notes on VD is evident from f.4<sup>v</sup> onwards.

As it stands, then, LDP is certainly later than Court's 'Memoires'. However, the section on the Fanjeaux miracles is manifestly a revised version of an earlier text. For instance, it announces four miracles, exactly as in the 'Memoires', but it actually contains five. As in the 'Memoires', evidence that the miracle of fire occurred in the house which later belonged to Raymond de Durfort is cited from three royal letters; but Cambefort ineptly modified his original text to accommodate an extra 'confirmation' that he had found: the primary evidence which he quotes for the miracle itself comes from 'l'ancien breuiaire de l'ordre', and this is followed by a 'confirmation' from 'un autre auteur' (actually VD 691); he goes on, 'oultre la precedante preuee et confirmation nous en raporterons troys ou quatre faictes par les feux Roys d'heureuse memoire'. He proceeds to quote the three royal letters which are also quoted by Court (not 'three or four'); the fourth 'confirmation' is not a royal letter and it does not corroborate the location of the miracle, it is an extended quotation from Jordan of Saxony, *Lib.* §23-25. Apart from the inappropriate way in which his testimony is introduced, Cambefort would surely have cited the 'Reuerendissime Maistre general de l'ordre, successeur

<sup>9</sup> N.Janssenius, *Vita sancti patris Dominici*, Antwerp 1622, 143-144.

de saint Dominique' as his primary witness if he had known the *Libellus* when he first compiled the Fanjeaux miracles.

Cambefort mentions that he had transcribed the royal letters from the originals in the archives of the Fanjeaux Dominicans in 1623 (LDP f.15<sup>v</sup>). His transcriptions, together with the originals of the first two letters, are preserved in Arch. dép. de l'Aude H 460. We thus have four texts of two of the extracts quoted by Court: the original letters, Cambefort's 1623 transcription, Court's 'Memoyses', and LDP. A comparison reveals that in six places all three transcriptions have the same mistake, in four places Court and LDP have the same mistake where the 1623 text is correct, in two places LDP is alone in error, and in two places Court has the same mistake as the 1623 transcription but obvious corrections have restored the correct reading in LDP (for the details, see Appendix III).

This must mean either that Court used Cambefort's transcriptions of the royal letters and that Cambefort used Court in LDP, or—and this is far more likely—that both Court and Cambefort in LDP drew on an earlier text compiled by Cambefort himself. Court got his 'Memoyses' signed by the consuls of Fanjeaux and a Notary Royal and sealed with the town seal (VD 1020); what he sent Rechac, then, was not just a Dominican account of Dominic's local miracles, it was an official document of the town. Cambefort seems to have been Fanjeaux's resident antiquary; all told, it is very probable that some time between 1623 and 1646 he put together a kind of pamphlet on Dominic's Fanjeaux miracles and that this expressed, if it did not create, a local orthodoxy on the subject.

It is clear that the local story, before Rechac, was simply that the nine matrons whom Dominic converted at Fanjeaux were the first nuns of Prouille. It must have been Rechac who connected it with the supposed list of the first nuns and accordingly added two more recruits to bring the number up to eleven, and it was he who tried to reconcile it with the common opinion of Dominican historians by calling the matrons 'damoiselles'.<sup>10</sup>

The Latin source of the local story, from which Court reproduces a few sentences, is quoted in full in LDP f.15<sup>v</sup>, and Cambefort also

<sup>10</sup> Cambefort faced a different problem, that of reconciling Rechac's account with the local Fanjeaux story. He harmonized Rechac's 'damoiselles' with the *matronae* of the Latin source by calling them 'damoiselles d'honneur' (LDP f.15<sup>v</sup>, Appendix I 44 b1), and later on he tentatively absorbed Rechac's two extra 'damoiselles' into the local story (implicitly making them converted heretics too) by turning the nine noble ladies who sought Dominic's help into 'nine or eleven' (LDP f.20<sup>v</sup>; Appendix I 44 b2).

indicates where it comes from, 'l'ancien breuiare de l'ordre, 3<sup>e</sup> lecon du 3<sup>e</sup> jour infra octauam B.Dominici'. The passage which Cambefort quotes is found only in a few breviaries printed in the late fifteenth century,<sup>11</sup> where the reading in question is, in fact, the third reading for the *second* day in the octave of St Dominic (Appendix I 25b).<sup>12</sup> Its source appears to be Dietrich §33-34 (Appendix I 15b), but the text is considerably compressed, especially at the end:

## Dietrich

Conuersus autem ad matronas sanctus Dominicus territas nimis consolabatur dicens, Ecce per hoc quod coram oculis uestris faciente deo figuratiue apparuit potestis aduertere qualis est ille, cui credentes hereticis seruiuistis. Ille uero gratias deo referentes ad fidem catholicam perfectissime sunt conuerse. Quarum etiam aliquae apud sorores de Pruliano religionis habitum assumpserunt.

## Breviary

Beatus igitur Dominicus conuersus ad matronas illas dixit, Ecce quali domino seruiuistis. Que domino gratias agentes monasterium de Pruliano sunt ingresse et habitum sancte religionis assumpserunt.

The impression given by the breviary that all nine matrons became nuns at Prouille is nothing more than an accidental result of the editor's careless abridgement of his source.

The breviary reading seems to be the source of Garzoni's imaginative recreation of the story (Appendix I 26b), which ends with all the converts becoming nuns (though it is not specified where); otherwise it had little immediate effect.<sup>13</sup> However, Garzoni

<sup>11</sup> It first appears in the breviary printed in Venice in 1487, but from another of Cambefort's references to 'l'ancien breuiare' it is clear that he was using the revised version first published in Venice in 1494, where the text quoted by Cambefort is on f.cccxxxv'. The story of the Fanjeaux matrons does not feature in the comparatively meagre readings provided in breviaries printed before 1487 or in that edited by Alberto di Castello in 1507 or in any of those which appeared thereafter.

<sup>12</sup> Cambefort provides two French versions of the text (Appendix I 44 b1 and b2), of which the second is heavily influenced by Rechac, while the first (in the 'Fanjeaux miracles') has only been superficially accommodated to his account of the story; this reinforces the belief that the quotation from the breviary was in Cambefort's 'Fanjeaux miracles' before he started using VD.

<sup>13</sup> Taegio always says that only some of them became nuns (Appendix I 29b, 30b and 31b), as do Flaminius (32b), Razzi (34b) and Castillo (35b). Malvenda mentions Garzoni in connection with the Fanjeaux matrons, but the only source he actually quotes is Vincent of Beauvais (8b) who quoted Constantine; so the version of the tale which he transmits is one in which *some* of the matrons became nuns (Malvenda 96).

was the main source of Bzovius's narrative in his continuation of Baronius's *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Appendix I 38b), and Janssenius was influenced by Bzovius, though he chose not to mention the converts becoming nuns (Appendix I 39b). Curiously enough, Garzoni also influenced Rechac (Appendix I 43 b1).

The most distinctive feature of Garzoni's narrative is that he makes the oldest matron the spokeswoman for them all and provides her with a far more elaborate speech than any previous source, including an explicit request for a sign to confirm Dominic's message. Like Bzovius and Janssenius, Rechac developed this feature in his own way, but his model seems to be Garzoni himself. Bzovius and Janssenius restored the Fanjeaux ladies to their traditional dignity as *matronae*, but Rechac follows Garzoni in calling them 'women' (*mulieres*, 'femmes'), and the plea which their spokeswoman makes to Dominic, after explaining the perplexity in which his preaching has left them, is similar in their two accounts:<sup>14</sup>

Garzoni	Rechac
Tu pater optime animum nostrum tanta suspicione libera.	S'il étoit possible, ô Pere, qu'il vous plût deliurer nôtre esprit de la perplexité dans laquelle vous l'avez reduit.

However, another detail comes ultimately from Galvano (Appendix I 20b). It was part of the traditional story that the hell-cat had 'linguam longam latamque atque sanguinolentam' (Rechac could have found this in Malvenda), but it was Galvano who added the extra touch, 'cum qua terram lingeat'; this was picked up by Flaminius and Castillo (Appendix I 32b and 35b), and also by Rechac ('dont il lêchoit la terre'). Before he visited Fanjeaux, Rechac evidently rejected Garzoni's conclusion to the story in favour of its traditional ending, as transmitted by Flaminius, Castillo and Malvenda: as he tells the story in VD 120-121, *some* of the converts became nuns at Prouille.

Since Constantine gathered Dominic's miracles into a systematic *tractatus de miraculis*, the Fanjeaux episode had no fixed place in the story of Dominic's life, but it was generally included well after the foundation of Prouille.<sup>15</sup> Bzovius, however, probably because of

<sup>14</sup> Bzovius simplifies the text to 'Tu porro animum nostrum elibera'; and Janssenius returns to older sources and substitutes 'Quapropter accessimus ad te, quo fluctuantibus pateat ipsa veritas'.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. Flaminius, Castillo, Malvenda (Appendix I 32, 35 and 37).

his confused chronology, situated it three years before his formal account of the founding of Prouille; in this he was followed by Janssenius (Appendix I 39), but, unlike Janssenius, he goes on immediately to comment that the Fanjeaux conversions helped Dominic convert other women, many of whom 'in monasterio Prulliani extracto conclusit' (Appendix I 38b). Since this is the first time Bzovius mentions Prouille, we could easily get the impression that the Fanjeaux converts were at least indirectly a factor in its foundation.

Rechac may have been inspired by Bzovius to juxtapose the founding of Prouille and the Fanjeaux conversions in VD 118-121; but, by placing the founding of Prouille first, he effectively ruled out any connection which might be inferred from Bzovius.

Rechac presumably knew Bzovius's published *Annales ecclesiastici*; but he also had access to a later compilation which is now lost: in 1629 the general chapter commissioned Bzovius to write a history of the order (MOPH XII 21); the task was unfinished when he died in 1637, but two manuscript volumes of his material were passed on to Rechac (AFP 2 [1932] 411, VD 5-6). His more specialist work on Dominican history may have led him to change his account of the Fanjeaux matrons, the foundation of Prouille, and the relationship between them; it is at any rate possible that he quoted Garzoni and other sources *in extenso*.<sup>16</sup> VD 118-121 may therefore be based on Bzovius's Dominican annals or on texts which were quoted there. Since these annals have disappeared, there is no way of knowing.

In any case, the story which Rechac tells in VD 197 is one which he learned at Fanjeaux, and, as Cambefort and Court show, it was inspired by the 1494 breviary;<sup>17</sup> but, of course, the breviary reading

<sup>16</sup> His *Annales sacri ordinis Praedicatorum* are described in QE II 491 as 'opus innumeris documentis antiquis locupletatum'.

<sup>17</sup> The editor of the 1487 breviary consciously provided a complete 'legenda' of Dominic (cf. MOPH XXVI 140), and I suspect that, as expanded in 1494, this was at first the only *vita* to which Cambefort had access (and he could almost certainly consult anything which the Fanjeaux Dominicans possessed); his acquaintance with primary sources available at Prouille came significantly later. He definitely used Sorbin's French translation of Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernai before VD, as well as Catel's *Histoire des comtes*, but neither of these said anything about the foundation of Prouille. I know of no evidence that he had seen Garzoni or Bzovius, but it is possible that there was a copy of the latter's published Annals at Fanjeaux, in which case the local understanding of the breviary's account of the Fanjeaux conversions may have been influenced by them; but that would not alter the fact that the breviary was the ultimate source of the story.

does not actually say that the Fanjeaux matrons were the *first* nuns of Prouille.

The date which Cambefort and Court give for the matrons' vestition undoubtedly reflects local tradition, but it combines two inherited elements. The belief that Prouille was founded in 1206 was enshrined in Gui's history of the foundation (Appendix I 17a), of which there was a copy at Prouille in the manuscript which Gui himself had presented to the monastery; there is no reason to dispute it.<sup>18</sup> Gui's prefatory letter to the nuns is dated 'anno incarnati uerbi .m.ccc.vii. in festo beati Ioannis apostoli et euangelistae, in quo festo beatus pater sanctus Dominicus sorores primo inclusit in monasterio Pruliani, sicut apud uos usque in praesentem diem successiue seniores iunioribus tradiderunt';<sup>19</sup> it may well be true that the nuns were first enclosed on 27 December; but, as M.H.Vicaire pointed out,<sup>20</sup> the year must be 1212, when the monastery buildings were completed, not 1206.

The primary sources for the Fanjeaux episode, Constantine and Stephen of Bourbon,<sup>21</sup> are both explicit that only some of the Fanjeaux converts became nuns at Prouille (Appendix I 6 and 7). It must therefore be admitted that the account of the foundation of Prouille which Rechac encountered when he visited the region rests squarely on a late fifteenth-century version of the story of the Fanjeaux matrons which contradicts the primary sources, arbitrarily linked to a mistaken interpretation of traditional data about when Prouille was founded; and there is some reason to believe that the connection had only been made fairly recently (cf. Appendix I introduction to 40).

<sup>18</sup> By 17 April 1207 there were *moniales*, with a prioress, to whom the archbishop of Narbonne could make a gift (Appendix II).

<sup>19</sup> Gui's original manuscript is lost, but the text of his letter is known from Carquet's memoir (AGOP XIV lib. K 765) and from Cambefort (LDP f.63<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>20</sup> *Histoire de Saint Dominique* (hereafter 'Histoire'), Paris 1982, I 258-268. Unless it is specified to the contrary, references are to this revised edition. The first edition ('Histoire<sup>h</sup>') was published in Paris in 1957.

<sup>21</sup> Constantine undoubtedly received an account of the episode among the material sent in by the province of Provence in response to the appeal of the 1245 general chapter (MOPH III 33.16-18). Stephen heard about it from Romeo, sometime provincial of Provence, but his narrative was patently influenced by that of the 'new legenda' (i.e. Constantine) to which he alludes—I do not know why J.C.Schmitt says that *legenda nova* 'certainly' refers to Humbert ('La parola addomesticata. San Domenico, il gatto e le donne di Fanjeaux', *Quaderni Storici* 41 [1979] 420); the only relevant textual difference between Humb. §52 and Const. §48-49 is that the former has *aliquam horam* where the latter has *horam aliquam*, and on this point Stephen agrees with Constantine.

Rechac's book did not at first make any impact outside France;<sup>22</sup> in France, though, his elaboration of the Fanjeaux story was adopted by Percin with some new refinements. Percin seems to have begun by believing that Prouille was founded in 1207, and it may just be due to a re-arrangement of his material to accommodate its foundation in 1206 that he gives priority to the nine Fanjeaux ladies (called 'matronae'). Their conversion 'increased' Dominic's desire to found a monastery (though Percin has not previously said anything about Dominic having such a desire), and it was followed by Dominic's choice and acquisition of a site for it at Prouille. They took up residence there on St Cecilia's day (22 November) 1206;<sup>23</sup> a makeshift monastery having been prepared, they were then enclosed on St John's day. The other two 'first nuns' (whom Rechac made Dominic's first recruits) entered in 1207; Percin does not indicate whether they too were converted heretics or whether, as Rechac implied, they had always been good Catholics.<sup>24</sup>

Percin's book was published just in time to allow T.Souèges to make some last-minute alterations to the life of Dominic included in the first August volume of *L'Année Dominicaine*, Amiens 1673, 153-525.<sup>25</sup> In his brief notice on Guillemine de Fanjeaux, the first prioress of Prouille, he simply follows Rechac: she was 'la fille aînée de son Pere saint Dominique', she and Messande are distinguished

<sup>22</sup> Nanni's account of the founding of Prouille (Appendix I 45) is based mainly on Castillo, and D.M. Marchese's on Nanni (Prouille was to be a refuge for 'pouere donzelle' whose parents' poverty put them at risk of being sold to heretics); Marchese also tells the usual story of the Fanjeaux matrons, some of whom, after their conversion, 'renunciorno al Mondo, rinchiudendosi Monache nel Monastero ... di Pruliano' (*Sagro Diario Domenicano* IV, Naples 1676, 327, 333). In his brief life of Dominic, F.Steil does not mention the foundation of Prouille; he gives a résumé of the conversion of the nine 'edle Damen' of Fanjeaux, but says nothing about any of them becoming nuns (*Ephemerides Dominicano-sacrae* II, Dillingen 1691).

<sup>23</sup> There is nothing about this in any writer before Percin. The date probably derives from a misunderstood marginal note at the head of Gui's *Fundatio Pruliani*, 'anno domini .m.ccc.vii. in festo Cecillie' (cf. MOPH XXIV 7). Gui's compilation of *Dominicana* is characterized by periodic notes indicating when he was writing (cf. MOPH XXII pp.VI-XVIII), and 22 Nov. 1307 was surely the date on which he finished revising the *Fundatio* after his visit to Prouille; while Percin still thought the monastery was founded in 1207 an inattentive reading of the note might have suggested that it reported when the nuns first settled at Prouille. After he came to believe that they were enclosed in December 1206, he obviously had to move the date back a year.

<sup>24</sup> J.J.Percin, *Monumenta conventus Tolosani*, Toulouse 1693, I 4 §16-17, 6 §27.

<sup>25</sup> On p.243 he gives a precise reference to *Monumenta* 'page 10 n.7', so there can be no doubt that he was using the published book.

from the nine converts (called 'Demoiselles'), and they all apparently received the habit together on St John's day 1206 (pp.68-69). The section on the founding of Prouille in the life of Dominic (pp.173-177) is full of echoes, not to say translations, of Percin. It was no doubt as a concession to him that this time Souèges gives priority to the Fanjeaux 'Demoiselles', whose 'vocation' as well as their revulsion against heresy was meant to be reinforced by the vision of the hell-cat; 'peu de jours après', he goes on, 'il en convertit deux autres, sçavoir les Soeurs Messane et Guillemine'—which implies that they too were converted from heresy.<sup>26</sup> It was these conversions which gave Dominic the idea of founding a monastery. Souèges does not say when the sisters first took up residence at Prouille, but he does imply that they received the habit before their enclosure on St John's day 1206.

Souèges includes in his story the text of two deeds which had first been published by Rechac to document Fulk's donation of the site at Prouille itself and the beginnings of the monastery's 'progrez temporel' (VD 198-199, 201). The first, dated 1211, refers to the Prouille chapel being made over at Dominic's request 'pro mulieribus conversis per Praedicatores ad praedicandum contra Haereticos ... delegatos'; the second is the gift which Archbishop Bérenger made in 1207 to 'priorissae et monialibus noviter conversis monitis et exemplis Fratris Dominici Oxomensis sociorumque eius'. As Souèges points out, the second deed is dated about four months 'après la clôture de ces Converties', and it is possible that the presence of *conversis* in both deeds encouraged him to make the Fanjeaux conversions the primary factor in the foundation of Prouille.

Échard followed Percin in making the Fanjeaux *matronae* the first to enter Prouille; they took up residence on St Cecilia's day and were enclosed on St John's day, being joined shortly afterwards ('paulo post') by 'Manenta' and Guillelmina. However, since Échard quotes Humbert §19 before this, we are left to infer that Dominic was already intending to found a monastery even before the Fanjeaux conversions. He also quotes the same two deeds as Souèges, remarking that they show the establishment of the monastery to have been, for all Diego's help and support, 'singulare Dominici opus ... qui foeminas illas convertit' (QE I 6-7).

<sup>26</sup> This implication is confirmed shortly afterwards when Souèges refers to Dominic's conversion of 'les onze premieres' and goes on to speak of 'autres hérétiques'.



Cuypers essentially followed Échard, though he acknowledged that Prouille was founded by Diego as well as Dominic;<sup>27</sup> but Loddi once again made the Fanjeaux conversions responsible for Dominic's idea of founding a monastery. When the site had been acquired, the nine 'Nobili Signore' moved there on St Cecilia's day and were enclosed on St John's day; 'Manenta' and Guglielmina joined them 'dopo poco tempo'. Loddi also included the two deeds, beginning with Bérenger's which he decided to quote 'poichè fa menzione della conversione delle predette Signore'.<sup>28</sup>

J.Vaissete returned to the traditional story, which he knew from Gui and Trevet (Appendix I 16 and 19), that Dominic's monastery was founded to provide for the education of girls who would otherwise be entrusted to the heretics: 'Saint Dominique, voulant remédier à un si grand mal, se chargea lui-même de pourvoir à l'instruction de ces filles. Il en rassembla un certain nombre, les joignit à quelques autres qu'il avoit converties à la foi catholique, et leur fit embrasser la profession religieuse avec la clôture perpetuelle etc.'.<sup>29</sup> Vaissete does not make the connection explicit, but the 'quelques autres' are presumably the Fanjeaux converts.<sup>30</sup>

Touron combined Vaissete's account with that of Échard. While accepting that the foundation of Prouille was inspired by the dangers to which the daughters of impoverished 'Gentilshommes' were exposed, he gave pride of place to the needs of those 'qui voudroient servir Dieu dans la retraite' but lacked the necessary dowry to become nuns; providing girls with a christian education came second. He therefore modified Vaissete's account of Dominic's first recruits, substituting would-be nuns for girls in need of an education: 'Outre plusieurs jeunes personnes qui se présenterent d'abord pour vivre dans la maison du Seigneur, le Saint en reçut quelques autres, qu'il avoit déjà converties à la foi catholique, en leur faisant embrasser à toutes la vie religieuse, avec la clôture perpetuelle'. Dominic offered these 'prémices de son apostolat' at the end of 1206 or the beginning

<sup>27</sup> *Acta Sanctorum, Aug. I*, Antwerp 1733, 401-402.

<sup>28</sup> Serafino M.Loddi, *Vita del glorioso patriarca S.Domenico*, Lucca 1727, 31-33.

<sup>29</sup> *Histoire générale de Languedoc III*, Paris 1737, 148; in the revised edition by Cl.Devic, Toulouse 1874-1892, VI 253.

<sup>30</sup> Vaissete took issue with Échard's chronology of the foundation of Prouille (III 559; rev. ed. VII i 44-45), but not with his involvement of the Fanjeaux converts in it.

of 1207<sup>31</sup> (Touron quietly drops the more precise dates furnished by Échard). Not recognizing them as the source of Vaissete's 'quelques autres', Touron re-introduced the Fanjeaux matrons ('Dames ou Demoiselles') at a slightly later stage: after their conversion, Dominic 'leur ouvrit les portes de son Monastere, et après les épreuves nécessaires, il les joignit à celles qui s'étoient consacrées les premieres à Dieu, dans la profession de la vie religieuse'; so they all became nuns at Prouille, but they were not themselves 'les premieres'.<sup>32</sup>

H.D.Cristianopulo went further in rejecting Échard's account. Pointing out that, according to the earliest sources, only *some* of the Fanjeaux converts entered Prouille and that they did so when the monastery was already in existence,<sup>33</sup> he returned unequivocally to the view that Prouille was founded for girls who would otherwise be entrusted to the heretics. 'Sic veterum fert auctoritas: adolescentularum caussa, quae propter rei domesticae inopiam magno salutis suae periculo haereticis institutoribus altioribusque uterentur, Dominico monasterii aedificandi innatam fuisse cupiditatem'. He does not even allow that there were any converts from heresy among the first recruits: in an evident allusion to (and implicit interpretation of) 'nouiter conuersis monitis et exemplis fratris Dominici oxomensis' in Bérenger's deed, he says that Dominic opened his monastery 'cum inuenisset feminas quae eius monitis hortationibusque parerent'.<sup>34</sup>

Cristianopulo's fellow Annalist, Pollidori, told much the same story except that, patently on the basis of a different understanding of *conuersis* in Bérenger's deed, he made out that all the first nuns

<sup>31</sup> Touron cites Bérenger's deed as evidence of the date, quoting the phrase identifying its beneficiaries ('à la Prieure et aux Religieuses, qui s'étoient nouvellement converties par les exhortations de Frere Dominique d'Osma ...'). He does not comment on 'converties', but the context rather suggests that he took it as 'converted from heresy'.

<sup>32</sup> A.Touron, *La vie de saint Dominique*, Paris 1739, 62-67.

<sup>33</sup> 'Veteres auctores ... ita docent: earum mulierum aliquas *apud sorores de Pruliano religionis habitum assumpsisse*. Qui vero *apud sorores de Pruliano habitum assumerent*, si *sorores* adhuc nullae Prulii erant?' (*qui* = 'how').

<sup>34</sup> T.Mamachi, *Annalium OP tomus I*, Rome 1756, 158-161. Alban Butler gave a similar account in the life of Dominic in *Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs and other principal Saints* first published in 1756-1759: Dominic was moved to found Prouille by the plight of 'children of Catholic parents'; it 'became a sanctuary to many ladies who desired to find a secure retreat from the corruption of the world, and a nursery of religion and piety for those who were afterward to encounter its dangers' (VIII 195 in the edition of Dublin-London 1833). There is no mention of any nuns being converts from heresy.

of Prouille were converts from heresy: 'Nel giorno di S.Giovanni Apostolo ed Evangelista ... introdusse nel nuovo Monastero ... parecchie di quelle donne che alle persuasive e alla vista del tenore di vita edificante di lui e degli altri predicatori eransi convertite alle Fede Cattolica'. They were later joined by some of the Fanjeaux converts.<sup>35</sup>

Melloni agreed with Cristianopulo that the first nuns of Prouille were Catholics, and that Dominic's intention was to establish a 'college or monastery' to provide for the daughters of impoverished 'gentiluomini'; the Fanjeaux converts came later, but, in spite of his reference to the *Annales*, Melloni has them all enter Prouille ('le fiddò alle Suore di Prulliano, dove poi professarono anch'esse i voti di Religione').<sup>36</sup>

Cristianopulo's account re-appears in its fulness in Lacordaire, with Prouille as 'un monastère destiné à recueillir les jeunes filles catholiques que la naissance et la pauvreté exposaient aux pièges de l'erreur'; on 27 Dec. 1206 'Dominique eut la joie d'ouvrir les portes de Notre-Dame-de-Prouille à plusieurs dames et demoiselles qui avaiant souhaité se consacrer à Dieu entre ses mains'. Subsequently some of the Fanjeaux converts joined the community ('plusieurs même d'entre elles se consacrèrent à Dieu dans le monastère de Prouille').<sup>37</sup> But then the tide turned again.

In her first *Life of Saint Dominic*, Mother Drane accepted that Dominic's aim was to provide for the daughters of impoverished nobility by founding 'a monastery where, within the protection of strict enclosure, and under the charge of a few holy women whom he gathered together ..., these children might be nurtured under the Church's shadow'. In the outcome, though, the founding community consisted simply of the nine Fanjeaux converts, followed shortly by 'two noble ladies of Catholic families', including 'Guillemette de Fanjeaux' who, 'though the last to receive the habit, was chosen by Dominic as their Superior'.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>35</sup> F.M.Pollidori, *Vita di S.Domenico*, Rome 1777, 21-23, 26.

<sup>36</sup> G.B.Melloni, *Atti o memorie degli uomini illustri in santità nati o morti in Bologna*, classe I, volume II, Bologna 1788, 122-123; *Vita di S.Domenico*, Naples 1791, 17.

<sup>37</sup> H.D.Lacordaire, *Vie de saint Dominique*, Paris 1841, 61-66; ed. A.Duval, Paris 1889, 55-59.

<sup>38</sup> A.T.Drane, *Life of St Dominic with a sketch of the Dominican Order*, London 1857, 19-20 (the first edition was anonymous, but the author's name appears in later editions). The same story is repeated at greater length in her more substantial *History of St Dominic*, London 1891, 48, 52-53 (and this time it is even more explicit that

M.A.Potton claimed that Rechac was the main source of what he said about the beginnings of Prouille, but all that he actually took from him was a reference to the 'signe miraculeux' which allegedly prompted Dominic to choose Prouille as the site of his monastery; he ignores the supposed rôle of the Fanjeaux converts and describes the foundation as motivated by Dominic's desire to provide 'un asile assuré pour les jeunes filles que leurs parents, trop pauvres, étaient plus exposés à voir séduire par les hérétiques'.<sup>39</sup>

Potton's contemporary, Balme,<sup>40</sup> did essentially go back to Rechac's story as modified by Percin and Souèges, though he added twists of his own to reconcile it with Jordan on one side and Constantine on the other. He used the tradition derived from Jordan, enriched with evidence from inquisition records, to explain the context in which Prouille was founded (impoverished nobility entrusting their daughters to heretics), but not the actual decision to found a monastery. This was prompted by the conversion of the Fanjeaux matrons—whom Balme turns into 'jeunes Croyantes élevées chez les Parfaites de Fanjeaux' to fit them into the perspective inherited from Jordan. Having converted them, Dominic started worrying about their future, and it occurred to him that it would be a good thing to found a monastery for people like them to shield them from 'returning to their vomit'. He got the church of Prouille put at his disposal and, on St John's day 1206, the first nuns made their profession there, namely the nine Fanjeaux converts and two other noble women, including the first prioress. Balme was aware that Constantine says that *some* of the converts became nuns, so, ignoring the fact that Constantine also says that there were nine converts in all, he makes out that the nine who became nuns were only some of the converts.<sup>41</sup>

The editors of *Gallia Christiana* simply quoted Gui's *De Fundatione* to explain the foundation of Prouille; but they also published for the first time a purported deed from 1206 in which Fulk made over the church there for the use of women converted by

---

the nine converted Fanjeaux matrons were the first to become nuns at Prouille, and that the other two joined them later). A French translation of the *History* was published in Paris in 1893.

<sup>39</sup> *Constitutions des Soeurs Dominicaines du second ordre*, 2nd ed., Paris 1878. I have not seen the first edition, published in 1864.

<sup>40</sup> Potton made his profession at Flavigny in 1851 (I.Body, *Le R.P.Potton*, Paris 1901, 19-20), Balme in 1852 (ASOP 4 [1899-1900] 524).

<sup>41</sup> F.Balme-P.Lelaidier, *Cartulaire ou histoire diplomatique de Saint Dominique*, Paris 1893-1901, I 130-142.

the anti-heretical preachers (XIII i 315-316, ii 247). Balme cited this as well as Bérenger's deed in confirmation of 'la conversion des femmes hérétiques devenues les premières soeurs du nouveau monastère' (Balme-Lelaidier I 150-151, 157); he also provided a new edition of Fulk's deed of May 1211 (first published by Rechac) giving the church of Bram to the *dominae conversae* of Prouille (Balme draws attention to the phrase, *ibid.* I 231-232, 234), and he edited from Cambefort LDP f.35<sup>v</sup> a longer version of the 1211 donation of Prouille than the one quoted by Rechac (*ibid.* I 266-267).

Balme and his documentation gave a new lease of life to the idea that the nine Fanjeaux converts were the first nuns of Prouille; Mandonnet even followed him in turning them into 'nine of the Fanjeaux converts'.<sup>42</sup> But his position did not go unchallenged.

Scheeben dismissed the whole story, preferring to interpret the foundation of Prouille as another example of Diego's tactic 'die Häretiker mit ihren eigenen Methoden zu schlagen'. In his view, although Prouille was turned into a monastery within a few years, it was not originally founded as such; it was to be 'a mission-station with missionaries and mission-sisters', the sisters forming a 'religiösen Verein' or 'Laienapostolat' whose chief task was to provide a Catholic equivalent to the girls' 'boarding schools' ('Internate') run by heretical women. For this it would be absurd to rely on recent converts from heresy, and the reference to 'nuns converted by Dominic' in Bérenger's deed cannot be used to suggest that the 'women who responded to the call of Dominic and his fellow-workers' were ex-heretics: 'Der Ausdruck Bekehrung bedeutet hier offenbar die Gewinnung für ein religiöses Unternehmen, wie man auch die Wahl des Ordensberufes als Bekehrung auffaßte'.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>42</sup> E.g. *Histoire du Monastère de Notre-Dame de Prouille*, (Prouille) 1898, 2-9; J.Guiraud, *Saint Dominique*, Paris 1901, 57-61; A.Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux I*, Paris 1903, 11-13; Guiraud, *Cartulaire de Prouille*, Paris 1907, I cccxxii, cccxxvi; B.Kirsch-H.S.Roman, *Pèlerinages dominicains*, Lille-Paris 1920, 121; P.Mandonnet, *Saint Dominique*, Gent 1921, 37; (implicitly) A.Bacic, 'Chronotaxis vitae S.Dominici', in *Miscellanea Dominicana*, Rome 1923, 2; B.Jarrett, *Life of St Dominic*, London 1924, 37-40; J.Girou, *Saint Dominique*, Paris 1959, 85-89; M.J.Dorcy, *Saint Dominic*, St Louis 1959, repr. Rockford Il. 1982, 19; eadem, *Saint Dominic's family*, Dubuque 1964, 4; John Cumming, ed., *Lives of the Saints, August*, Tunbridge Wells 1998, 57-58 (though this work is presented as a revision of Butler's *Lives*, the account of Prouille owes nothing to Butler's original text); R.Spiazzi, *San Domenico di Guzman*, Bologna 1999, 97-101.

<sup>43</sup> H.C.Scheeben, *Der heilige Dominikus*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1927, 67-74; he does not just reject the identification of the Fanjeaux converts with the first nuns of Prouille, he dismisses the whole story of their conversion as a 'reichlich phantastische

Apart from this general attack on Balme's story, two of its ingredients were specifically targeted: Altaner repeated Cristianopulo's objection that according to Constantine only some of the Fanjeaux converts became nuns at Prouille, and they were not the first;<sup>44</sup> and Scheeben denied the authenticity of the 1206 donation of the church of Prouille (AFP 2 [1932] 291-293).

When Vicaire re-issued Mandonnet's *Saint Dominique* with the scholarly apparatus which the original edition lacked, he could scarcely hope to defend Mandonnet's account of the foundation of Prouille as it stood.<sup>45</sup> He admitted the inauthenticity of the supposed deed of 1206, and he dropped the Fanjeaux matrons from the story;<sup>46</sup> but he insisted, against Scheeben, that Prouille was from the outset meant to be a proper monastery,<sup>47</sup> and that it was for adult converts from heresy.

Like Rechac, Vicaire had to find a way of reconciling his theory with the tradition based ultimately on Jordan. He complicates things for himself by mistranslating *feminarum* in *Lib.* §27 as 'filles', but he soon turns them into 'apprenties "parfaites"' for whom Prouille, precisely as a monastery, could provide the opportunity to fulfil their religious aspirations as Catholic nuns.

As a monastery, not 'un simple hospice' or, as Scheeben would have it, a 'boarding school', it would not seem to matter very much whether Prouille accepted young girls as 'apprenties moniales' or not; but Vicaire set his face against them: 'Prouille ne veut recevoir, en principe, que des adultes, ou tout au moins, de grandes filles propres à devenir des religieuses'. This is said to be in line with 'les conceptions régulières contemporaines', and Vicaire supports it with three observations.

His first point is that 'nous ne voyons jamais mentionné dans les textes un autre élément que les converties, ou moniales, ou

---

Legende' (434-435 note 134). His account of Prouille was followed by A.Walz, *Compendium historiae Ordinis Praedicatorum*, Rome 1930, 5 (also revised edition, Rome 1948, 6), O.Decker, QF 31 (1935) 33-36, and J.M.Vesely, *Il Secondo Ordine di San Domenico*, Bologna 1943, 16.

<sup>44</sup> B.Altaner, *Der hl. Dominikus*, Breslau 1922, 36-37.

<sup>45</sup> P.Mandonnet-M.H.Vicaire, *Saint Dominique*, Paris 1938, I 99-104.

<sup>46</sup> He allowed that 'one or two' of the Fanjeaux converts may have entered Prouille as Constantine claims, 'bien qu'on soit tenté de ne voir dans cette affirmation qu'une combinaison légendaire'.

<sup>47</sup> With good reason. Jordan's reference to Diego founding a *monasterium* might be dismissed as anachronistic (even on Scheeben's theory, Prouille was a *monasterium* by 1217, when Jordan's informants set off for Paris); but *moniales* in Bérenger's deed cannot plausibly be taken to mean anything other than 'nuns', so by April 1207 Prouille was at least a monastery in the making.

soeurs'; this is an overstatement, since *fratres* and *donati* are also mentioned, but the main difficulty is that the surviving early documents concerning Prouille are few and not of a kind which would require any mention of young girls even if the monastery was bursting with them.

Secondly, 'l'ancienne règle de Prouille' states that 'we are not in the habit of receiving girls under the age of eleven'; the reference is to a declaration in the *Institutiones sancti Sixti* whose first-person formulation shows that it is not even part of the original text of the *Institutiones*, let alone any putative 'Rule of Prouille'.<sup>48</sup>

Thirdly, 'les autres règles contemporaines' are said to contain equivalent measures against filling monasteries with young children; this is apparently inspired by Balme's notes on the relevant part of the *Institutiones* (Balme-Lelaidier II 431-432; cf. *Histoire* I 260), but the texts cited there are little to the point: the Gilbertines (who were scarcely known outside England anyway)<sup>49</sup> do not support his contention,<sup>50</sup> and the setting of a minimum age for receiving boys into an order is doubtfully relevant to girls and in any case it does not of itself preclude the presence of younger children in the monastery,<sup>51</sup> the Cistercians forbade the education of boys who were

<sup>48</sup> Ed. A.Simon, *L'Ordre des Pénitentes de Sainte Marie-Madeleine*, Fribourg 1918, 145. I am preparing a critical edition of the *Institutiones* in which I shall attempt to disentangle the elements which go back to the original San Sisto text (of which there is no known manuscript) and whether all or any of them go back to the constitutions of Prouille (if any).

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Brian Golding, *Gilbert of Sempringham and the Gilbertine Order c.1130-c.1300*, Oxford 1995, 256.

<sup>50</sup> Balme quotes from their constitutions (edited in W.Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum* VI ii, London 1830), 'Non admittatur aliqua in monialem minus quam plene duodecim annos etatis habens' (Oxford, Bodleian Library Douce 136 f.73'; ed. cit. lxxxvi\*); but this ignores the preceding reference to 'paruulis nondum nouiciis' (f.73', ed. cit. \*lxxxv). The author of the most recent study on Sempringham draws attention to evidence suggesting that some girls were received at a very early age, and that, at least in the early thirteenth century, the nuns were in effect running 'schools' even for girls who were not intended to join the order (Golding, *Gilbert of Sempringham* 139-141).

<sup>51</sup> Balme cites 'the ancient Praemonstratensian constitutions': IV 3 in the mid and late 12th-century customary contains the regulation 'Pueri non recipiantur nisi .xv. annorum fuerint' (Clm 7702 f.89', ed. Pl.F.Lefèvre - W.M.Grauwen, *Les statuts de Prémontré au milieu du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Averbode 1978, 46; BNF lat. 14762 f.237', ed. E.Martène, *De antiquis ritibus* III, Bassano 1788, 334). But this refers to boys being received *into the order*, as can be seen from the fact that by 1222-1223 it had been suppressed in favour of a new text at the beginning of I 16, 'Nouicii cum suscipiendi fuerint recipiantur decem et octo annorum ad minus' (Glasgow, Mitchell lib. 308892 f.11, ed. B.Krings 'Das Ordensrecht der Prämonstratenser', *Analecta Praemonstratensia*

not monks or novices,<sup>52</sup> but their nuns—who were well represented in Languedoc (CdF 23 [1988] 306-308)—evidently followed a different practice.<sup>53</sup> Fontevraud also had a strong presence in Languedoc (CdF 23 [1988] 305-306), and it was clearly taken for granted that the nuns would have pupils in their care.<sup>54</sup>

The case against the presence of young girls at Prouille, either as pupils or as 'apprentice nuns', is thus not proven.<sup>55</sup>

With the Fanjeaux matrons and the 1206 deed out of the picture, Vicair had to rely on Bérenger's reference to 'moniales récemment converties' as proof that the initial community of Prouille consisted

---

69 [1993] 151); the revision from the late 1230s increased the minimum age: 'Nullus abbatum de cetero recipiat aliquem in canonicum uel conuersum qui uicesimum etatis sue annum non egerit' (BNF lat. 9752 f.9<sup>r</sup>, ed. Pl.F.Lefèvre, *Les statuts de Prémontré réformés sur les ordres de Grégoire IX et d'Innocent IV*, Louvain 1946, 27). That this did not preclude the presence of *pueri* in the monastery is shown by the retention of the clause in I 6 allowing *pueri* to have mixt after terce (Glasgow f.6, BNF 9752 f.5<sup>r</sup>; Krings 143, Lefèvre 13). Balme also cites 'Nullus recipiatur infra .xviii. annos' from the Dominicans' primitive constitutions (I 14; ed. A.H.Thomas, *De oudste Constituties van de Dominicanen*, Louvain 1965, 325), but this too refers to reception into the order, and it did not prevent the brethren from taking 'pueri seculares' under their wing at least from the mid thirteenth century onwards (cf. M.M.Mulchahey, "First the bow is bent in study ..." *Dominican education before 1350*, Toronto 1998, 85-97).

<sup>52</sup> Balme quotes the Cistercian *Usus* to this effect, with its rider that no one under the age of 15 was to be accepted as a novice (cf. *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis* 6 [1950] 37).

<sup>53</sup> Simon de Montfort's daughter Petronilla was entrusted to their monastery of Saint-Antoine in Paris in 1222 when she was significantly less than twelve, with the option of becoming a nun in due course if she wanted (AFP 73 [2003] 60). The only restriction which the order came to impose was that girls were not meant to be received until they were ten—this seems to be presupposed by a ruling of the 1287 general chapter, as is the practice of receiving *puellae*: 'De conservatoribus et de receptionibus puellarum ante decennium non faciendis, et de hiis quae ipsarum puellarum intuitu data fuerint monasteriis seu oblata qualiter expendantur, patrum abbatum dispositioni totaliter committatur auctoritate capituli generalis' (J.M.Canivez, *Statuta capitulorum generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis* III, Louvain 1935, 239).

<sup>54</sup> Cf. *Regulae* 17 (PL 162:1080), where *nutriciae* are distinguished from *iuvenes claustrales*. In his will of 30 March 1228 Bernard-Jourdain, son of Jourdain de l'Isle, left 300s to go with his unborn child, should it be a girl, to the Fontevriste nuns of Lespinasse, 'et fiat et stet ibi monacha' (*Hist. gén. de Languedoc*, rev. ed. VIII 751-752); I doubt whether he meant the implementation of this to wait until she was old enough to take the veil.

<sup>55</sup> Humbert of Romans plainly considered it normal for girls to be brought up in nunneries: he provided *materia praedicabilis* for a sermon 'ad puellas que nutriuntur in monasteriis monialium', beginning 'Quedam puella uirgines solent enutriri in monasteriis monialium' (*De erud. praed.* VII ix 1.52).



of ex-heretics. He acknowledged that *converti* had long been used to refer to people becoming religious, but maintained that this cannot be the meaning of *conversae* in Bérenger's deed: 'En Albigeois, à cette époque, la conversion peut à la rigueur signifier à la fois l'entrée en religion ou la conversion de l'hérésie; toutefois, étant données les circonstances, il est bien évident que le deuxième sens s'impose presque de lui-même'. However, it is far from obvious that this really is the more natural interpretation of Bérenger's phrase unless we already have some other reason to favour it.

The beneficiaries of Bérenger's donation (Appendix II) could not be identified in the usual way by reference to their monastery or even to the church of Prouille, since some of them were living in a private house in Fanjeaux; in addition to indicating their residence 'in castro Fanoious et in ecclesia beatae Mariae de Pruliano' he therefore specified even more precisely that they were the nuns who had recently been 'converted' by Dominic and co. Coming as it does immediately after *monialibus*, 'conuersis monitis et exemplis fratris Dominici ...' is most naturally taken to mean that they were inspired to become nuns by Dominic and co., just as Clare became a nun, six years after Francis's *conversio*, 'sancti viri monitis ad Deum *conversa*' (1 Celano 18, AF X 17); after the first few nuns took up residence at S.Agneşe in Bologna, 'fratres predicantes per Lombardiam et marchiam *conuertebant* dominas ac earum collegio sociare curabant' (AFP 70 [2000] 90). This use of *converti* was well-established in the vocabulary of the universal church;<sup>56</sup> there is no reason to suppose that it lost currency in Languedoc just because there were heretics there who needed converting in a different sense.

In support of his contention that *conuersus* would most naturally be understood to mean 'converted from heresy', Vicaire appeals to 'les chartes et les récits dominicains de cette période' which, he says, only use the word 'avec cette valeur précise de conversion du pécheur, retour à la foi de l'hérétique ou de l'égaré';

<sup>56</sup> All collections of decretals contain a chapter 'De conversione coniugatorum' (married people becoming religious) (Æ.Friedberg, *Quinque compilationes antiquae*, repr. Graz 1956, 39, 86, 124, 143, 176; id., *Corpus iuris canonici*, repr. Graz 1959, II 579); a religious house's right to receive people *ad conversionem* was guaranteed by the standard bull *Religiosam vitam* (e.g. MOPH XXV no. 77.64-66). *Ordo conversionis* means the order of seniority in religious life (e.g. *Anal. S.Ord. Cist.* 6 [1950] 92), coming *ad conversionem* means entering religious life (e.g. Lefèvre-Grauven, *Statuts de Prémontré ...* IV 4), *noviter conuersus* means a novice (e.g. J.Sieglwart, ed., *Die Consuetudines des Augustiner-Chorherrenstiftes Marbach im Elsass*, Fribourg 1965, 103 §4).

this 'valeur' is less 'précise' than the one required to support his hypothesis, and the texts he cites do nothing to show that it was the preponderant connotation of the word, let alone that even in the context of people becoming religious it would of itself suggest 'converted from heresy'.<sup>57</sup>

He is on slightly firmer ground in using later Prouille deeds to clarify what Bérenger meant by *conuersis* in 1207. The 1211 donation of the church of Prouille refers specifically to women 'conuerties par les prédicateurs délégués pour prêcher contre les hérétiques', which, on the face of it, implies that they were converted from heresy—though the apparent implication would be nullified if we knew that the anti-heretical preachers needed to recruit Catholic ladies to staff a monastery where girls could be educated who would otherwise be entrusted to heretical households. In the same year Fulk gave the church of Bram 'dominabus conuersis religiose uiuentibus' at Prouille (MOPH XXV no. 11). Vicaire exaggerates in saying that this distinguishes sharply between their conversion from heresy

---

<sup>57</sup> Of the texts he cites, *Lib.* §17 and Ferr. §12 refer to Diego's desire to convert Cumans, Languedoc canonization process §23 to women 'ab errore conuersis', Ferr. §11 to Dominic's 'conversion' of the Toulouse host 'to the Catholic faith' (in *Lib.* §15, be it noticed, Jordan uses *reduxit* rather than *conuertit*), Ferr. §21 to Dominic being reserved by God 'ad ... animarum quamplurimarum conuersionem' (where *conuersio* is used in a general sense applicable to the task of any preacher), Const. §48-49 to the 'conversion' of the Fanjeaux matrons (but in Const. §30, 52 and 58, *conuersio* is also used of the 'conversion' of Reginald, Ugo de Sexto and Conrad to religious life); the passages cited from Balme are Dominic's reconciliation of Pons Roger (MOPH XXV no. 8) and extracts from inquisition records. MOPH XV nos. 67 and 78 (MOPH XXV nos. 64 and 80) raise the same questions as *conuersis* in Bérenger's deed; in all the other instances the context excludes the meaning 'conversion to religious life'. In support of Vicaire it might be noted that Jordan and Ferrandus do not use *conuertit* where they might have done in connection with 'conversions' to religious life (*Lib.* §56-57, 72; Ferr. §33-34); but this does not prove that they refrained from doing so because the word would necessarily have suggested something else. If anything, it would be safer to infer the opposite from the fact that in the inquisition records cited from Balme, where the context should have been sufficient to indicate what was meant by *conuertit*, the word is only used once on its own to mean 'converted from heresy', and even there *conuersi* is combined with *reconciliati* (Balme-Lelaidier I 471; Toulouse 609 f.179<sup>v</sup>); in every other case (and in all the others which I have noted from Toulouse 609, though I have not examined the whole manuscript) there is some phrase indicating conversion to the Catholic faith (Toulouse 609 ff.22<sup>r</sup>, 22<sup>v</sup>, 179<sup>r</sup>, 183<sup>v</sup>, 184<sup>r</sup>, 251<sup>v</sup>). In Pons Roger's letter of reconciliation, where again the context ought to suffice, *conuersum* is filled out as 'ab hereticorum secta conuersum'. Similarly in Pelhisson's history of the first Dominican inquisitors, the two converts from heresy whom he mentions are both described as 'conuersus ab heresi' (ed. J.Duvernoy, *Guillaume Pelhisson, Chronique*, Paris 1994, 54, 92).

(*conversis*) and their religious life (*religiose viventibus*), but it is true that *conversis* appears to be otiose before *religiose viventibus* if it only means 'converted to religious life'; however, the terms of the donation—granting a life-interest to named individuals—suggest that Fulk did not regard these ladies as constituting a regular monastic institution, so *conversis religiose viventibus* could just be a cumbersome way of identifying the status of women who have been converted from secular life and are living 'religiously' but are not formally religious.

In 1954 R.J.Loenertz undermined Vicaire's argument by showing that the 1211 donation of the church of Prouille was as inauthentic as that of 1206 (AFP 24 [1954] 37-47). When he returned to the fray in 1957, Vicaire tried to salvage something by claiming that Loenertz nevertheless 'remarque que ces faux ont été établis à partir d'une donnée littéraire' (*Histoire* I 244 n.44), but Loenertz does not say anything of the kind.

Vicaire's argument against Prouille receiving young girls is the same as before, except that he refers in rather more cautious terms than before to the 'rule of San Sisto' (*ibid.* I 259-260); and he now quotes *Lib.* §27 in Latin, and Jordan's *feminae* are interpreted as 'dames ou filles nobles' (*ibid.* I 242).

He was as determined as ever to distance the Fanjeaux matrons from the foundation of Prouille.<sup>58</sup> So, thanks to Loenertz, the evidence that it was founded as an 'oeuvre de converties'<sup>59</sup>—which, Vicaire now adds, does not necessarily mean that all the nuns were converts (*ibid.* I 249)—is reduced to the phrase *monialibus conversis* ... in Bérenger's charter and *dominabus conversis* in MOPH XXV no. 11. Vicaire refers back to his earlier discussion to justify interpreting *conversae* as 'converted from heresy', tacitly ignoring the broader significance which he allowed the word there (*ibid.* I 249 n.77); but shortly afterwards he wrecks his own argument by maintaining that the *dominae conversae* of MOPH XXV nos. 64 and 80 were converted prostitutes (*ibid.* I 330): if *conversae* can mean this in Toulouse in 1215, why are we obliged to interpret it as 'converts from heresy' with reference to Prouille in 1207 and 1211? All said, Vicaire's case is rather less proven than it was in 1938.

<sup>58</sup> The most he would concede is that some of them *may* have entered Prouille, but the monastery 'existait avant leur aventure' (*ibid.* I 250).

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.* I 220; the phrase was perhaps inspired by Guiraud's 'oeuvre des Nouvelles Converties' (*Saint Dominique* 58).

Nevertheless, it has generally been accepted in Vicairé's wake that Prouille was founded as a monastery for converts from heresy,<sup>60</sup> though 'jeunes filles' have shown a tendency to creep back into the picture.<sup>61</sup> All the same, the older tradition, that Prouille was envisaged as an asylum for girls at risk of heresy, still has its adherents,<sup>62</sup> and Scheeben's doctrine re-appears from time to time,<sup>63</sup> V.J.Koudelka offered his own, rather more nuanced, account,<sup>64</sup> and

<sup>60</sup> E.g. W.A.Hinnebusch, *History of the Dominican Order I*, Staten Island 1965, 25; J.Dureau, *Den helige Dominikus*, Stockholm 1969, 12; L.K.Little, *Religious poverty and the profit economy in medieval Europe*, Ithaca 1983, 155; K.Thomell, *Dominikus*, Uppsala 1983, 42; A.D'Amato, *L'ordine dei Frati Predicatori*, Rome 1983, 16-17; M.A.Abós, in *Domingo de Guzmán*, Valencia 1986, 104-105; L.Galmés-V.T.Gómez, *Santo Domingo de Guzmán*, Madrid 1987, 26; J.R.Bouchet, *Saint Dominique*, Paris 1988, 33-34; M.Joulin, *Petite vie de saint Dominique*, Paris 1989, 59-60; C.Morris, *The papal monarchy*, Oxford 1989, 445; B.Ashley, *The Dominicans*, Collegeville 1990, 6; L.Galmés, in *Religiosas Dominicanas de Clausura*, Valencia 1992, 13; M.Lohrum, *Dominikus*, 2nd ed. Leipzig 1992, 33; R.Sconamiglio, Το φωτεινό πρόσωπο του Αγίου Δομνίκου, Athens 1996, 45-46; P.Lippini, *San Domenico visto dai suoi contemporanei*, rev. ed. Bologna 1998, 96-97; P.Tourault, *Saint Dominique face aux Cathares*, Paris 1999, 122; R.Sickert, in G.Melville-J.Oberste, *Die Bettelorden im Aufbau*, Münster 1999, 297; P.Épinoux, in J.Berlioz, ed., *Le Pays cathare*, Paris 2000, 105-106.

<sup>61</sup> E.g. L.A.Redigonda, *Secoli Domenicani*, Bologna 1967, 6-7 (the nuns were to educate 'ragazze'); É.Griffe, *Le Languedoc cathare de 1190 à 1210*, Paris 1971, 265 (the monastery was to harbour 'les jeunes filles converties de l'hérésie ou en danger d'être attirées dans les maisons des parfaites'); E.Cacciato, *San Domenico di Guzman*, Rome 1979, 57-59; G.Bedouelle, *Dominique ou la grâce de la parole*, Paris 1982, 73; A.D'Amato, *Domenico di Guzman*, Bologna 1992, 36; M.D.Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, London 1977, 98-99; id., *The Cathars*, Oxford 1998, 101 (Prouille was an 'hospice-nunnery'); Cumming, *Lives of the Saints*, August 57-58; P.B.Halvorsen, *Dominikus*, Oslo 2002, 102-103 ('Det dreier seg i første rekke om å forsørge fattige adelspiker som de katolske misjonærene hadde lyktes i å fravriste katarene', 'It was in the first place a matter of providing for poor noble girls whom the Catholic missionaries had succeeded in wresting from the Cathars').

<sup>62</sup> E.g. C.Thouzellier, *Catharisme et valdésisme en Languedoc* (1966), rev. ed. Louvain-Paris 1969, 200; M.Goodich, *Vita perfecta*, Stuttgart 1982, 179; M.Costen, *The Cathars and the Albigensian crusade*, Manchester 1997, 114.

<sup>63</sup> Scheeben himself re-affirmed it in *Der heilige Dominikus*, Essen 1961, 47-48, and it is essentially his theory which is followed by L.A.Redigonda in *Dizionario degli Istituti di Perfezione III*, Rome 1976, 781; it is repeated by R.Butz, on Decker's authority, in Melville-Oberste, *Die Bettelorden im Aufbau* 529.

<sup>64</sup> Prouille was 'un monastero di donne con diversi compiti', such as setting an example of Catholic 'perfection' to heretical women, and providing material assistance to the preachers (*Bibliotheca Sanctorum IV*, Rome 1964, repr. 1987, 698). Dominic 'gewann ... von Anfang an Frauen für die Nachfolge Christi, unter denen sicher auch vom Irrglauben Bekehrte waren'; for them the monastery of Prouille was founded, whose rôle at first was similar to that of Albigensian 'hospices', 'nämlich materielle Unterstützung der Wanderprediger und wahrscheinlich auch Aufnahme von Frauen und Mädchen, die durch die Irrlehre gefährdet waren' (*Dominikus*, Olten 1983, 184).

Schmitt, clearly dissatisfied with all the available interpretations, declared that 'si ignora in quali circostanze' Prouille was founded ('La parola addomesticata' 420),

Of the main theories on offer, one dominates the medieval texts which count as sources for later historians, but it derives entirely from a dubious understanding of *Lib.* §27; the other has been progressively deprived of its props until only two deeds remain which cannot support it on their own.

N.M.Schulman has recently attempted to re-examine the foundation of Prouille from scratch.<sup>65</sup> He re-opens several important questions, such as the meaning of *conversus*, the legitimacy of using the 'deeds' which Loenertz dismissed as inauthentic, and whether Prouille was originally intended to be a monastery. He credits Fulk with realizing the value of orthodox alternatives to heretical forms of 'religious life'<sup>66</sup>—it was this which 'led him to assist in the creation' of Prouille; however, Schulman refuses to accept that Prouille was founded for converts from heresy or that its first recruits were all ex-heretics.

Schulman's desire for a re-appraisal of the evidence is welcome, but his study of the sources is too perfunctory to yield more than rather arbitrary judgements on previous accounts of Prouille. On one point, though, he is certainly correct: Loenertz has not said the last word on the fake 'deeds' of 1206 and 1211.

## 2. *Inauthentic deeds with authentic sources*

In his article, 'Archives de Prouille', largely devoted to what we can learn from Cambefort about the monastery's lost cartulary,<sup>67</sup> Loenertz edited and discussed 'trois documents suspects' (AFP 24 [1954] 37-47).

<sup>65</sup> *Where troubadours were bishops, the Occitania of Folc of Marseille*, New York 2001, 75-77.

<sup>66</sup> Apart from Prouille, his only evidence is the case of Peire Raimon de Cuq: 'Since Peire clearly was accustomed to a regulated communal life of devotion, Folc urged him to become a hospitaller; the Hospital would provide him with an orthodox outlet for his religious nature'. But the source which he indicates for this merely says that Peire 'fuit reconciliatus per dominum Fulconem episcopum tholosanum et fecit se hospitalarium' (Toulouse 609 f.97"); there is nothing to show that he became a hospitaller at Fulk's instigation.

<sup>67</sup> This seems to be the least inaccurate designation, though Cambefort prefers 'bullaire' and Rechac uses several terms including 'terrier'.

The last of these is a deed from 1214, in which Fulk gave the tithes and firstfruits of the church of Fanjeaux to the nuns of Prouille. The text comes from Rechac (VD 204) and Cambefort (LDP f.36<sup>r</sup>); neither indicates its source, but in Loenertz's view it was 'undoubtedly' taken from the cartulary. He denies its authenticity on the grounds that it is incompatible with Fulk's gift of the same church to the brethren in 1221 complete with its tithes and firstfruits (MOPH XXV no. 153), and that it was unusual, perhaps uncanonical, to give away the revenues of a church without making provision for the support of its priest. Though he frequently complains about Rechac's 'defective and incomplete' transcriptions of documents,<sup>68</sup> it apparently never occurred to him that the 'deed' in question is just a typically inaccurate version of the genuine deed in which Fulk gave the nuns *some* of the tithes and firstfruits of Fanjeaux (MOPH XXV no. 58); but that is certainly what it is, whether or not Rechac's source was the cartulary.<sup>69</sup> So it is misleading to claim that his text as it stands was taken from the Prouille cartulary.<sup>70</sup>

The other two suspect documents are really three, all purporting to record Fulk's gift of the church of Our Lady, Prouille, to or for the women who were living there 'religiously'. So that we shall know what we are talking about, I re-edit them all here.

A. The text comes from Rechac, who describes it as 'le premier contrat de donation que Foulques Euéque de Toulouze fit a Saint Dominique de la Chappelle de Prouille'; he says that it was 'au 2. feuillet du premier Terrier en la premiere colonne' (VD 198-199).<sup>71</sup>

<sup>68</sup> Cf. his comments on nos. 1, 20, 50 and 97 of his catalogue of the 'chartes' contained in LDP.

<sup>69</sup> The fact that the opening is different—with 'hanc cartam legentibus siue audientibus' after 'notum sit omnibus praesentibus et futuris'—does not prove that it is a different document. In all probability, Rechac's note originally just had 'notum sit omnibus etc.' (as in the deeds printed in VD 201 and 205), and on this occasion he decided to fill out 'etc.' with the help of other deeds ('hanc cartam legentibus siue audientibus' is found in VD 198, and the same formula, with *vel* instead of *siue*, is found in VD 202 and 203).

<sup>70</sup> In addition to Rechac's version, Cambefort ended up with two copies of the complete text of MOPH XXV no. 58 (LDP f.35<sup>v</sup>), seemingly taken from two different sources, one of which was almost certainly the cartulary; but the demonstration of this must await another occasion. Laurent retained three separate 'deeds' in MOPH XV (nos. 54-55 and 58), but Koudelka rightly reduced them to one (MOPH XXV no. 58).

<sup>71</sup> There is an exact copy of A (except for the omission of *etc.* at the end) in Cambefort's notes on Rechac (now in Arch. dép. de l'Aude H 461), with the heading 'Donation de la chapele nostre dame de Prouille aux religieuses, premier contrat de

After his transcription of A he comments that 'Il y en a de plus vne autre semblable qui parle de la sorte, et aioute la donation de trente pas a l'entour de ladite Chappelle, et ce de l'adueu et consentement du Chapitre de la Catedral de Saint Etienne de Toulouze, avec la signature de plusieurs temoins' (VD 199), which looks like a reference to B.<sup>72</sup>

Manifestum sit omnibus praesentibus et futuris hanc chartam legentibus siue audientibus, quod Dominus Fulco Dei gratia sedis Tolozanae Minister humilis, dedit et concessit Ecclesiam Beatuae Mariae de Prulliano, ad preces Domini Dominici Oxomensis pro mulieribus conuersis per Praedicatores ad praedicandum contra haereticos et ad repellendam haeresim delegatos tam praesentibus quam futuris Religiose viuentibus, absque decimis et primitiis, et ipsam Ecclesiam possideant absque aliquo censu et seruitute. Datum 1211, regnante Rege Philippo, etc.

B. The text comes from Cambefort, who says that it 'contient au bullaire 61 lignes petites en marge et 4 autres plus grandes, fol. 1' (LDP f.35r).<sup>73</sup>

Manifestum sit omnibus praesentibus et futuris hanc cartam legentibus siue audientibus quod dominus<sup>74</sup> Fulco dei gratia tholosanae sedis minister humilis dedit et concessit, cum consilio et assensu domini M. praepositi sancti Stephani, in quantum firmiter potuit, ad praeces domini Dominici Oxomensis, et praecipue quae sibi uisum fuit esse pietatis et misericordiae, Ecclesiam B. Mariae de Pruliano et territorium per xxx passus sibi adiacens ex utraque parte circa

---

donation fait par de Fulco euesque de Tholose, fol. 198 du livre'; it was not used in LDP. Échard printed two 'diplomata' of which transcripts had apparently been sent to him from Prouille, Bérenger's deed (Appendix II) and our A (QE I 7); but his text of the former is recognizably taken from Rechac (VD 201), so we may presume that Rechac was also the ultimate source of his text of A. Mamachi (*Annales* App. 39) explicitly took A from QE and AGOP XIV lib. Y, but lib. Y's text was itself copied from QE (cf. Koudelka, MOPH XXV p.xxix). There is thus no witness to the cartulary text which can be considered independent of Rechac.

<sup>72</sup> The comment appears in Cambefort's notes on VD in the form 'Il y en a encor une autre semblable qui parle de la sorte et adioue la donation de trante pas alentor de ladite Chapele et ce de l'adueu et consentement du chappitre de la Cathedral de Tholose avec la signature de plusieurs tesmoings'.

<sup>73</sup> Loenertz complained that the text of B has been printed with so many faults that it is almost unintelligible and, as a consequence, editors have failed to grasp its purport ('Archives ...' 37); however, the only text we have (Cambefort's) is unintelligible towards the end. I print it here as it appears in the manuscript, without emendation and, where it does not make sense, without punctuation.

<sup>74</sup> The manuscript has *nos* crossed out before *dominus*.

praedictam ecclesiam, in quantum iure canonum recipitur, mulieribus conuersis per praedicatores ad praedicandum contra haereticos et ad repellendam haeresim pestiferam delegatos, tam praesentibus quam futuris, ibidem religiose uiuentibus, absque tamen decimis et primitiis, itaque uero decimae et primitiae que ad iamdictam ecclesiam iure parrochiali aliquando spectasse uidentur ecclesiae quae est in Fano Iouis reddantur ex integro, ipsam uero Ecclesiam possideant absque aliquo censu et seruitute et quiete deinceps iam dicta ecclesia vel dominae praefatae donatione vel emptione vel aliquo modo iuste acquisierunt sine decimis et primitiis nunc a domino praedicto episcopo vel ab eius successore concedantur. Data anno domini M<sup>o</sup>CC<sup>o</sup>XI<sup>o</sup> regnante Chistophoro in Biterris et Carcassonensi et in Redesii et Albiensis partibus, et regnante Philippo Franciaie rege et Fulcone Tholosano episcopo. Huius rei testes sunt frater Aymericus et frater Ioannes et frater Dominicus et Petrus Donatus et Raymundus Petrus de Causerano qui hanc cartam scripsit.

C. The text is known from Avignon 1437 f.5<sup>v</sup> and *Gallia Christiana* XIII ii 247.<sup>75</sup>

Manifestum sit omnibus presentibus \*ac futuris hanc cartam legentibus siue audientibus quod dominus Fulco dei gracia tholosane sedis minister humilis dedit et concessit, \*concilio et assensu domini \*prepositi sancti Stephani, in quantum \*fieri potuit, ad preces domini Dominici oxomensis, \*precipue que<sup>76</sup> sibi uisum fuit esse pietatis et misericordie, ecclesiam beate Marie de Pruliano et territorium per triginta passus sibi adiacens ex utraque parte circa predictam ecclesiam, \*ut in iure canonum \*reperitur, mulieribus conuersis per predicatorum ad predicandum contra hereticos et ad repellendam heresim pestiferam delegatos, tam presentibus quam futuris, ibidem religiose uiuentibus, absque tamen decimis et primiciis, ita \*quod decime et primicie que ad iamdictam ecclesiam iure parochiali aliquando spectasse uidentur ecclesie que est in Phanoioiuis reddantur ex integro, ipsam uero ecclesiam possideant absque aliquo censu et seruitute et quiete deinceps, \* nisi predictae decime et primicie ab episcopo concedantur dicte ecclesie de Pruliano. \*Acta sunt hec anno domini millesimo ducentesimo \*sexto, \* regnante Philipo francorum rege. \*

Rechac evidently found two documents in the 'terrier', and his account of the one he did not reproduce suggests that it was B. This

<sup>75</sup> Loenertz was unaware of the Avignon manuscript, which was first used by Koudelka in MOPH XXV Appendix II no. I. The text is very close to that of B; I have placed asterisks at places where they differ.

<sup>76</sup> *Gallia Christiana* has *Oxonienensis* for *Oxomensis*, and omits *que* after *precipue*.



implies that if A is an abridged version of B,<sup>77</sup> it was at any rate not he who produced it; his indication of how the two documents differed also shows that A cannot be his abridgement of C, since C contains two of the features which he attributes to the one which was not A. Furthermore, his remark that A, dated 1211, is 'le premier contrat de donation' is good evidence that there was no similar deed with an earlier date (such as C) in the 'terrier'; if there were, he would have been unlikely to overlook it, since he knew that Prouille was founded well before 1211.<sup>78</sup>

Loenertz was surely right to identify Rechac's 'terrier' with Cambefort's 'bullaire', and we may suspect that what Rechac refers to as the 'first column' was simply the main text on the page, the implied 'second column' being the one which Cambefort says was written 'en marge'.<sup>79</sup> If so, Rechac's '2. fueillet' and Cambefort's 'fol.

<sup>77</sup> This is in effect Balme's theory; he cites Échard and Mamachi for an 'incomplete' version of B (Balme-Lelaidier I 267), and this can only refer to their text of A.

<sup>78</sup> He even draws attention to the problem: in his narrative he claims that Fulk gave Dominic the church 'at once' (in time for the first nuns to enter in 1206), complete with 'trente pas de terre à l'entour' (which shows that he was drawing on B as well as A); but, he goes on to concede, 'Il est vray que l'acte de donation n'en fut expédié que l'an 1211' (VD 197). There is also no reason to question '1211' in B: as Loenertz points out ('Archives ...' 42), its elaborate date (in which the nonsensical *regnante Christophoro* must be a mistranscription of *regnante Xpo*, i.e. *Christo*, which refers to the conquests made by the crusaders) would be inapplicable to 1206.

<sup>79</sup> I am not convinced that the cartulary was written in columns. Loenertz argued that only columns can explain the high number of lines needed for each document, but the one example he cites is MOPH XXV no. 58 ('Archives ...' 40 n.41), where the number is in fact disproportionately high. To get some idea of the layout of the cartulary I have taken two documents whose originals survive and done a letter-count both of the originals (treating spaces between words as characters) and of my own typescript (with few abbreviations and modern punctuation, treating punctuation and spaces as characters): the original of MOPH XXV no. 10, said to have taken up 34 lines in the cartulary (LDP f.34<sup>r</sup>), has 1334 characters, which works out at just over 39 characters per line (my typescript has 1659 characters, i.e. just under 49 characters per line); MOPH XXV no. 176, said to have taken up 24 lines in the cartulary (LDP f.47<sup>v</sup>), has 1318 characters in the original, i.e. just under 55 characters per line, and 1629 characters in my typescript, i.e. just under 68 characters per line. According to LDP f.35<sup>r</sup>, MOPH XXV no. 58 took up 17½ lines; my typescript has 514 characters, which would work out at about 29.5 characters per line, and with normal abbreviations it would have had about 418 characters, i.e. just under 24 characters per line. Either way the tally is significantly lower than in the other two documents, suggesting that Cambefort's '17½ lines' refer either to a part of the cartulary whose lay-out was untypical or to something else altogether (the Prouille manuscript of Gui may well have been in columns like, for example, Agen 3, Bologna 1535, Bordeaux 780, and Toulouse 488).

1' must refer to the same page, which is quite possible if Rechac was thinking in terms of pagination and Cambefort in terms of foliation,<sup>80</sup> or if the (unnumbered) first page of text was preceded by a title-page which Rechac counted and Cambefort did not.<sup>81</sup> We may therefore agree with Loenertz that B was probably added in the margin at some stage as an alternative or complement to the text from which Rechac derived A.

Balme edited C and B as distinct and authentic deeds (Balme-Lelaidier I 148, 266-267). Since the last clause of B before the date cannot be construed as it stands, he emended it, with less than total candour, to read: '(Quae) iam dicta ecclesia vel Dominae prefatae, donatione vel emptione vel aliquo modo iuste adquisierunt, sine decimis et primitiis nunc a Domino predicto Episcopo vel ab eius successore conceduntur'; this doctored text was reprinted by Laurent in MOPH XV no. 11. In both editions the meaning is alleged to be that the bishop was exempting the nuns from paying tithes or first-fruits on the possessions they had acquired.

Scheeben very properly challenged this interpretation (AFP 2 [1932] 293) on the grounds that, if the purpose of B was simply to exempt Prouille from certain tithes and first-fruits, there was no need to renew the gift of the church which had already been effected by C; he suggested instead that C was inauthentic.

According to Scheeben, the text of C 'ist am Schluss offenbar verstümmelt', and B (as presented in MOPH XV) contains a better version; if C's ending is mutilated, but echoes that of B, it is reasonable to suppose that C is nothing but a poor copy of B. To this we may retort that it is only the comparison with B which suggests that C's ending is 'obviously mutilated'; and, even as emended, B makes less sense than C.

As edited by Balme-Lelaidier and Laurent, B would have us believe that Fulk or his successor is *now* granting to the *mulieres* whatever they have legitimately acquired, without (having to pay)

<sup>80</sup> Rechac's book was paginated, and he uses 'feuillet' to mean 'page'—in VD 1021, for example, he refers back to 'feuillet 691' (= p.691). LDP, by contrast, is foliated (by Cambefort himself). We should expect the donation of the nuns' own church to be the first document in the cartulary, but it could still be on f.1<sup>v</sup> if f.1<sup>r</sup> served as a title-page.

<sup>81</sup> Loenertz suggested that 'le 2 feuillet en la premiere colonne' was a *lapsus calami* for 'le 1 feuillet en la deuxième colonne' ('Archives ...' 37), but this is only possible if the cartulary was written in columns.

tithes or firstfruits. But how could Fulk's successor be doing anything *now*? What business was it of the bishop to *grant* things which the nuns had already acquired? And what right did he have to make decisions about tithes on land which might not even be in his own diocese?<sup>82</sup>

Loenertz proposed more drastic emendations, but the text still does not make sense: '<Bona uero quae> iamdicta ecclesia uel dominae praefatae, donatione uel emptione uel aliquo modo iuste adquisierunt <possideant> sine decimis et primitiis, nisi a domino praedicto episcopo uel ab eius successore concedantur <dictae ecclesiae de Pruliano>'. This is apparently supposed to mean that the nuns can hold their acquisitions without having to pay tithes or firstfruits unless the (quite different) tithes and firstfruits (which originally belonged to Prouille but had since been transferred to Fanjeaux) are restored to Prouille. This is an awful lot of meaning to extract from the emended text, and in any case the same difficulty remains that it was not for the bishop of Toulouse to fix the terms on which the nuns could possess properties which were none of his business.

C raises no such problems.<sup>83</sup> The church of Prouille had its own *decimarium* (cf. MOPH XXV no. 37.15-16), but that was a purely geographical fact deriving from an earlier period when Prouille was a *castrum* with its own parish church; since then it had probably been swallowed up by the parish of Fanjeaux.<sup>84</sup> The law on tithing was complex, but the basic principle is clear, that tithes were to be paid to the parish church.<sup>85</sup> The church of Fanjeaux belonged to the bishop's *mensa* (cf. Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 78 no. 333); granted that episcopal finances were in a state of collapse when Fulk became bishop,<sup>86</sup> it is understandable that he would not wish to surrender

<sup>82</sup> In principle, by 1211 the nuns were in possession of the church of St Martin, Limoux, in the archdiocese of Narbonne, 'cum omnibus decimis et primiciis territorii beati Martini de Limoso et territorii de Taxo eidem contigui' (Appendix II, MOPH XXV no. 9).

<sup>83</sup> B needs drastic emendation to become intelligible, but the only manifestly impossible reading in C is *precipue que* (which is also in B), and this is easily emended to *precipue quia*.

<sup>84</sup> For some general remarks on this phenomenon, with references to more detailed literature, see A.Ramière de Fortanier, *CdF* 25 (1990) 182-184.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Raymund of Penyafort, *Summa de Poenitentia*, Rome 1603, 123. The dispute over tithes between the Dominicans and the diocese of Toulouse in 1217 centred on the question of what counted as a parish church (MOPH XXV no. 83).

<sup>86</sup> Guillaume de Puylaurens, *Chronica* VI-VII, ed. J.Duvernoy, Paris 1976, 40, 44.

the income due to Fanjeaux, and, in the circumstances, it might even have been uncanonical for him to do so.<sup>87</sup> He therefore gave the church to the *mulieres conuersae*, with the territory (thirty paces all round) indicated in C.17 q.4 c.6 (Friedberg, *Corpus I* 816) for a chapel or minor church, but he did not restore its tithes. Since this meant that he was not providing any income for the church, it was only fair that he did not demand any rent or service for it; should he later be able to grant tithes to Prouille,<sup>88</sup> this exemption would cease ('absque aliquo censu et seruitute ... nisi predicte decime et primicie ab episcopo concedantur dicte ecclesie de Pruliano').

Scheeben also attacked the date of C: in 1206 it should have been Diego, not Dominic, who asked for Prouille. But this is really a more telling argument against the date of A, in which the gift is made to someone unspecified, at Dominic's request, for the *mulieres conuersae*; to whom was the church actually given in 1211 if both Dominic and the *mulieres* themselves are excluded, as the text requires? If C and A derive from the same ultimate source and C's date is correct, the problem disappears: there is no reason why Fulk should not have given Prouille to Diego in 1206 'ad preces domini Dominici ... <pro> mulieribus conuersis per predicatores'. We shall still have to explain why A's date is (on this hypothesis) wrong, but the loss of *pro* before *mulieribus conuersis* in C would be the most natural thing in the world, as it would make both sense and syntax complete by leaving *mulieribus conuersis* as a dative indicating the recipients of the gift.<sup>89</sup>

Loenertz also criticized the date of C on the grounds that 'regnante Christo' (the necessary emendation of 'regnante Chistophoro') refers to the conquests made by the crusaders; it makes sense in 1211, then, but not in 1206. But C does not say 'regnante Christo', so the objection only works if we already know

<sup>87</sup> A bishop was generally forbidden to alienate diocesan property, but he could give a limited amount to a monastery he founded himself provided it would not harm his own church (C.12 q.2 c.18-19, 73-74; Friedberg, *Corpus iuris canonici I* 692, 711-712).

<sup>88</sup> To harmonize the principle that tithes could not be transferred from an older church to a new one with the principle that they were paid only to 'baptismal churches' Gratian pointed out that dioceses and parishes can be temporarily amalgamated, just as they can be divided (C.16 q.1 c.43-45, 48-49, 53-54; Friedberg, *Corpus I* 774-778); this leaves open the possibility that tithes belonging to a church which had been absorbed into a bigger parish could be separated from it again.

<sup>89</sup> Conversely, it is scarcely conceivable that *pro* was interpolated into the text in A.

that C is a defective copy of the same document as B. There is nothing inherently wrong with the way C is dated.<sup>90</sup>

Nor is B's date devoid of difficulty. The only other document in MOPH XXV which contains a similar style of date, with 'regnante Christo ...', is no. 13. The person who wrote it is identified as 'Raymundus Petrus de Causlirano', who can scarcely be different from the 'Raymundus Petrus de Causerano' mentioned as the writer of B; but there is nothing to connect Raymundus Petrus with Fulk or with Prouille.<sup>91</sup>

In Mandonnet-Vicaire I 105 n.39, Vicaire agreed with Scheeben's verdict, though not with his arguments; but the worst that he alleges against C is that the text it shares with B is 'manifestement surchargé et que ces additions supposent un texte antérieur, lequel n'est autre que celui de Réchac' (our A). If there is anything here other than a prejudice in favour of short versions coming before longer ones, I have failed to spot it, and if there is a genuine argument it ought also to work in C's favour against B.

Loenertz introduced a further argument against the independence of C, and it would be decisive if it held water.

Noting that the article on Prouille in *Gallia Christiana* XIII i 315-316 contains a substantial quotation 'ex cartario', Loenertz inferred that it was 'évidemment' from the same *cartarium* that the editors took at least some of the accompanying *instrumenta* in XIII ii 247-250, for the first nine of which no source is cited.<sup>92</sup> The text explicitly quoted 'ex cartario' comes from Gui's *Fundatio Pruliani* (MOPH XXIV 7-8.24), and *instrumenta* III-IX are presented in the form given them by Gui; this suggests, according to Loenertz, that the *cartarium* contained material taken from Gui, including perhaps some items not found elsewhere which Gui added specially in the manuscript he gave to Prouille ('Archives ...' 9-10). The *cartarium* used by the editors of *Gallia Christiana* is 'sûrement' the same as the 'terrier' and 'regitres' cited by Rechac and the 'bullaire' cited by Cambefort (*ibid.* 34); to explain how, 'ayant probablement puisé

<sup>90</sup> MOPH XXV no. 64, a genuine deed of Fulk's, whose original still survives, is dated simply by the year and an indication of who is ruling.

<sup>91</sup> The witnesses to MOPH XXV no. 13 include the abbot and sacristan of Saint-Antonin, which suggests that the deed was drawn up at Pamiers; the bishop of Comminges was also present, but not the bishop of Toulouse.

<sup>92</sup> Instrumentum X (= Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 143-145 no. 386) explicitly comes 'ex archivio Prulianensi'.

dans le bullaire (leur *cartarium*), they nevertheless have Gui's text of several deeds, we must 'compter avec la possibilité que le bullaire manuscrit suivait aussi le texte de Bernard Gui' (ibid. 36). These possibilities and probabilities, having in the interim apparently become certainties, lead to the unqualified assertion that our document C (*instrumentum* I in *Gallia Christiana*) was edited 'd'après le *cartarium* de Prouille, sûrement identique au *terrier* de Jean de Rechac et au *bullaire* de Cambefort' (ibid. 37-38).

We may accept that *cartarium* in *Gallia Christiana* XIII i 315 could mean 'cartulary',<sup>93</sup> though it would not necessarily follow that it refers to the cartulary proper rather than to Gui's manuscript (the *Fundatio Pruliani*, after all, consists largely of transcriptions of bulls and charters). The matter is of small importance, though, since it can be proved beyond all doubt that the *instrumenta* in *Gallia Christiana* were not taken from the same source as the extract from Gui's *Fundatio Pruliani*.

The textual evolution of the *Fundatio* is easily traced, and the quotation in *Gallia Christiana* contains distinctive features appropriate to a manuscript of Gui's compilation written at the end of 1307 and plausibly attributable to the Prouille manuscript in particular.<sup>94</sup> *Instrumenta* III-IX, however, are recognizably taken

<sup>93</sup> *Chartarium* first appears in patristic Latin and designates a receptacle in which documents are kept: ἔχεις πλείστας ἐπιστολάς ἐν τῷ γλωσσοκόμῳ in Cyril of Alexandria, *Ep. ad Eulogium*, becomes in Latin 'habes plurimas epistulas in chartario' (E.Schwarz, ed., *Concilium Universale Ephesinum* I 1 iv 37.4-5, I 3 i 194.20); *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* s.v. also quotes a glossary in which *chartarium* = χαρτόπηρον. In medieval Latin it could also mean 'cartulary' (O.Weijers, *Vocabulaire du livre et de l'écriture au moyen âge*, Turnhout 1989, 130), and, according to *Le Grand Robert*, 'chartrier' developed the same ambiguity in French; there can be no doubt that *cartarium* was used in the eighteenth century to mean 'cartulary': the document in *Gallia Christiana* III ii 206 'ex mai. chartario S. Victoris fol. 157 verso' comes from f.157<sup>v</sup> of the monastery's *chartularium maius* (M.Guérard, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor de Marseille* II, Paris 1857, 41-42 no. 699); the document 'ex magno cartario' in E.Martène-U.Durand, *Veterum scriptorum ... amplissima collectio* I, Paris 1724, 657-658, is edited from the *chartularium maius* in Guérard 132-134 no. 784.

<sup>94</sup> It was during his visit to Prouille earlier in the year that Gui learned about the gift of St Martin's church, Limoux, to Prouille; at MOPH XXIV 8.6 the original text simply stated that Dominic had, for his support, 'ecclesiam Fani Iouis et quedam alia' (thus Toulouse 488 f.25<sup>v</sup> and Agen 3 f.91<sup>v</sup>); 'et S. Martini de Limoso', which *Gallia Christiana* includes, was added later (as in Bordeaux 780 f.49<sup>v</sup>, Toulouse 490 f.94<sup>v</sup>, Avignon 1437 f.6<sup>v</sup>), but it is in Cambefort (LDP f.20<sup>v</sup>), so it must already have been present in the Prouille manuscript. At MOPH XXIV 8.13, the older manuscripts do not have *fundatore meritis et precibus* (Toulouse 488, Agen 3), but the extra words are in Cambefort and *Gallia Christiana*. On the other hand, at MOPH XXIV 8.1, the

from the edition of Gui in Martène-Durand, *Amplissima collectio* VI (or from Baluze's manuscript which is the avowed source of the text printed there);<sup>95</sup> and Martène-Durand cannot be the source of the

original text referred to Jordan as 'magistri ordinis nostri secundi' (thus Toulouse 488 and Agen 3), and so does the *Gallia Christiana* extract (the fact that *nostri secundi* is not in Cambefort is unimportant: he was not a Dominican and habitually suppressed phrases which would imply that he was); later manuscripts do not have *nostri secundi*. At MOPH XXIV 8.7, the older manuscripts do not specify that Casseneuil was 'in dyocesi Agennensi' (this appears in Bordeaux 780, Toulouse 490, Avignon 1437, but not in Toulouse 488 or Agen 3), and neither do Cambefort or *Gallia Christiana*.

<sup>95</sup> *Instrumentum* III is Fulk's deed of 1221 (MOPH XXV no. 153) as presented by Gui (MOPH XXIV 18-19, whose line numbers I cite): it shares all the bad readings of Martène-Durand VI 447-448 (*et priore* for *uel priore* in 18.30, omission of *Dominicus* in 18.33, *et ordini* for *uel ordini* in 19.5, omission of *conuerso* in 19.11, *Compragnano* for *Campragnano* in 19.11); it also omits *primitiis ... pertinentiis* in 18.25-26—Martène-Durand's wrong reading *pertinentibus* for *pertinentiis* would make it easy for a copyist to jump from *pertinentibus* in 18.25 to *pertinentibus* in 18.26. The text in AGOP XIV lib. K 782-784 probably comes from the Prouille manuscript of Gui, and it does not support any of these eccentricities, nor—notwithstanding *et ordini* and *Compragnano* in MOPH XXIV—do the other manuscripts I have checked (Agen 3, Avignon 1437, Bordeaux 780, Toulouse 490). *Instrumentum* IV is Honorius's confirmation of Fulk's gift (MOPH XXV no. 159, MOPH XXIV 21); Martène-Durand VI 450 and *Gallia Christiana* omit *omnino* in 21.21, with no support from the manuscripts. *Instrumenta* V-IX are the dossier on the transfer of the church of Fanjeaux to the nuns (MOPH XXIV 19-23), re-arranged in chronological order. Unlike MOPH XXIV, the manuscripts all include the full text of Innocent IV's letter, but Martène-Durand simply note its existence without giving the text (VI 451), and it is not even mentioned in *Gallia Christiana*. In Fulk's letter of 1227 *Gallia Christiana* correctly has *pro commutatione* (MOPH XXIV 19.23), where Martène-Durand VI 449 has *per commutationem*, but this is a natural correction in the context. In Gregory's letter Martène-Durand and *Gallia Christiana* have *pro hoc* for the manuscripts' *per hoc* (MOPH XXIV 22.2 also has *pro hoc*), and *inspeximus* for *perspeximus* (22.9). *Gallia Christiana* restores *omnino* in 22.12, which Martène-Durand omit, but the correction would be obvious to anyone familiar with papal documents. Martène-Durand and *Gallia Christiana* omit the date of Gregory's letter (22.16), and the editors of *Gallia Christiana* were clearly using a source which lacked it, otherwise they would not have had to guess ('circa 1230'). Unlike MOPH XXIV, the manuscripts reproduce the entire text of Fulk's letter in that of Raymund (MOPH XXIV 20-21), but Martène-Durand VI 450 and *Gallia Christiana* break off after *necessitatem* (20.25) with 'etc. ut supra'. The medieval manuscript tradition of Gui's transcription of these documents is very stable, and, judging by AGOP XIV lib. K and Cambefort, the Prouille manuscript was as accurate as any other. Martène-Durand and *Gallia Christiana* have too many idiosyncrasies to be coincidental (I have not checked Baluze's manuscript, so I do not know whether they are all there already); the two occasions on which *Gallia Christiana* has a better text are insignificant by comparison, as it would have been easy for the editors to make the required correction. It should also be noticed that neither the quotation in *Gallia Christiana* XIII i 315-316 nor the

quotation from the *Fundatio*,<sup>96</sup> nor, judging by their edition, was Baluze's text taken from the Prouille manuscript.<sup>97</sup> The *cartarium* cited in *Gallia Christiana* XIII i 315 was therefore not the source of *instrumenta* III-IX, so there is no presumption that it was the source of I-II.

*Instrumenta* I-II are the same as two documents found in a sixteenth-century hand on f.5<sup>v</sup> of Avignon 1437, where they were inserted in the space between Gui's *Catalogus provincialium* and his *Fundatio Pruliani*. *Instrumentum* I is our C. *Instrumentum* II is a degenerate version of MOPH XXV no. 58; its text is similar to that found in Avignon 1437, and significantly different from those offered by Prouille sources (LDP ff.35<sup>r</sup> and 35<sup>v</sup>, AGOP XIV lib. K 780),<sup>98</sup> except that, unlike Avignon 1437 which gives the date as 'v kal. iunii', *Gallia Christiana* has 'VIII cal. Junii' which agrees with the Prouille sources. Its text cannot come from Avignon 1437, then, but the suggestion that it was taken from the Prouille cartulary is contradicted by the evidence from Prouille. Since it can scarcely

---

*Instrumenta* can have been taken from LDP: there are faults in LDP which do not recur in *Gallia Christiana* and which could not have been repaired by conjecture, notably the omission of *ab apostolica sede concessis* in MOPH XXIV 8.4 (LDP f.20<sup>v</sup>), *quam eidem ordini predicationis* in 18.23 (LDP f.36<sup>v</sup>), *ita scilicet ut eandem ecclesiam* in 20.7 (LDP ff.37<sup>r</sup> and 44<sup>r</sup>) and *indicat* in 22.9 (LDP f.38<sup>r</sup>); and Cambefort did not take the text of Fulk's letter of 1221 from Gui, so it does not even have the same form in LDP as it does in *Gallia Christiana*.

<sup>96</sup> As I have already indicated, *Gallia Christiana* has a text which we should expect to find in the Prouille manuscript; the text in Martène-Durand VI 437-438, by contrast, conforms to that of later manuscripts.

<sup>97</sup> This is evident, not just from the Martène-Durand text of the *Fundatio Pruliani*, but also from the *priores Pruliani* (MOPH XXIV 23-29), where, like later manuscripts, it separates the building of the main monastery church from that of the chapel of St Martin (VI 453), which were still together in the Prouille manuscript (cf. LDP f.108<sup>v</sup>) as they were in Agen 3 f.92<sup>r</sup> and Toulouse 488 f.25<sup>v</sup>; it also carries the story on to 1315 (VI 455-456) like Toulouse 490 f.108<sup>r</sup>, whereas the original text of the Prouille manuscript naturally stopped at 1307 and did not have Gui's continuation (cf. LDP f.109<sup>v</sup>). Hyacinthe Baluze (on whom see R.Coulon-A.Papillon, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum* III, repr. Heverlee 1961, 123-124) had several of Gui's works copied for him in 1703—from manuscripts in Toulouse according to B.Montagnes (CdF 16 [1981] 194); his copies passed to the royal library and are now BNF lat. 5486-5487.

<sup>98</sup> By comparison with the text in MOPH XXV no. 58, Avignon and *Gallia Christiana* omit *omnibus* in line 13 and *paginam* in line 20, and they have *de assensu et voluntate* for *uoluntate et assensu* in line 14, *Fanoioiue* for *Fano Iouis* in line 15, and *roborauimus* for *roboramus* in line 20. Of these errors, only *Fanoioiue* receives any support from elsewhere: Cambefort's first text also has *Fanoioiue* in line 15, but it has it in line 18 too where it is out of step with Avignon and *Gallia Christiana*.



be a coincidence that *Gallia Christiana* contains an almost identical text of precisely the two documents which someone had inserted into Avignon 1437 over a century earlier, we may conclude that *instrumentum I* came from the same source as *instrumentum II*, and that this was not the Prouille cartulary.<sup>99</sup>

All told, then, we have no convincing reason to regard C as merely a mutilated version of B,<sup>100</sup> and it has, in fact, stood up to scrutiny much better than B; and if C existed in its own right, A could be an abridgement of it, in spite of the difference in date.

Loenertz opposed the suggestion that A is an abridgement ('Archives ...' 45) on the grounds that an abbreviator does not change the word-order 'sans motif', and he clearly thought that A's placing of 'ad preces Domini Dominici Oxomensis' after rather than before 'Ecclesiam Beatae Mariae de Prulliano' would be such a motiveless alteration. But if A is an abridgement (and it makes no difference whether the original was B or C), 'ad preces Domini Dominici Oxomensis' has been extracted from a complex sequence of phrases of which the rest is dropped; in such circumstances the abbreviator would surely have an adequate motive for inserting it wherever he wanted—nor should it be forgotten that we have no way of checking the accuracy of Rechac's text.<sup>101</sup>

Loenertz's other argument, that the compiler of the cartulary—'lui qui transcrivit intégralement tant de grimoires interminables'—would have had no reason to abridge an already short deed, ignores the fact that if A, B and C are all inauthentic, as Loenertz concluded, there may have been special factors at work in determining the choice of an abridgement for inclusion in the cartulary, not just a general disinclination to transcribe long documents.

<sup>99</sup> I have no idea whether Baluze was in any way involved, but the text of Gui in Martène-Durand does not come from Avignon 1437, judging by the latter's eccentricities which I have checked.

<sup>100</sup> The text of MOPH XXV no. 58 in Avignon 1437 and *Gallia Christiana* seems to be inferior to that offered by the Prouille sources, so the quality of C's text may be doubted; but that does not of itself warrant the suspicion that it is incomplete.

<sup>101</sup> Transposition of individual words is not uncommon in the documents published in VD. There is a more elaborate reshuffling of the word-order in MOPH XXV no. 91, where Rechac turns 'regnum cum eis percipiatis eternum' (ASV Reg. Vat. 9 ff.252<sup>v</sup>) into 'regnum percipiatis aeternum cum eis' (VD 375); but his text patently comes from the papal register and Rechac must have found it in Bzovius's papers, so the fault could be Bzovius's rather than Rechac's.

On one point, though, we must agree with Loenertz: if the difference in date between C and the other two documents is to be attributed to scribal error—and it would be easy to misread ‘m.cc.xi’ as ‘m.cc.vi’ or vice versa—anyone who was aware that Prouille was founded in 1206 would be vastly more likely to misread 1211 as 1206 than the other way round.

Loenertz has no difficulty in showing that A, B and C cannot be exact transcriptions of genuine documents. In any authentic deed, Fulk would appear in the first person, not the third (‘Ego Fulco ... do et concedo ...’); in the unlikely event of his getting someone else to produce a deed on his behalf, it would be most improper for that someone to refer to him as ‘humilis minister’—as Loenertz remarks, ‘Le pape peut s’appeler “serviteur des serviteurs de Dieu”; un autre n’a pas le droit de l’interpeller ainsi’.

In itself, however, this could mean simply that we have been given a regest instead of an actual transcription. Gui incorporated most of the dossier on Limoux into his *Fundatio Pruliani* ‘extracted’ in narrative form (MOPH XXIV 8-13). If our three documents are regests, they were made with less skill than Gui displays, but that does not of itself invalidate their contents.

Apart from its defect of form, B contains other features which Loenertz deemed unacceptable, notably the reference to the nuns as *mulieres* rather than *moniales* or *dominae*, and the use of *dominae praefatae* when the word *dominae* has not previously occurred; the first flaw is also present in A and C.

To explain how these ‘documents’ came into existence, Loenertz conjectured that A was created first, to plug a gap in the monastery’s documentation: the compiler of the cartulary, having searched in vain for a deed in which Fulk handed over possession of the church, supplied a regest of what it must have contained; later on, someone dissatisfied with A produced an expanded version of it, namely B/C, cobbled together from documents in the monastery archives.<sup>102</sup> But this hypothesis raises more questions than it answers.

<sup>102</sup> To illustrate how B/C was cobbled together, Loenertz draws attention to some possible sources: ‘le faussaire’ could have culled witnesses from MOPH XXV no. 153 (Aimeric) and MOPH XXV no. 73 or no. 83 (Petrus Donatus), the initial of the provost of Saint-Étienne from MOPH XXV no. 11 or 64 or 73, and the name of the *scriptor* from MOPH XXV no. 13 (which could also have supplied the opening ‘Manifestum sit’ and the elaborate date at the end). ‘Il insiste lourdement sur la clause des dîmes non données, prétend savoir qu’elles furent affectées à l’église de

If A was created without any documentary foundation, why are the nuns referred to so rudely as 'mulieres'? Why state that the church was given to them 'absque decimis et primiciis', when, by the time the cartulary was compiled, Prouille had long been enjoying, not just the revenues which had once belonged to the church there, but all those attached to the church of Fanjeaux?<sup>103</sup> Why begin with 'manifestum sit', when Fulk's other charters begin 'notum sit' (MOPH XXV nos. 11, 58), as, indeed, do nearly all the other early deeds concerning Prouille? If the 'deed' was meant to represent Fulk's definitive gift of Prouille, it is extraordinary that it should be formulated in terms of women converted by anti-heretical preachers: why should anyone have imagined that the bishop expected anti-heretical preachers to be needed in his diocese for ever, or that he intended the monastery to recruit exclusively among their converts? The cartulary was apparently compiled round about the beginning of the fourteenth century,<sup>104</sup> and a forgery created then *ex nihilo* would surely have spoken of the monastery in quite different terms. And, nearly a century after the foundation of Prouille, who would jib at a claim that the site was given to Dominic or to the nuns themselves in 1206, so why would a faker opt for 1211 instead?

There is a further problem. Rechac presents A as 'le premier contrat de donation que Foulques Euéque de Toulouse fit a *saint Dominique*' (VD 198), but this is not borne out by the text he quotes, and Cambefort was plainly unconvinced since he substituted a different heading in his notes on VD, 'Donation de la chapele nostre dame de Prouille *aux religieuses*, premier contrat de donation faict par de Fulco euesque de Tholose'. B's heading in LDP f.35<sup>r</sup> is similar, 'Donation de l'eglize nostre Dame de Prouilles par le seigneur de Fulco Euesque de Tholose aux Religieuses du Monastere dudit

---

Fanjeaux, et prévoit expressément le cas d'un futur retour à celle de Prouille; enfin il fait étalage de son érudition canonique en appuyant la donation du terrain adjacent à l'église sur une citation du Décret de Gratien'. To complete the analysis, we might suggest that 'Tholosanae sedis minister humilis' was taken from MOPH XXV no. 63, that the reference to canon law was prompted by Guiraud *Cartulaire* II 77-78 no. 333, and that 'fr. Ioannes' comes from *Cartulaire* II 5 no. 237 and 'fr. Dominicus' from *Jordan Lib.* §31.

<sup>103</sup> Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 77-78 no. 333; in the early 14th century there was a dispute over tithes between Prouille and Saint-Étienne, to which the bishop sought a resolution on 3 March 1316 by appointing commissioners to fix the boundaries of their respective *decimaria* (ibid. II 65 no. 314).

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Loenertz, 'Archives ...' 34. The documents it contains suggest such a date even if we do not accept that it incorporated extracts from Gui.

Prouille', which fits the text perfectly since (like C) it has 'mulieribus conuersis ...', not 'pro mulieribus conuersis ...'; but the note in the margin says 'Donation nostre dame de Prouilles a saint Dominique par de Fulco Euesque de Tholose 1211'. Was this interpretation of A and B forced on Rechac and Cambefort by a heading in the cartulary itself identifying Dominic as the beneficiary (cf. Appendix I introduction to 40)? But if A was created to record a gift made to Dominic, why was it formulated in a way which not merely fails to identify him as the recipient, but casts him in a different rôle which would effectively exclude him from being the recipient?<sup>105</sup>

Loenertz's hypothesis rests on the assumption that there was a gap in the documentation which the compiler of the cartulary needed to plug. He found confirmation of the lack of any authentic deed of donation in the fact that nothing of the kind is quoted in Gui's *Fundatio Pruliani*; but this proves nothing: Gui does not quote the deed granting Saint-Romain to the brethren (MOPH XXV no. 73) either, but he does paraphrase deeds in which gifts were made to the brethren of Saint-Romain (MOPH XXIV 44-46, quoting MOPH XXV nos. 74-76).

Leaving aside, for the moment, the question whether it was specifically a gap in the cartulary which needed to be filled, is it not possible that the gap itself was caused, not by a complete absence of documents, but by the failure of available deeds to record what was wanted, namely the outright transfer of Prouille to the nuns or to Dominic? The peculiarities of our texts are much easier to understand if they were adapted from authentic but unsatisfactory deeds than if they were created *ex nihilo*.

If there was a genuine deed in which Fulk made the Prouille church over to Diego in 1206 for the use of women who had been 'converted' by the anti-heretical preachers and wanted to live 'religiously', it obviously fell short of documenting the nuns' right to permanent possession of the site. The simplest way to adapt it was to drop all reference to Diego and either trust that 'ad preces domini Dominici' would be understood as implying that the church was given to Dominic (in which case *pro mulieribus conuersis* is needed), or to omit *pro* as well so that the donation would appear to have been made to the *mulieres conuersae* themselves. To disguise the

<sup>105</sup> If the gift were made to Dominic at his own request, his name would appear as the recipient, not as the petitioner ('domino Dominico ad preces eius', for example); there would be no room for 'ad preces domini Dominici'.

fact that the result was not a genuine deed, 'ego Fulco ... minister humilis dedi et concessi' could be (rather ineptly) turned into 'dominus Fulco ... minister humilis dedit et concessit' to give the impression of a regest. We thus arrive at the text of C (leaving it unresolved whether or not *pro* should be restored).

B degenerates into nonsense towards the end. Cambefort may have mistranscribed it, but no amount of emendation will salvage it. If we look at it without prejudice, we can easily see that it is a version of C thrown out of kilter by the insertion of extraneous matter, and this too was surely drawn from some other deed (it can scarcely have been invented simply to make nonsense of C):

C

Ipsam uero ecclesiam possideant absque aliquo censu et seruitute et quiete deinceps, nisi predictae decime et primicie ab episcopo concedantur dicte ecclesie de Pruliano.

B

Ipsam uero Ecclesiam possideant absque aliquo censu et seruitute et quiete deinceps iam dicta ecclesia vel dominae praefatae donacione vel emptione vel aliquo modo iuste acquisierunt sine decimis et primitiis nunc a domino praedicto episcopo vel ab eius successore concedantur.

We learn several things from the interpolated words. The *mulieres* are now referred to as *dominae* (and *dominae praefatae* shows that they had already been mentioned in an earlier part of the original document). They have acquired property in their own name or in the name of their church—a distinction which would only be important if they had not been given outright possession of the church:<sup>106</sup> if and when they ceased to occupy Prouille, anything acquired by the church would remain the property of the church, but anything acquired by them would be theirs to dispose of.

The *dominae* deed was obviously later than the *mulieres* deed; but it must have been even less adapted to the faker's purposes if it was merely pillaged for supplementary material, not taken as the basis for a false deed of donation. Nevertheless, it must in some way have renewed Fulk's donation of the Prouille church: the attempt to merge the two documents suggests that they dealt

---

<sup>106</sup> No such distinction between church and occupants was made when the properties of Prouille and Saint-Romain were confirmed by the pope in 1215 and 1216 (MOPH XXV nos. 65 and 77). A, B and C all grant the convert women the right to *possidere* the church, but this denotes occupation, not ownership.

essentially with the same subject, and *dominae praefatae* can hardly designate anyone other than the ladies of Prouille, so *dicta ecclesia* presumably refers to the church which they were occupying and *praedictus episcopus* to the bishop who had allowed them to do so. It looks as if there were two deeds of donation, then; and if Diego was originally named as the beneficiary there was a very obvious occasion for the second deed: Diego's death on 30 Dec. 1207 (AFP 73 [2003] 70).

If the church at Prouille was made over to Diego in 1206, when news arrived that he was dead someone else obviously had to take possession of it; but this was not the only problem: the community at Prouille had been an integral part of Diego's *praedicatio* (MOPH XXV no. 6) and it was intended for women 'converted' by the anti-heretical preachers; but with Diego's death the *praedicatio* effectively came to an end (cf. AFP 73 [2003] 8-12, 83-86). The women at Prouille were thus deprived not only of their official sponsor in the diocese, but also of the institutional context which should have sustained the project in which they were involved and secured its continuation, at least for the immediate future. So what did Fulk do?

Even in May 1211 he apparently did not see Prouille as a permanent monastic institution, but as a house of *dominae conuersae* whom he was willing to help as individuals (in this instance by giving them a life-interest in the church of Bram) (MOPH XXV no. 11). *A fortiori* he is unlikely to have been willing to set it up as a regular monastery when news of Diego's death reached him, presumably some time in January 1208; but the *praedicatio* was finished and there was no obvious candidate to take Diego's place,<sup>107</sup> so he had to accept responsibility himself for the *dominae conuersae* who were living there. Is it not likely that he made provision for them by giving them a life-interest in the church at Prouille as individuals? This would explain both the reference to *dominae praefatae* in B<sup>108</sup>

<sup>107</sup> Dominic had an important rôle in the *praedicatio* and at Prouille, but only as his bishop's deputy; when his bishop died, his rôle automatically lapsed and, not having any further canonical right to remain in the region, he presumably returned to Osma (AFP 73 [2003] 5-69). William Claret continued to act for the nuns after Diego's death (MOPH XXV no. 9), but he was almost certainly a Cistercian of Boulbonne (cf. Vicaire, *Histoire* I 252), so he could only inherit Diego's rôle if Fulk was prepared to make the church of Prouille over to Boulbonne and Boulbonne was willing to take full responsibility for its occupants.

<sup>108</sup> It comes in a clause dealing with properties acquired by the *dominae* or the church, which must obviously have come after the clause in which the church itself was made over to them.

and the distinction made there between property acquired by the *dominae* and property acquired by the church.

If there was such a deed from early in 1208, it would be as useless as that of 1206 to anyone wanting to document the nuns' right to permanent possession of their church and land, and it would be considerably harder to adapt.

We may wonder why there was no genuine deed from after 1208 which could be used or adapted; but there was no real occasion for such a deed.

In the latter part of 1211, after Dominic's return to the region, Fulk decided to recognize the nuns as constituting a durable institution; he made Dominic responsible for them, but—as he claimed later on, to justify giving them the church of Fanjeaux which was diocesan property—he himself founded their monastery (AFP 73 [2003] 43). Furthermore, in the deeds which follow this development it is striking that the *fratres* are always mentioned before the nuns (MOPH XXV nos. 6, 13, 27-30, 33-37 etc.), suggesting that they were regarded as the primary component of Prouille, not just as the ancillary male personnel which usually accrued to a nunnery;<sup>109</sup> the sisters may have acquired institutional standing, then, but not as an autonomous monastery. Dominic was still a canon of Osmia with no permanent status in the diocese of Toulouse, so he and his *fratres* were in much the same position at Prouille as they were before Diego's death, except that Diego's rôle was now filled by Fulk himself. To whom, then, could Fulk have transferred ownership of the site except to himself?

When the *praedicatio* began to be reconstituted, Prouille was apparently re-attached to it,<sup>110</sup> but the *praedicatio* itself first achieved institutional status as a diocesan entity (MOPH XXV no. 63). Its transformation into a religious order, on the advice of Innocent III, did not cause any major upheaval (locally it continued to be referred to as 'praedicatio': AFP 73 [2003] 9-10); when its base at Saint-Romain was taken under papal protection, Prouille was recognized as one of its properties (MOPH XXV no. 77.53-54). There was no stage in this evolution at which it would necessarily have seemed

<sup>109</sup> In MOPH XXV no. 10, by contrast, a donation made by Simon de Montfort in 1211 on the day when Fulk gave the individual *dominae conuersae* a life-interest in the church of Bram, the prioress and *dominae* are mentioned before the *fratres*.

<sup>110</sup> This would explain why, from 1 Feb. 1214 onwards (MOPH XXV no. 56), it is no longer referred to as *monasterium* or *abbatia*, as it had been since the end of 1211.

important for the bishop formally to give Prouille to Dominic and his brethren, and the whole process made it less and less appropriate for it to be transferred to the nuns themselves.

In sum, it is perfectly credible that there never was any deed recording the outright donation of Prouille to anyone.

Loenertz's suggestion that the compiler of the Prouille cartulary needed something to plug a gap in the record is plausible enough, except that it remains unexplained why the faker attached the date 1211 to his creation rather than 1206; but there was also a much earlier occasion on which it might have seemed desirable to have evidence of a straightforward donation of Prouille.

The Toulousains' rebellion against Simon de Montfort in 1217, whose imminence prompted Dominic to disperse most of his brethren (AFP 69 [1999] 15-20), left Saint-Romain with a very uncertain future; this put Prouille, as a possession of Saint-Romain, in a vulnerable position, and there can be little doubt that this is why word was sent to Dominic in Rome asking him to get *Religiosam vitam* issued specifically for the brethren of Prouille (MOPH XXV no. 90)<sup>111</sup>—according to its standard formula, this would guarantee their right, not just to whatever other possessions they had, but also, and most importantly, to the place where their monastery itself was situated.

The new issue of *Religiosam vitam* is not the only sign of unease. Deeds concerning Prouille from the beginning of 1214 onwards no longer refer to the 'monastery' or 'abbey', but only to the 'locus', the 'domus', the 'ecclesia', or simply 'the nuns' or 'the brethren and sisters'; as late as 11 Jan. 1218 the prior, Natalis, uses the word 'locus' (MOPH XXV no. 85). On 27 Feb. 1218, however, the same prior got Hugh de Lacy to confirm a gift he had made in June 1214 to 'Our Lady of Prouille' and its brethren and sisters (MOPH XXV nos. 59 and 89); in the new deed, drawn up in the presence of Natalis, every mention of the prior, the brethren and the sisters includes a reference to their *monastery*. *Religiosam vitam* itself was issued for Prouille at the request of the prior of the *monastery* (MOPH XXV no. 90.19). On 26 Nov. 1218 the archbishop of Narbonne insisted that St Martin's, Limoux, be restored to Prouille (MOPH

<sup>111</sup> Cf. AFP 65 (1995) 121-124; but I exaggerated in saying that 'Prouille itself had little to gain' from the new issue of *Religiosam vitam*: what was in question was not its status as a religious house, but its status as an entity which could exist in its own right regardless of what happened to Saint-Romain.



XXV no. 93); for the first time in this whole saga, which began with Bérenger's original gift in 1207, Prouille is insistently referred to as a *monastery*. On 3 June 1219 another (by now rather out-of-date) formula was revived, when an endowment for a perpetual anniversary was given 'abbatiae de Prolano noviter constructae' (MOPH XXV no. 100).

In these circumstances, the available documentation might well have seemed inadequate. Fulk's deed of 1208 would show that some of the sisters had a right to be at Prouille, but it would at the same time show that the nuns as a community had no long-term claim on the place, and it would do nothing to justify the brethren's possession of it. The bull of 8 Oct. 1215 taking Prouille's properties under papal protection (MOPH XXV no. 65) mentioned the brethren ahead of the sisters, but it did not actually make it clear by what right they were in possession of Prouille itself.<sup>112</sup> Fulk himself was away preaching the crusade in the North, so he could not be asked to issue a new deed.<sup>113</sup>

Could this not be the occasion for someone to produce, not necessarily a fake deed, but a report—perhaps even a report which some official of the diocese could be asked to endorse—showing that at some time after 1208 Fulk had made the church of Prouille over definitively to the brethren for the use of the *dominae conuersae*? Although no deed had been drawn up, it could in retrospect be said quite honestly that this is what Fulk had done towards the end of 1211. And the report could be expressed in Fulk's own words by extracting the essentials from his deed of 1206 (including 'pro mulieribus conuersis' to show that it was the brethren, as Dominic's 'heirs', not the nuns themselves who were in legal possession of Prouille). All that had to be altered was the date. Might this not be the origin of A?

It is perhaps worth remarking again that someone simply inventing a false deed would not have been likely to use the language found in our three texts. It was no more natural in 1218 than it was at the turn of the century to refer to 'women converted by anti-heretical preachers', when there were far better phrases available to

<sup>112</sup> In any case, the bull was probably in Toulouse, since the brethren there were responsible for Prouille's temporalities (cf. MOPH XXV no. 82), and it would have been difficult to get at as long as the city was under siege.

<sup>113</sup> Puy-laurens XXVIII, ed. cit. 101; *Chanson de la croisade albigeoise* laisse 194.28 and 42-61, 196.35-36; Cernai, ed. cit. §606. Cf. the date-charts in CdF 21 (1986) 176 and Schulman, *Where troubadours were bishops* 276.

a faker: Fulk's genuine deed of 1211 (MOPH XXV no. 11) could have supplied 'dominabus conuersis religiose uiuentibus', and Bérenger's 'priorissae et monialibus conuersis monitis et exemplis fratris Dominici oxomensis sociorumque eius' (Appendix II) would have been an admirable way of underlining their dependence on Dominic and his *socii*.

If we make the reasonable assumption that no one at Prouille would misread 'm.cc.vi' as 'm.cc.xi' in a document concerning the monastery's beginnings, A and B must have been deliberately dated 1211, and this seems to indicate a sensitivity to historical fact which is more likely to have been felt in 1218 than at the turn of the century; either way, though, C must represent a discarded earlier attempt to adapt the 1206 deed to meet the requirements of 1218 or to plug a gap in the record for the cartulary.<sup>114</sup> The dropping of *pro* in C could be accidental, but it is also possible that its effect was intended: without *pro*, *mulieribus conuersis* has to be read as a dative, which makes the convert women themselves the beneficiaries of Fulk's deed, a rôle which the removal of Diego from the text would otherwise have left vacant.

B appears to be an elaboration of C or its still-born sibling.<sup>115</sup> It is such a mess that it is best seen as an unfinished draft of an ambitious attempt to update the 1206 deed by incorporating material from that of 1208 and to deck it out with an elaborate way of indicating the date (undoubtedly 1211) borrowed from MOPH XXV no. 13,<sup>116</sup> presumably in the hope that this would give greater verisimilitude to the result.

<sup>114</sup> Once A was in existence, it would have been superfluous to adapt the 1206 deed to make it look as if the church of Prouille had been definitively made over to or for the nuns in 1206; the original deed could have been retained unaltered to complete the record, except that its similarity to the 1211 'deed' might have raised suspicions about the authenticity of one or other of them.

<sup>115</sup> Like C, it has *precipue que*, clearly a misreading of abbreviated *precipue quia*, and it lacks *pro*; this could indicate either derivation from C or the same person making the same mistake and the same decision twice. If the genuine 1206 deed referred to the Prouille tithes being restored by Fulk or his successor, then B, which retains this while C does not, must be dependent on the original deed, not just C.

<sup>116</sup> The original of this deed was at Prouille—it was one of the Prouille documents copied for Doat (BNF Doat 98 ff.5<sup>v</sup>-6<sup>v</sup>). It surely contributed 'Raymundus Petrus de Causerano qui hanc cartam scripsit' to B, but the other witnesses could come from the genuine deed of 1208. Aimeric was a monk of Grandselve whose presence in Fulk's entourage is attested in June 1211 and April 1221 (MOPH XXV nos. 12 and 153), of whom Salanhac says that 'antiquus socius et fidelis amicus beati

We are guessing, of course, but we can at least suggest a sequence which makes sense, whether we suppose that the fakes were made in 1218 or at the turn of the century. What was needed was a document showing that Fulk had definitively made over the Prouille church to the monastery. The easiest procedure was to adapt the 1206 deed by dropping Diego from it and making the convert women the beneficiaries instead (C). However, this was unsatisfactory because the date was wrong (honesty, or the risk of being caught out, made it desirable or prudent to acknowledge that it was not until 1211 that there was any decisive transfer of the property). A bolder attempt was therefore made to produce a 'deed' from 1211, incorporating the genuine grants made both in 1206 and in 1208 (B); but this proved too difficult to accomplish, and in any case it still did not justify the position of the brethren at Prouille. So simplicity prevailed after all: 1211 could be kept as the date, and by restoring *pro* to the text, it could be implied that Dominic was the real beneficiary; the awkwardness of having no explicit recipient of the gift could be made less evident by producing a shorter, more regest-like, text (A).

There is, however, one apparent difficulty in the way of this or any theory which regards C as the closest of our three fakes to a genuine deed and the only one to have preserved the original date (1206): all three fakes have the same opening, *Manifestum sit*, and none of the deeds which we know to have been available at Prouille has this beginning except MOPH XXV no. 13; if this served as a model for the ending of B, was it not also the inspiration for *manifestum sit*? If so, B must after all have preceded C and A.

The two formulae otherwise found in Fulk's deeds relating to Dominicans, are *notum sit* and *nouerint uniuersi*.<sup>117</sup> Judging by the edited regional documents which I have been able to consult, the general favourite in the early thirteenth century was *notum sit*, and

---

Dominici fuerat in domo domini Fulconis' (MOPH XXII 18); John could be another Cistercian. 'Frater Dominicus' would be St Dominic, who was no doubt keen that Fulk should make provision for the ladies of Prouille before he himself returned to Osmā. Petrus Donatus could be the *causidicus* appointed in 1217 to act as arbiter in any future dispute between the Dominicans and the diocese over the order's share in the diocese's tithes (MOPH XXV no. 83), very probably the same man as the P. Donatus present when Saint-Romain was given to the Dominicans in 1216 (MOPH XXV no. 73).

<sup>117</sup> *Notum sit*: MOPH XXV no. 11 from 1211, no. 58 from 1214 (both of which should have been in the Prouille archives), nos. 63-64 (from 1215), no. 153 (from 1221). *Nouerint uniuersi*: Guiraud, *Cartulaire II* 77 nos. 332-333 from 1227 and 1230 (both might have been in the Prouille archives).

*nouerint uniuersi* became popular later on. However, *manifestum sit* is not unknown,<sup>118</sup> and the evidence is too slight to warrant the assertion that it could never have been used by Fulk, not even in the first year of his episcopacy. Granted that it is problematic to ascribe priority to B, is it not possible that our texts have *manifestum sit* precisely because this was how Fulk's 1206 deed actually began? If so, this might have been what drew the faker of B's attention to MOPH XXV no. 13 in the first place. It should also be noted that B does not follow either the beginning or the end of MOPH XXV no. 13 exactly, which suggests that this deed was not the faker's primary inspiration, it was rather used to add colour to a pre-existing text based on a different model.

On the basis of C, with a little help from A and B, we can more or less retrieve the entire contents, though not the exact wording, of Fulk's deed of 1206. It must have been something like this:

Manifestum sit omnibus presentibus ac futuris hanc cartam legentibus siue audientibus quod ego Fulco dei gracia tholosane sedis minister humilis do et concedo <domino D. episcopo oxomensis>, consilio et assensu domini <M.> prepositi sancti Stephani, in quantum fieri potest, ad preces domini Dominici oxomensis, precipue quia michi uidetur <opus> (?) esse pietatis et misericordie, ecclesiam beate Marie de Pruliano et territorium per triginta passus sibi adiacens ex utraque parte circa predictam ecclesiam, ut in iure canonum reperitur, <pro> mulieribus conuersis per predicatores ad predicandum contra hereticos et ad repellendam heresim pestiferam delegatos, tam presentibus quam futuris, ibidem religiose uiuentibus, absque tamen decimis et primiciis, ita quod decime et primicie que ad iamdictam ecclesiam iure parochiali aliquando spectasse uidentur ecclesie que est in Fanoiois reddantur ex integro, ipsam uero ecclesiam possideant absque aliquo censu et seruitute et quiete deinceps nisi predictae decime et primicie a me <uel a meo successore> (?) concedantur dicte ecclesie de Pruliano. Acta sunt hec anno domini millesimo ducentesimo sexto, regnante Philipo francorum rege.

<sup>118</sup> I do not know of other deeds issued by Fulk with *manifestum sit*, but, apart from MOPH XXV no. 13, I have found nine instances between 1184 and 1219 in *Hist. gén. de Languedoc*, rev. ed. VIII 376, 385, 390, 425, 435, 480, 491, 602 and 725; the formula was used by Bishop Fulcrand of Toulouse in a deed from 1196 (*Gallia Christiana* XIII ii 26); there is an example from 1202/1204 in J.H.Mundy, *Liberty and political power in Toulouse 1050-1230*, New York 1954, 204; the deeds from 1200-1220 in J.Rouquette-A.Villemagne, *Cartulaire de Maguelone I-II*, Montpellier 1912-1913, display a range of formulae with no evident bias in favour of *notum sit*, and there are five with *manifestum sit* (II 137, 151, 167, 176, 194), and one with *sit manifestum* (II 161).

The extraneous matter which the creator of B borrowed from a later deed can only give us a vague idea of what that deed contained, but we may be fairly confident that it too involved some kind of donation of the church of Prouille, and it was evidently not such as to obviate the need for our fakes. I have suggested that the likeliest occasion for it was the death of Diego and the consequent departure of Dominic early in 1208; if this is correct, it is not clear to whom Fulk could have given the church except the *dominae conuersae* themselves, and the terms of his gift of the church of Bram in May 1211 (MOPH XXV no. 11) must make it probable that he gave them a life-interest in Prouille as named individuals.

This hypothesis has the added advantage of suggesting a plausible source for the list of the 'first nuns' of Prouille. As can be seen from numerous documents edited in MOPH XXV, the *stylus incarnationis* was used locally, so the deed whose existence I am postulating would have been dated '1207'. Especially if a precise date in January '1207' was indicated, this would be quite early enough to tempt anyone who misunderstood '1207' and believed that the founding community entered Prouille on 27 Dec. 1206 to infer that it preserved the names of the monastery's very first nuns.

It is not really a difficulty that, though Rechac and Cambefort both reproduce the list of the first nuns, neither of them shows any knowledge of the deed from which, on my theory, it was derived, as it probably reached them independently of any documentary context.

Rechac confusingly prefaces his edition of Fulk's donation of the church of Bram (MOPH XXV no. 11) with the comment that 'l'acte qu'il en fit exprime les noms des premieres Filles du Monastere' (VD 202); this was certainly not the source from which he derived the names,<sup>119</sup> but it implies that he had at least not kept a note of any other documentary source for them.

One of the 'first nuns' appears in VD 197 as 'Seur Guillaumine de Beau-puys', who is patently the 'Guilhelma de Bellopodio' of MOPH XXV no. 11.<sup>120</sup> 'Beau-puys' is the correct French name of

<sup>119</sup> Apart from the fact that his text of MOPH XXV no. 11 omits some of the names which he included among the first nuns, this was clearly where he found the first few names on his list of those who entered *after* the first nuns (VD 198); the 'first nuns' do not even correspond to the first eleven names in MOPH XXV no. 11, so his basis for identifying which of those listed there were not 'first nuns' must have been a list of 'first nuns' derived from some other source.

<sup>120</sup> As can be seen from VD 202-203, 'Guillaumine' is how Rechac translated 'Guillelma'.

'Bellumpodium'; however, Rechac wanted to display knowledge of the local vernacular, so in VD 216 we find 'Guillaumine de Beau-Puys, ou en langage du Pays, de Bel-pous', and in VD 184 simply 'Guillaumine de Bel-pous'. Evidently pleased with his ability to translate *podium* into Occitan, Rechac also rendered *Podium Suiranum* as 'Pouzerans', and *Podium Viride* as 'Pou-Verd' (VD 204, 238). Unfortunately for him, though, *pous* is the Occitan for *puteus*, not *podium*; and the confusion can only have arisen in French: while he was still in the region, he must have asked someone the Occitan for 'puy' (*podium*) and not realized that he was actually told the Occitan for 'puits' (*puteus*).<sup>121</sup>

Rechac could no doubt make the connection between *podium* and 'puy' for himself, but there is no reason to suppose that in VD 204 and 238, where he was simply translating Latin documents, he turned the place-names into French before attempting to turn them into Occitan. It is therefore most probably in connection with 'Guillaumine de Beau-puys' that he first learned to treat *pous* as the Occitan for *puy*; and it was on the basis of her French name that he was led astray. It is thus far from certain that he had ever seen her name in Latin, let alone that he had seen it in the context of our putative deed of 1208.

In his notes on VD, Cambefort copied the 'first nuns' from VD 197. In LDP f.21<sup>v</sup>, however, 'Guillaumine de Beau-puys' has mysteriously turned into 'Guillaumine de Beau Pons' or 'Beau Fons' (the initial capital is unclear).<sup>122</sup>

If he wanted to give the name in French, Cambefort had no reason to be dissatisfied with 'de Beau-puys', so it looks as if the first nuns entered his compilation before he started using VD. All the same, it is difficult to see what could underly 'Beau Pons' or 'Beau Fons' except a misreading of Rechac's misguided 'Bel-pous'.<sup>123</sup>

<sup>121</sup> Bellumpodium was 'Belpug' in Occitan in the 13th century (Toulouse 609 f.22<sup>r</sup>). According to A.Sabarthès, *Dictionnaire topographique du Département de l'Aude*, Paris 1912, 28, *Belpech* and *Beaupuy* are both attested from the 16th century.

<sup>122</sup> It was read as 'Beau Fons' by 'frere Ph.<sup>e</sup> Abadie' in 1726 (p.105; his transcription of LDP is in the archives of Prouille, and he identifies himself and the date *ibid.* p.672), and by the author of *Histoire de Prouille*, p.9; but read as 'Beau Pons' it is undoubtedly the source of 'de Bellopont' in Percin, *Monumenta* I 6 §27, and (independently, it seems) QE I 6.

<sup>123</sup> It seems that Rechac's handwriting did not distinguish clearly between u and n: *Pons viridis*, where one of Prouille's offshoots was founded, appears in print as 'Pou-Verd' (VD 716-717, 989, 1003), which is presumably not what Rechac intended; with the help of Gui's Latin text, Cambefort was able to correct it to 'Pont vert' (LDP

or an attempt to turn it into a more plausible place-name. Rechac had presumably shown Cambefort his list of the first nuns before leaving Fanjeaux. One thing at least is certain: Cambefort reproduced the list without reference to any Latin original.<sup>124</sup>

Though the names in Percin's version of the first nuns are unmistakably translated into Latin from Cambefort's French, he claims to have obtained them from 'Jordan' (*Monumenta* I 6 §27). This is how he refers to the Prouille manuscript of Bernard Gui, and it is possible that he had seen them there—this would not be the only occasion on which he cites a manuscript to which he had certainly had access while actually quoting a text taken from a different source.

In principle, it is not unreasonable to surmise that Gui included extra material on Prouille in the manuscript which he presented to the nuns; but if he had actually been able to name the founding community he would have retained the information in subsequent manuscripts of his compilation, and this is not the case.<sup>125</sup> This does not necessarily prove that the Prouille manuscript did not contain our putative deed from 1208 in which the names were included, since Gui—who would have understood the true significance of '1207'—might have transcribed it without inferring anything about 'first nuns'; but Cambefort made extensive notes on the manuscript<sup>126</sup> as well as copying a fair amount of material from it into LDP, and he shows no sign of knowing any such deed, and it is unlikely that he would simply have ignored it if it was there.

If we take Percin's reference to 'Jordan' seriously—and his track-record does not inspire confidence—it is conceivable that Gui did come across the 1208 deed, did not consider it worth transcribing, but found the names in it worthy of note, not as indicating the founding community, but as a sort of equivalent to his list of the 'brethren who chose the Rule with St Dominic' (MOPH XXII 150-157) which it would be appropriate to include in the manuscript

---

f.24<sup>v</sup>), though he retained 'Pou-vert' when he copied Rechac's chronological list of foundations in his notes on VD.

<sup>124</sup> Cambefort corrected Rechac's pseudo-Occitan rendering of *Podium Suiranum* and *Podium Viride* to 'Pechsiuran' and 'Pechvert' (LDP ff.45<sup>v</sup>, 62<sup>v</sup>), but in these cases he was guided by the accompanying Latin text.

<sup>125</sup> He listed the foundresses of Prouille's daughter-houses (MOPH XXIV 234, 239, 284, 287); a fortiori, he would have listed the foundresses of Prouille itself if he could.

<sup>126</sup> His notes are preserved in Arch. dép. de l'Aude H 461.

intended for Prouille;<sup>127</sup> in that case it would be in line with Cambefort's general practice not to transcribe from Gui a list of names which he had already got from Rechac.<sup>128</sup> As for Rechac, I have the impression that his acquaintance with the Prouille manuscript was limited to a few passages to which his attention was drawn, probably by the prior, Jean Carquet.

All told, it is not certain that the list of the 'first nuns' was in Gui's manuscript, and if it was there the deed from which it was taken was not necessarily transcribed in full; and the names may have been preserved at Prouille independently of Gui's manuscript and passed on to Rechac, possibly in French, by someone such as the prior or prioress, both of whom Rechac thanks for their kindness (VD 194bis). There is no proof that Cambefort knew them from any source other than Rechac; Souèges certainly took them from VD, Percin from Cambefort, and Échard from an informant at Prouille who took them from Cambefort.

In conclusion:

(a) A, B and C cannot be genuine deeds, but they are also unconvincing as pure fakes. No surviving source can account for their most disconcerting elements, which may therefore be presumed to come from some other document or documents.

(b) C is not, as has been alleged, a mutilated version of B, it exists in its own right; and it is easy to reconstitute from it a perfectly plausible deed from 1206 in which Fulk gave Diego the use of the Prouille church, at Dominic's request, for women who had been 'converted' by the anti-heretical preachers and wanted to live 'religiously'.

(c) A does not have any of B's distinctive features, and '*pro mulieribus conuersis*' shows that it cannot be an abridgement of C as it stands; but it could be an abridgement of the deed on which C was based.

(d) The situation in 1218 could explain why the date was changed to 1211; in any case, the change suggests an appreciation of the fact that it really was in 1211 that Fulk effectively transferred ownership of the Prouille territory to the monastery.

<sup>127</sup> He might have devoted one of his periodic marginal notes to reporting that he had found such-and-such nuns named in a deed of Jan. 1207.

<sup>128</sup> The same would apply if someone at Prouille had extracted the names from the deed and added them in the margin of Gui's manuscript (perhaps when the deed was pillaged by the compiler of B, especially if the original was then discarded).



(e) B is an apparently unfinished attempt to insert into C some elements taken from another, later deed.

(f) There are reasons for conjecturing that B's secondary source was a deed from 1208 in which Fulk gave the 'converted ladies' of Prouille, as named individuals, a life-interest in the church which they were occupying.

(g) It was probably from this secondary source that the list of the 'first nuns' was derived, though it is unlikely that any of the seventeenth-century writers who recorded the list had seen it in its original context.

### 3. Conclusions

If my analysis of the fake deeds is correct, we have found good reason to take them seriously and we have retrieved vital documentary evidence that the church in Prouille was made available to Diego in 1206 (i.e. before 25 March 1207) so that women 'converted' by anti-heretical preachers could lead some kind of religious life there, and that, by the beginning of 1208, Fulk had upgraded them from *mulieres* to *dominae conuersae*.

It is clear from MOPH XXV no. 6 that there were *sorores* as well as *fratres* involved in Diego's *praedicatio*; we know of no one to whom the term could apply except the sisters of Prouille, and it was in their archives that the deed in question was preserved. The word *sorores* does not necessarily imply that they were nuns,<sup>129</sup> but they must surely be the same as the people whom Bérenger called *moniales* (MOPH XXV no. 5), in which case they were nuns or could at least be considered such; and there can be no doubt that the 'moniales nouiter conuersae monitis et exemplis fratris Dominici oxomensis sociorumque eius' living at Fanjeaux and Prouille to whom Bérenger refers in April 1207 are the same as the 'mulieres conuerse per predicatores ad predicandum contra hereticos et ad repellendam heresim pestiferam delegatos' to whom Fulk refers in 1206.

Nuns 'converted' by anti-heretical preachers and regarded as an integral part of their *praedicatio* are not necessarily women converted from heresy. If it was Diego's intention to create a monastery where

<sup>129</sup> 'Soror Bene' in Const. §46 and 52 was clearly not a nun, any more than was 'soror Amata' in Cecilia, *Mir.* §5 (there is an edition by A. Walz in AFP 37 [1967] 29).

girls could be educated as an alternative to the heretical households to which they were otherwise liable to be sent, then he needed nuns to staff it. However, as we have seen, the educational theory of Prouille rests on a questionable interpretation of *Lib.* §27, and our recovered deeds permit a more precise elucidation of Jordan's rather cryptic words.

The monastery was founded, he says, 'ad susceptionem quarundam feminarum nobilium'—for 'women', not for 'girls', and women of a certain social standing; this tallies with *mulieres* in Fulk's deed of 1206 and with his subsequent reclassification of them as *dominae*. Jordan does not actually say that they were heretics, but 'quas parentes earum ratione paupertatis erudiendas et nutriendas tradebant hereticis' is presumably meant to explain their background, and it implies that as adults they were forced by their families' poverty to throw in their lot with the heretics. This is consonant with Fulk acceding to Dominic's request 'precipue quia sibi uisum fuit <opus> esse pietatis et misericordie'.

If Prouille was founded for converts from heresy, the discrepancy between Bérenger's willingness to call its inhabitants 'moniales' and Fulk's refusal to call them that even in May 1211 becomes explicable. As far as Diego and his team were concerned, what they were trying to establish was a *monasterium* (as Jordan says); all that potential benefactors such as the archbishop of Narbonne needed to know was that its recruits were needy *moniales*. But, with Diego dead and Dominic departed, it is understandable that the diocesan bishop was hesitant to take responsibility for them as a monastic institution and preferred to go on treating them as 'lady converts' (*dominae conuersae*), as he had in 1208.

Nor should we be overhasty in banishing the 'noble' Fanjeaux matrons (*dominae*, clearly, not just *mulieres*) from Prouille's beginnings. Scheeben dismissed the whole tale as a 'reichlich phantastische Legende' (*Der hl. Dominikus* 435), but a witness in the Languedoc canonization process testified on oath to the apparition of the hell-cat and the conversion of nine women (Appendix I 2);<sup>130</sup> and, whatever we make of the hell-cat, it is absurd to treat the claim that some of them became nuns at Prouille as a 'combinaison légendaire' or dubious 'embellishment', as Vicaire

<sup>130</sup> As is now generally recognized, the Berengaria who gave this testimony cannot be identified with the 'Berengere' who appears among the 'first nuns'. The Modena manuscript, which has the fullest text of the Languedoc process, clearly identifies the nuns of Prouille who testified, and Berengaria is not one of them.

seems inclined to do (Mandonnet-Vicaire I 100, *Histoire* I 250). It was certainly not invented by Constantine who had no interest at all in Prouille,<sup>131</sup> and it was presumably included by the Languedoc brethren who supplied the information simply because it was part of the story as they knew it—it does not make the episode any more miraculous, and it was *miracula* which the 1245 general chapter had called for (MOPH III 33); I see no reason why it should not be true.<sup>132</sup>

Constantine's text has been used as proof that in any case the Fanjeaux matrons did not belong to the founding community of Prouille, and 'quarum etiam aliquae apud sorores de Pruliano religionis habitum assumpserunt' (Appendix I 6) does indeed give the impression that there were already nuns there; but we cannot rely on his choice of words to answer a question which was of no concern to him, and Stephen of Bourbon's formulation, 'quedam earum apud Prulianum sororum habitum assumpserunt' (Appendix I 7), is not incompatible with them being among the first to receive the habit. Neither author was interested in the anecdote as evidence for the early history of Prouille: for Constantine it was an example of Dominic's thaumaturgical prowess, and Stephen of Bourbon used it to illustrate 'horror demonum'; for their purposes it was more than enough that some of the matrons were so thoroughly converted that they became nuns. Neither of them tells us when these ladies were converted, but the heretics fled Fanjeaux in 1209 (cf. AFP 73 [2003] 27), so it must have happened before Dominic left the region at the beginning of 1208, and 1206 is as plausible a date as any.

Fanjeaux was certainly involved in the beginnings of Prouille. Death prevented Diego from completing the monastery as he had intended (*Lib.* §28), so for some years the nuns could not all live at Prouille; Fanjeaux, which is mentioned first in the earliest deeds (MOPH XXV nos. 5 and 9), may even have been their main residence.<sup>133</sup> We may surmise that it was precisely because a

<sup>131</sup> He did not even retain the account of its foundation in his legenda.

<sup>132</sup> The testimony of Prouille nuns is clearly demarcated in the Modena manuscript of the Languedoc process, and none of them says anything about the Fanjeaux conversions; but it is doubtful whether any nuns from 1206/1207 were still alive and at Prouille in 1233 (four Prouille nuns remained at S.Sisto: AFP 31 [1961] 70). The names are too garbled in the Modena manuscript to be of much value, but of the numerous nuns listed in a deed from 1234/1235 (BNF Doat 98 f.71, LDP f.34, VD 203; Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 112 no. 353) none can be identified with any of the 'first nuns'.

<sup>133</sup> Vicaire argued that 'in castro Phano Iouis' was simply repeated from MOPH XXV no. 5 and did not mean anything in 1209 (*Histoire* I.258 n.84; CdF 23 [1988]

community of converts was taking shape there that Dominic asked Fulk to let them have the church at Prouille in the first place. Someone must have supplied the house, very possibly a local lady who was herself a member of the community. She may or may not have been one of the 'noble matrons' whose conversion is reported in Const. §48-49; if she was, the story current in Fanjeaux in the seventeenth century was after all not wholly false.

Schulman has recently re-opened the question whether Prouille was originally meant to be a monastery, and specifically whether enclosure was envisaged from the outset. He suggests that though Fulk was 'not opposed to Prouille becoming a formally organized monastery'—rather an understatement, granted that Fulk claimed to have *built* the monastery<sup>134</sup>—what he initially had in mind was 'an outlet for orthodox religiosity that was sufficiently flexible to accommodate the needs of the people in the face of a heretical movement whose attraction the Church did not fully understand'; 'there is no reason to think that Fulk believed claustration, or even formal organization, was the only way to harness female religiosity' (*Where troubadours were bishops* 77).

The nuns of Prouille were certainly enclosed at some stage.<sup>135</sup> The monastery tradition attested by Bernard Gui in 1307 in the letter which I have already quoted, that Dominic himself 'first enclosed the sisters in the monastery of Prouille on the feast of St John the evangelist', might be considered suspect in as much as it could have been motivated by the same concern which later made them insist on having Dominic named as their founder (cf. AFP 66 [1996] 149-150); but they must have been enclosed by 1221 when eight of their nuns were brought to Rome to provide formation for the new

---

237), but this is not fair: MOPH XXV no. 9 updates the formula by dropping *nouiter* from 'monialibus nouiter conuersis'; *in castro Phani Iouis* could also have been dropped if it no longer applied. The first evidence that the nuns were all at Prouille comes from May 1211 (MOPH XXV nos. 10 and 11).

<sup>134</sup> Fulk makes the claim that the *monasterium* was 'a nobis edificatum et constructum' in connection with his gift to it of the church of Fanjeaux. The text of his deed known only from Bernard Gui (MOPH XXIV 19-20), but his claim is echoed in Gregory IX's confirmation of the gift, which is also known from the papal register: Prouille is called a monastery 'quod ipse construxerat' (*Epitome Bullarii*, ASOP 3 [1897-1898] 614; Reg. no. 631).

<sup>135</sup> Innocent IV addressed them as *inclusae* in 1248 (Guiraud, *Cartulaire* I 8 no. 10), and their perpetual enclosure is mentioned in Humbert's *legenda* §19; enclosure is also implied by the claim which the nuns made in 1236 that they were living by the 'regula monialium sancti Sixti de Urbe' (AFP 65 [1995] 165).

community at San Sisto:<sup>136</sup> getting the Roman nuns enclosed was one of the main purposes for which San Sisto was founded,<sup>137</sup> so it would have been absurd to rely on unenclosed nuns to nurture its observance.

Dominic's letter to the nuns of Madrid shows that they too were enclosed.<sup>138</sup> The letter was occasioned by the completion of the monastery buildings which removed whatever excuse the nuns had had for not observing their *religio*; this implies that enclosure, like the other observances mentioned, was something which had been envisaged from the outset even if it had until then not been possible in practice.

The origins of the monastery go back to Dominic's visit to Madrid in 1218.<sup>139</sup> His letter gives the impression of reminding the nuns of key points in their *religio* which could now come fully into force, and we may reasonably suppose that the observance they were intended to follow was the same as at Prouille. However, even if we infer that the nuns of Prouille had already been enclosed before Dominic left Languedoc at the end of 1217, this does not necessarily take us much further back, in that it could be suggested that enclosure was a feature of female monastic life which he had learned to appreciate from his contacts with the papal curia in Rome earlier in the year.<sup>140</sup>

<sup>136</sup> Benedetto of Montefiascone, ed. Koudelka, AFP 31 (1961) 70.

<sup>137</sup> Cf. the texts quoted by B.M. Bolton in W.J. Sheils-D. Wood, ed., *Women in the church*, Studies in Church History 27, Oxford 1990, 108. According to Cecilia, *Mir.* §14, Dominic established enclosure at S. Maria in Tempuli even before the nuns moved to S. Sisto.

<sup>138</sup> 'Nulla egrediatur portam et nullus ingrediatur nisi episcopus uel aliquis prelati causa predicandi uel uisitandi' (ed. Tugwell, AFP 56 [1986] 12).

<sup>139</sup> What Jordan says about Dominic's Spanish foundations in *Lib.* §59 was probably based on information which he gleaned during Dominic's visit to Paris in 1219, but the statement that the house in Madrid 'nunc est monialium' looks like a later adaptation of whatever he originally wrote. However, it was presumably during his visit to Paris that Dominic sent his brother Mamés to take charge of the nuns: Mamés was sent to Paris in 1217 (*Lib.* §51), and he must have been in Madrid for some time before Dominic wrote to the nuns there (he says in his letter that his dearest brother 'multum laborauit et ad istum sanctissimum statum uos copulauit'); this implies that the plan to create a monastery in Madrid must have been formed before Dominic left Spain. It is therefore entirely possible that he himself gave the habit to the first nuns there, as is stated in a story in the *Vitas fratrum* (cf. MOPH I 224).

<sup>140</sup> It is clear from the *formula* which he was shortly to give to Clare's 'Poor Ladies' that Cardinal Ugolino attached great importance to enclosure (*Formula Hugolini* §3); on the earliest known version of this text, see Tugwell, AFH 93 (2000) 511-513. Dominic's contacts with Ugolino in 1217 and 1218 are evident from Bologna canonization process §12 (cf. AFP 66 [1996] 109-113) and Ferr. §33.

As long as some, perhaps most, of the nuns were living at Fanjeaux, it is, as Schulman points out, absurd 'to view them as cloistered' (op. cit. 93 note 120); but this does not necessarily reveal anything about the founders' intentions. As happened at Madrid, it is quite conceivable that full monastic observance was always the goal, even if it could not immediately be attained.

It is no doubt true that Fulk's enthusiastic response to the béguines he encountered in the Low Countries displays an openness to less formal kinds of religious life, but there is no reason to believe that he had even heard of them in 1206;<sup>141</sup> he had, however, almost certainly been involved, as abbot of Le Thoronet, in the recent foundation of a Cistercian nunnery at Saint-Pons-de-Gémenos.<sup>142</sup> If we also bear in mind that Diego had founded a Cistercian nunnery in his diocese,<sup>143</sup> and that William Claret, who evidently had some sort of responsibility for Prouille more or less from the outset,<sup>144</sup> was a Cistercian from Boulbonne (Vicaire, *Histoire* I 252),<sup>145</sup> there must be a certain presumption that what was envisaged at Prouille was a formal monastery along Cistercian lines, which would probably have entailed enclosure.<sup>146</sup>

<sup>141</sup> We learn about Fulk's reaction to the béguines from Jacques de Vitry's life of Marie of Oignies, which is dedicated to him (§2-3) (the life is edited in *Acta Sanctorum* under 23 June; I have also consulted Troyes, Bibl. Mun. 401). While preaching the Albigensian crusade in (northern) France, he went to the diocese of Liège, 'quasi tractus odore et fama querumdam deo in uera humilitate militantium', and he was filled with admiration for the 'sancte mulieres' he found there (§2). There is nothing to indicate that he visited the region more than once, and the only time he is known to have gone there is when he saw Marie of Oignies during her final illness (§104); she died on 23 June 1213 (§109), and Fulk went North after the council of Lavaur in time to be in Paris on 3 March 1213 (Cernai §418). It is tempting to speculate that he heard about the 'sancte mulieres' from Jacques de Vitry, whom he could have met when they were both engaged in crusade preaching in 1211 (Schulman, op. cit. 108); in any case, on his own account as reported by Jacques, he first learned to be impressed by the people of the Low Countries when he met some of them who had come to his territory as crusaders (§2), i.e. not before the arrival of the first crusaders in 1209.

<sup>142</sup> M. Aurell i Cardona, CdF 21 (1986) 236, 253, 259; Schulman, op. cit. 47-48.

<sup>143</sup> J. González, *El reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII*, Madrid 1960, I 554 and III 300-301. I suggested in AFP 68 (1998) 60 that it was to obtain support for this foundation that Diego visited Cîteaux on the way back from one of his journeys to the North.

<sup>144</sup> It was he, with Dominic, who acted on the nuns' behalf in receiving Bérenger's gift in 1207 (Appendix II).

<sup>145</sup> Later, according to a report which reached Bernard Gui, William actually tried to get Prouille transferred to the Cistercians (MOPH XXIV 24).

<sup>146</sup> Since the Cistercian order was slow to acknowledge the existence of Cistercian nuns, there were no official regulations on their observance until 1213,

If we add to this the fact that Jordan, who had good information about Diego (cf. AFP 68 [1998] 42-63), says that one of his intentions when he left Languedoc for the last time was to return with funds for the completion of his 'monastery' ('ad consummationem prefati monasterii feminarum', *Lib.* §28), and that Bérenger refers to *moniales* in April 1207 (Appendix II), we have scant grounds for believing that the founders of Prouille had anything other in mind than a proper monastery.

If we take all the evidence together, a coherent picture emerges.

Diego's intention (and Dominic's too, no doubt) was to establish a monastery where women converts from heresy could live as nuns, beginning with some who had been converted in or around Fanjeaux by preachers in his team under the leadership of Dominic. This may well imply a belief that *ex-perfectae* should be offered a Catholic equivalent to the way of life which they were abandoning, and it was probably foreseen from the outset that a monastery could provide a useful base for the *praedicatio*; however, Diego (and no doubt Dominic) were particularly moved by the plight of women who were in effect forced into heresy by the poverty of their families. His monastery was to be a charitable foundation making no financial demands on its recruits.

Dominic approached Fulk to ask if the church at Prouille could be made available for this purpose. Fulk obliged and gave the church to Diego<sup>147</sup> as the head of a *praedicatio* which was beginning to take shape and which, it was hoped, would provide a longer-term mission against heresy than that of the Cistercians. What was proposed was a work of mercy deserving the bishop's support, and it was related to one of his own major concerns, the campaign against heresy.

All too soon, though, before the plan to build a monastery could be fulfilled, Diego died and so his *praedicatio* collapsed. Fulk had

---

but in that year the general chapter forbade already 'incorporated' nuns to leave their monasteries without permission from the abbot to whose care they were entrusted, 'quia omnino non expedit animabus earum', and it made the incorporation of further nuns conditional on them being 'penitus includendae' (1213 §3) (J.M. Canivez, ed., *Statuta capitulorum generalium ordinis Cisterciensis* I, Louvain 1933, 405). This insistence on enclosure did not spring out of nowhere in 1213 (cf. F. Neining, *Konrad von Urach*, Paderborn 1994, 527 doc. 1), and there is a good chance that it was already part of the Cistercian ethos in 1206.

<sup>147</sup> 'In quantum fieri potest', if my reconstruction of his deed is correct: he could allow the church and its surrounding territory to be used, but he could not hand it over lock, stock and barrel because he could not afford to detach it from the parish church in Fanjeaux and restore its tithes.

inherited a nearly bankrupt see (Puylaurens VII, ed. cit. 44), so he was in no position to fund the completion of the monastery; the 'nuns' were thus left in a doubly anomalous position: as ex-heretics they were an unusual religious community, and they did not have a place where they could lead a full monastic life. However willing he was to help them as individuals, Fulk was understandably hesitant to commit the diocese to looking after them as a permanent institution; he therefore continued to regard them as 'the convert ladies' rather than as 'nuns'.<sup>148</sup>

The situation changed again in 1211 when Dominic returned to the region, probably with some other canons; under their care there was no reason why Prouille should not be recognized as an institution, and Fulk (whose own finances had presumably improved in the mean time) decided to build a proper monastery there. When it was ready, we may take it that full observance was established, and this is as likely an occasion as any for the nuns' enclosure.

How long Prouille continued to be primarily a house of converts from heresy there is no way of knowing, but nobody reading Jordan's description of it, which presumably reflects what Dominic's recruits thought of it in 1217, would guess that its denizens were anything other than model nuns (Appendix I 1):

Monasterium ... ubi usque in hodiernum diem ancille Christi grata exhibent suo creatori seruitia magno sanctitatis uigore et preclara innocentie puritate, uitam agentes salutarem sibi, exemplarem hominibus, iocundam angelis, gratam deo.

With regard to the 'jeunes filles' who feature so persistently in the historiography of Prouille, the most that can be said is that it was perfectly normal for a nunnery to take young girls under its wing and we have no special reason to believe that this was not expected to happen at Prouille. It is quite possible that Diego and Dominic foresaw the charitable purpose of their monastery as including the reception, not just of nuns who could not afford a dowry, but also of young girls whose families could not afford the customary donation; but there is no evidence that they were actually thinking in these terms, or that, in its early years, Prouille did in practice accept young girls with or without financial contributions from their parents. We are completely in the dark.

<sup>148</sup> 'The convert ladies' served to designate them as a group; by mid 1211, perhaps even by early 1208, it did not necessarily mean that every single individual was a convert from heresy (as Vicaire pointed out in *Histoire*<sup>1</sup> I 249). For that matter, they did not all necessarily come from poor families.



APPENDIX I  
The narrative tradition

The texts presented here are meant to display the historiographical traditions on (a) the founding of Prouille, and (b) the conversion of the Fanjeaux matrons, up to the point at which they coalesce in the mid-seventeenth century.

For each text I indicate an edition, if there is one, whose paragraph- or page-numbering can be cited; for those I have edited myself I also list the manuscripts I have used. Sigla for each work comprise the first letter of each manuscript's location or, if necessary, the first letter plus the next letter where they differ—thus Bo and Br for Bologna and Brussels, Pi and Pm for Paris and Parma; different manuscripts from the same place (or different texts in the same manuscript) are distinguished by suprascript numerals in accordance with the order in which they are listed. I have noted all but the most trivial variants so that the assessment of how one text may have influenced another can be based on the fullest possible information.

(1) Jordan of Saxony OP, *Libellus*

Ed.: H.C.Scheeben, in MOPH XVI.

Mss.: Osma (known from *Acta Sanctorum*, Aug. I, Antwerp 1733, 545-558). Prouille (known from QE I 2-23, 93-96, 99). Venice, Bibl. Marciana lat. IX 61. Würzburg, Univ. Bibl. M.p.th.q.57 (two texts, ff.7<sup>v</sup>-25<sup>v</sup> and ff.40<sup>v</sup>-51<sup>v</sup>).

In several places the other witnesses to the *Libellus* differ from O in ways which suggest that alterations were superimposed on otherwise unrelated manuscripts, presumably on the authority of the general chapter; however, though O is in principle closer to Jordan's original text, it is not exempt from scribal accidents. It is unlikely that the discrepancies in §27 are due to official intervention; O's idiosyncrasies are therefore not necessarily significant.

(a) §27 (the subject is *uir dei Didacus episcopus*, as in §26).

Ad susceptionem autem quarundam feminarum nobilium, quas parentes earum ratione paupertatis erudiendas et nutriendas tradebant hereticis, quoddam instituit monasterium situm inter Fanum Iouis et

---

(1a) 1 feminarum (cf. §28)] mulierum O 3 post hereticis add. e legenda Humberti post cap. gen. anni 1259 (cf. infra n.9a et 10) earum miseratus opprobrium servus dei Dominicus P situm om. P

5 Montem Regalem, et nomen loci eiusdem Prulianum, ubi usque in hodiernum diem ancille Christi grata exhibent suo creatori seruitia magno sanctitatis uigore et preclara innocentie puritate, uitam agentes salutarem sibi, exemplarem hominibus, iocundam angelis, gratam deo.

(2) Languedoc canonization process

Ed.: A.Walz, in MOPH XVI.

Mss.: Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1999 ff.26<sup>v</sup>-28<sup>v</sup> (Borselli). Carcassonne (known from QE I 56-58). Madrid, Mon. de S.Domingo ff.73<sup>v</sup>-78<sup>r</sup> (14th-century Spanish text; see infra 2 b2). Modena, Bibl. Estense Campori App. 59 ff.139<sup>r</sup>-144<sup>r</sup>. Prouille (Cambefort, LDP) ff.88<sup>v</sup>-90<sup>r</sup>. Venice, Bibl. Marciana IX 61 ff.41<sup>r</sup>-44<sup>r</sup>.

Mo is the only surviving witness to the Languedoc process as it existed independently of the combined processes (cf. AFP 66 [1996] 59-63), but it is not particularly accurate. C was printed, P copied, and Ma translated from manuscripts of Bernard Gui which are now lost. Taegio's text in AGOP XIV 53 ff.135<sup>v</sup>-137<sup>v</sup> was copied from Borselli.

Neither the text nor the meaning of Berengaria's deposition is entirely clear. Mo's *magnam* in line 6, which would make 'big as a dog' a comment on the cat's tail, is unlikely to be correct; literary versions of the story (infra 6b and 7b) support taking 'magnum quasi unum canem' with *demonium*. This suggests that *extrahentem* should be read and that it and *habentem* are also meant to agree with *demonium*, which is grammatically neuter but could be considered masculine in sense. If so, BV are probably right to have *qui*, and both *quod* and *extrahebat* can be regarded as scribal corrections. *Extrahebat* receives apparent support from Ma's *tenia*, but this is coincidental: *tenia ... de fuera* corresponds to *extra habentem* in P, turned into the indicative for the convenience of the translator; and *extra habentem* is surely a corruption of Gui's original reading, *extrahentem*, preserved by C in agreement with BV.

Ma's *braçada* indicates that *branch(i)am* was taken as a measure, which would allow *habentem* to agree with *caudam*, making *caudam* itself the object of *extrahentem*. Such a use of *habere* to mean 'having' a certain size is not impossible, but it is doubtful whether *branch(i)a* can serve as a measure; Walz refers to Du Cange for such a use, but Du Cange (s.v. *branchia* 2) merely cites the note on this very passage as found in *Acta Sanctorum*, Aug. I 647, where the editor actually suggests emending *branchiam* to *brachium*. Berengaria probably said that the demon 'had a tail like half a branch' (Occitan *branca*).

The rather vernacular *unum* in line 6 is supported by Stephen of Bourbon (infra 7b.11); CP suggest that Gui suppressed it.

---

4 et om. PV Prulianum] Pruilanum V, Plurianum W<sup>1</sup> 6 uigore] exemplo O 7 exemplarem hominibus] hominibus exemplarem P iocundam angelis gratam deo] iocundam deo gratam angelis W<sup>1</sup>W<sup>2</sup>

(b1) §23.

Berengaria dixit quod oculis uidit et auribus audiuit quando beatus Dominicus precepit nouem mulieribus hereticis ab errore conuersis prospicere in demonium qui eas possederat in specie catti, cuius oculi erant quasi bouis et etiam uelut flamma ignis, et linguam per dimidium pedem extrahentem quasi ignem, et caudam quasi dimidiam brancham habentem, et magnum quasi unum canem. Et ad preceptum ipsius per foramen corde campane exiuit et ab oculis earum euanuit. Tamen primo predixerat eis quod non timerent, quia ipse ostenderet eis cui domino seruierant.

(b2) §23 (Ma ff.77<sup>v</sup>-78<sup>r</sup>)

Ed.: L.G.A. Getino OP, *Origen del Rosario*, Vergara 1925, 211.

Berengaria jurada dixo que ella vio con los oios e lo oyo con las oreias quando santo Domingo mando a las nueue mugeres hereges conuertidas del error otear en el demonio que las posseya en spezia de gato los <oios> del qual eran commo de buey e commo flamma de fuego, e la lengua tenia por medio del pie de fuera assy commo fuego, e la cola commo media braçada, e la mano commo vn can, e salio por el forado de la cuerda de la campana por mandado de padre santo Domingo et desaparecio les, mas primo les dixo que non temiessen que el les demostraria a qual sennor seruian.

(3) Petrus Ferrandi OP, *Legenda*

Ed.: M.H. Laurent, in MOPH XVI.

Mss.: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Preußischer Kulturbesitz theol. lat. fol. 677 (this contains part of the legenda twice, on ff.9-22<sup>v</sup> and ff.31<sup>r</sup>-44<sup>v</sup>). Dijon, Bibl. Mun. 646. Florence, Bibl. Laur. Strozzi 4. Göttingen, Univ. Bibl. theol. 109. Heidelberg, Univ. Bibl. Sal. IX 24. Lisbon, Bibl. Nac. Alcob. CXXXIII/24. Wrocław, Bibl. Uniw. R 394.

In the passage quoted there are no editorial differences between Ferrandus's original text (preserved in G) and the version approved by the general chapter (found in the other manuscripts).

For a vernacular derivative of Ferr. see W.F. Manning, ed., *The life of Saint Dominic in Old French verse*, Cambridge Mass. 1944; it adds nothing on the founding of Prouille except some imaginative elaboration (pp.187-189).

(2b1) 1 oculis] ipsa oculis CP 3 qui] quod C<sup>Mo</sup>P possederat (+P)] possidebat C(Ma) 4 etiam om. C(Ma)P dimidium] medium B 5 extrahentem BCV] extra habentem P, extrahebat Mo brancham B<sup>Mo</sup>] branchiam CV, brachiam P (braçada Ma) 6 magnum] magnam Mo, mano (i.e. manum) Ma unum om. CP corde] porte B 7 et ab ... euanuit om. P tamen] tanquam P 8 ostenderet eis] ostenderet Mo, eis ostenderet P

(2b2) 3 oios supplevit Getino

(a) §16.

Qualiter episcopus oxomensis instituit monasterium Pruillani

... Erant autem in illis locis nobiles quidam qui egestate compulsi filias suas tradebant hereticis nutriendas et erudiendas, immo reuera pestiferis erroribus eludendas. Quarum perniciosum miseratus opprobrium dei seruus Didacus episcopus monasterium quoddam ad earum susceptionem instituit in loco qui dicitur Pruillanum, ubi usque hodie ancille Christi gratum deo exhibent famulatum.

(4) Jean de Mailly OP, *Vita beati Dominici*

Ed.: M.D.Chapotin, *Les Dominicains d'Auxerre*, Paris 1892, 317-324.

Mss.: Basel, Univ. Bibl. B III 14. Bern, Bürgerbibl. 377. Brussels, Bibl. Royale 5149 and IV 1147. Paris, Arsenal 937. Paris, BNF lat. 16537.

Dominic's life, an abridgement of Ferr., was added in the third edition of Jean's *Abbreviatio*, dated 1243; cf. Tugwell, in S.Lusignan-M.Paulmier-Foucart, edd., *Lector et compilator, Vincent de Beauvais*, Grâne 1997, 47-48.

(a) p. 319.

Cum ergo predictus episcopus ad fidem plurimos attraxisset et ad susceptionem uirginum, quas parentes pauperes hereticis nutriendas et erudiendas tradebant, monasterium construxisset, post biennium in Hispaniam redire decreuit ...

(5) Bartholomew of Trent OP, *Liber epilogorum in gesta sanctorum*

Ed.: E.Paoli, Florence 2001 (with no variants in the passage quoted).

Bartholomew's account of the founding of Prouille is obviously paraphrased from Ferr. (supra 3a); the name given to Prouille, 'Privilianum', is the same as in the Florence manuscript of Ferr.

(a) p. 210.

Dum igitur multi pre inopia filias suas in partibus illis hereticis alendas traderent, Didachus apud Privilianum monasterium instituit ancillis Christi.

---

(3a) 1 qualiter ... Pruillani (cf. Humb.) alia manu in marg. suppl. L] de gracia quam deus contulit oxomensi episcopo et qualiter instituit monasterium (+Pruillani B<sup>2</sup>) B<sup>2</sup>H, om. B<sup>1</sup>DFW (tales titulos non habet G) episcopus oxomensis scripsi (cf. infra n.10)] beatus Dominicus L 2 in illis locis (cf. Humb.)] illis in locis B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>L, in locis illis F 3-4 pestiferis erroribus GLT] erroribus pestiferis (cf. Humb., Diet.) B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>DHW, et erroribus pestiferis F 4 eludendas] illudendas W 4-5 dei seruus om. F 5 Didacus episcopus] Dominicus alia manu supra rasuram L 6 Pruillanum] Pruilianum W, Pruilianum D, Priuilianum F, Pr'ilianum H 7 deo om. B<sup>1</sup>

(4a) 1 ergo om. Ba 3 construxisset] construxissent BeBr<sup>2</sup>P<sup>1</sup>P<sup>2</sup>

(6) Constantine OP, *Legenda*

Ed.: H.C.Scheeben, in MOPH XVI.

Mss.: Berlin, Staatsbibl. theol. lat. fol. 591 and 677. Cambridge, Univ. Library Mm IV 6. Copenhagen, Det kongelige Bibliotek, Thott 138. Florence, BN conv. soppr. F.7.378. Göttingen, Univ. Bibl. theol. 108. Paris, BNF lat. 18324 and n.a.l. 772. Siena, Bibl. Com. K.VII.2. Trier, Stadtbibliothek 1140/443. Vatican, Reg. lat. 584.

Vincent of Beauvais and Humbert (infra 8b and 9b) copy Const. §48-49 almost verbatim and can be used as evidence for the text. In lines 27-28 their combined testimony suggests that the original reading was *coram oculis* with no possessive; granted phrases like *coram oculis meis* and *coram oculis nostris* in the Vulgate (Job 4.16, Ps. 78.10), this probably counts as a *lectio difficilior*. The resulting phrase can be analysed in two ways, though it may be doubted whether anyone using it could have said which he intended. We can take *coram* as an adverb (as such it is glossed by Giovanni Balbi, *Catholicon* s.v., 'id est patenter, euidenter, aperte'; cf. Apuleius, *Met.* 9.21, where being caught *coram* in a crime is contrasted with being disturbed by an awareness of one's own guilt); in this case *oculis* must be construed as a dative with *comparuit*. Or we can take *coram* as a preposition with *oculis*. Either way the whole phrase is analogous to *oculis uidere*, 'see for oneself, with one's own eyes', as used in Berengaria's testimony (supra 2b) (cf. Valerius Maximus 5.4.3, where the *praeclara exempla* which Rome only knows about by hearsay are contrasted with those which *uidit oculis*).

In the 14th-century Italian translation. ed. P.Ferrato, Venice 1867, the Fanjeaux matrons are on pp.69-72; 'quarum etiam ... assumpserunt' (lines 30-31) is rendered 'Alquante di loro presero abito di religione appresso le suore da Pruilone'.

In view of later derivatives of Const. it should be remarked that the translator was probably right to take *teterrimum* in line 18 as 'molto nero'. *Taeter* seems to have lost its original meaning ('hideous') in favour of 'dark, black'; thus Smaragdus comments on 'monachorum teterrimum genus' in *Reg. Benedicti* 1.6, 'Teterrimum dicit nigerrimum, obscurissimum, horribile, agreste vel ferum; veteres enim pro nimis fero teterrimum dixerunt' (ed. A.Spannagel-P.Engelbert, *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum* VIII, Siegburg 1974, 58), which echoes Isidore, *Etym.* 10.270, 'teterrimus pro feronimum, tetrum enim veteres pro fero dixerunt'. With a tacit nod to Isidore, Balbi interprets *teter* as 'niger vel ferus'.

## (b) §48-49.

Non minus autem ad diuine uirtutis accedit preconium id quod de demonio a quibusdam matronis per spiritum erroris diu uexatis in anima per uirum dei Dominicum in catti specie uisibiliter effugati in eisdem

---

(6b) 1 accedit] accedat Ca quod] quod est B' 3 in catti specie] in specie cati V eisdem om. V

partibus tholosanis per testes iuratos inuentum est. Cum enim aliquando  
 5 apud castrum quod dicitur Fanum iouis in predicatione quadam, fidem  
 probans catholicam, hereticorum perfidiam multipliciter improbasset, post  
 predicationem more solito in ecclesia ad orandum remansit, et ecce nouem  
 matrone nobiles ex eodem castro intrantes ecclesiam ad pedes eius  
 10 prociderunt dicentes, Serue dei adiuua nos; si uera sunt que hodie  
 predicasti, iam diu mentes nostras erroris spiritus excecauit. Nam istis quos  
 tu hereticos uocas, nos autem bonos homines appellamus, usque in  
 hodiernum diem credidimus et adhesimus toto corde, nunc autem in medio  
 fluctuamus. Serue dei adiuua nos et ora dominum deum tuum ut notam  
 nobis faciat fidem suam in qua uiuamus, moriamur, saluemur. Tunc uir  
 15 dei stans aliquamdiu et intra semetipsum orans post aliquantulum dixit eis,  
 Constantes estote et expectate intrepide; confido in domino deo meo quod  
 ipse qui neminem uult perire iam ostendet uobis quali domino hactenus  
 adhesistis. Statimque uiderunt de medio sui cattum unum teterrimum  
 20 prosilire, qui magni canis preferens quantitatem habebat grossos oculos et  
 flammantes, linguam longam latamque atque sanguinolentam et protractam  
 usque ad umbilicum, caudam uero habens curtam sursumque protensam  
 posteriorum turpitudinem quocumque se uerteret ostendebat, de quibus  
 fetor intolerabilis exalabat. Cumque circa matronas illas se per horam  
 aliquam huc illucque uertisset, ad cordam ex qua campana pendeat exiliens  
 25 et per eam usque ad superiora conscendens tandem per campanile lapsus  
 disparuit feda post se uestigia derelinquens. Conuersus autem ad matronas  
 illas uir dei Dominicus et consolans eas; Ecce inquit per hoc quod coram  
 oculis faciente deo figuratiue comparuit potestis aduertere qualis est ille cui  
 hactenus sequentes hereticos seruiuistis. Ille uero deo gratias referentes ab  
 30 illa hora ad fidem catholicam perfectissime sunt conuerse. Quarum etiam  
 alique apud sorores de Pruliano religionis habitum assumpserunt.

Verum quid cattus ille teterrimus tanteque deformitatis uarietas per  
 singula queque significare debuerit, quia cepti non est propositi sermonem  
 componere sed potius hystoriam texere, ad alia properans ad presens omitto,  
 35 hoc tamen adiciens quod mentes femineas et tanto tempore in errore

---

5 castrum] claustrum G in] et in S 7 remansit] permansit F 8 ex] in Ca 9 pro-  
 ciderunt dicentes] procidentes (in prociderunt corr.) dicentes Co, procidentes  
 dixerunt T 10 erroris spiritus] spiritus erroris Co istis] istos CaCo 11 tu om. aliquo  
 eraso B<sup>1</sup> autem om. Co bonos] beatos B<sup>2</sup> 12 credidimus] credimus B<sup>2</sup>S, credidimus  
 (!) Co adhesimus] adhesimus eis Co 13 dominum] ad dominum G 14 nobis om.  
 et in marg. post faciat inser. P<sup>2</sup> fidem] uiam P<sup>2</sup> saluemur] et saluemur FG 17 osten-  
 det] ostendit B<sup>1</sup> 18 de] in Co 19 preferens] preferens B<sup>2</sup>GV 22 quibus] quo Ca  
 25 et per eam usque ad superiora conscendens om. B<sup>2</sup>V 26 autem] igitur P<sup>2</sup> 27-  
 28 coram oculis e Vinc. et Humb. recepi] coram (in marg. uestris) oculis T, coram  
 oculis uestris B<sup>1</sup>CaP<sup>2</sup>, coram oculis nostris B<sup>2</sup>Co, coram oculis meis V, ante oculos  
 uestros G 31 Pruliano] Pruillano G, Pruilano B<sup>2</sup>, Peruliano P<sup>2</sup> 32 uerum] unde V  
 quid] quem B<sup>2</sup> tanteque deformitatis uarietas] tantaque deformitate uariatus B<sup>2</sup>V  
 33-34 sermonem componere] componere sermonem V 34 potius] post B<sup>2</sup> hysto-  
 riam] hystorias B<sup>2</sup>V 35 quod] quoniam Ca et om. G

fundatas facilius reducere potuit tam terribilis uisio ipsis oculis foris exhibita quam sola uerborum quantalibet persuasio per aures infusa, rursumque nulla forma tam deformis est atque horribilis que illi deformi conuenienter non congruat qui, cum esset similitudinis diuine signaculum, per superbiam factus est spectaculum infernale.

40

## (7) Stephen of Bourbon OP

Ed.: J. Berlioz-J.L. Eichenlaub, CCCM CXXIV, Turnhout 2002.

Ms.: Paris, BNF lat. 15970 f.160<sup>r</sup> (the manuscript used by *the editors*).

## (b) I. v 6. 756-778.

Item de horrore demonum ... audiui a fratre Romeio uiro perito et religioso qui aliquando fuit prior prouincialis fratrum predicatorum in prouincia Prouincie, et in legenda noua beati Dominici legitur, quod cum dictus sanctus predicasset apud Fanumiuois contra hereticos, cum esset in ecclesia orans accesserunt ad eum 9 matrone procidentis ad pedes eius et dicentes, Serue dei illos homines contra quos predicas usque modo credidimus et uocauimus bonos homines, et cum adhuc uacillemus rogamus te ut deum roges ut ostendat nobis in qua fide saluemur, cui adhareamus. Tunc cum aliquandiu apud se orasset ait eis, State intrepide, ostendet uobis dominus cui domino actenus seruiuistis. Et hiis dictis catus teterrimus in medio earum prosiliit habens quantitatem unius magni canis et oculos grossos et flammantes, linguam latam et longam et sanguinolentam et protractam usque ad umbilicum, caudam curtam sursum protensam, posteriorum turpitudinem quocumque se uerteret ostendebat, de quibus fetor intolerabilis exhalabat. Cum autem per horam aliquam circa illas matronas huc illuc se uertisset, ad campanule cordam prosiliens ascendit, post se fedea uestigia derelinquens. Ille autem a sancto confortate ad fidem catholicam perfecte sunt conuerse, et quedam earum apud Prulianum sororum habitum assumpserunt.

(8) Vincent of Beauvais OP, *Speculum Historiale*

Ed.: Douai 1624.

In the first version of *Spec. hist.* Vincent took the life of Dominic from Ferr., omitting the foundation of Prouille (Wrocław, Bibl. Uniw. R 341 f.275<sup>r</sup>). He later added material from Const., including the Fanjeaux matrons (supra

---

36 fundatas] fraudatas G ipsis] patris ut videtur in canis corr. Ca foris] fori S 37 quantalibet] talibus P<sup>2</sup>, quam talibus corr. ut videtur in quantalibet S, om. Co 38 forma tam] tam forma B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>CaFSV illi deformi] illius deformitati B<sup>2</sup>V 39 qui] que Ca, quod B<sup>2</sup> 40 est om. Co spectaculum infernale] infernale spectaculum B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>FSV

(7b) 4 Fanumiuois] Fammouis P

6b). I am grateful to Dr J.B.Voorbij for information on the evolution of *Spec. hist.*; see also his article in Lusignan–Paulmier-Foucart, *Lector et compiler* 159-166.

(b) XXX 76.

= 6b except: 1-4 non minus ... inuentum est *om. Vinc.* 4 enim *om. Vinc.* 7 in ecclesia ad orandum] ad orandum in ecclesia *Vinc.* 8 intrantes ecclesiam] ecclesiam intrantes *Vinc.* 9 sunt] sunt haec *Vinc.* 11 tu hereticos] hereticos tu *Vinc.* 14 saluemur] et saluemur *Vinc.* tunc] tunc autem *Vinc.* 15 et *om. Vinc.* semetipsum] seipsum *Vinc.* 16 et *om. Vinc.* 18 de medio] in medio *Vinc.* 24 *post* illucque *add* utrique (*sic pro* utrimque) *Vinc.* 29 seruiiustis] seruistis *Vinc.* 32-35 uerum ... adiciens quod] sic *Vinc.* 37-40 rursumque ... infernale *om. Vinc.*

(9) Humbert of Romans OP, *Legenda*

Ed.: A.Walz, in MOPH XVI.

Mss.: Cologne, Historisches Archiv G.B.4° 70 and G.B.4° 246. London, British Library add. 23935. Paris, BNF lat. 18309. Rome, AGOP XIV L 1. Toulouse, Bibl. Mun. 77 (only for §52), 82, 477 and 485. Troyes, Bibl. Mun. 401.

Humbert expanded the eulogy of Prouille, but otherwise §19 is taken verbatim from Ferr. (supra 3a); §52 comes from Const. (supra 6b), but without Constantine's comments.

The manuscript of S.Domingo, Madrid, contains a translation of Humb. §19 and §52 (ed. Getino, *Origen del Rosario* 190 §14, 212-213 §76), the end of the latter being rendered 'algunas de ellas tomaron la orden de Pruliano' (f.95<sup>v</sup>); on the sources of this compilation see Tugwell, *Vivarium* 37 (1999) 107-111.

The *legenda* in Würzburg, Univ. Bibl. M.p.th.q.57, which Altaner misguidedly ascribed to Conrad of Trebensee, is based on Humbert's *legenda*; it contains an abridged version of §52 with no mention of any of the matrons becoming nuns (ed. Altaner, *Der hl. Dominikus* 257).

(a) §19.

Qualiter episcopus oxomensis instituit monasterium de Pruliano.

Erant in illis locis nobiles quidam qui egestate compulsi filias suas tradebant hereticis nutriendas et erudiendas, immo re uera erroribus pestiferis eludendas. Quarum perniciosum miseratus obprobrium dei seruus  
5 Didacus episcopus monasterium quoddam ad earum susceptionem instituit

(9a) 1 qualiter ... Pruliano *om. C<sup>1</sup>* episcopus oxomensis *e cap. gen. recepi (infra n.10, cf. supra n.3)]* oxomensis episcopus *in tabula P*, Didacus episcopus *in textu P*, beatus Dominicus (*cf. infra n.10*) *cett. (supra rasuram RTo<sup>4</sup>)* de] in *C<sup>2</sup>* 4 miseratus obprobrium *om. To<sup>3</sup>* 4-5 dei seruus Didacus episcopus *P]* beatus Dominicus (*cf. infra n.10*) *C<sup>1</sup>C<sup>2</sup>LTr* et *supra rasuram R*, dei seruus beatus Dominicus *To<sup>2</sup>To<sup>3</sup>* et *partim supra rasuram To<sup>4</sup>*



in loco qui dicitur Prulianum, ubi ancille Christi sub clausura perpetua, sub obseruantis mirabilibus, sub arto silentio, manibus laborantes, in puritate conscientiarum creatori suo iocundum exhibent famulatum. Que cum numero et merito creuerint in immensum odorem suum longe lateque diffundentes multas deo deuotas ad imitationem sui sanctam feminas 10 prouocarunt ad similia cenobia construenda.

## (b) §52.

Cum aliquando apud castrum quod dicitur Fanum Iouis in predicatione quadam idem beatus Dominicus, fidem probans catholicam, hereticorum perfidiam multipliciter improbasset, post predicationem more solito in ecclesia ad orandum remansit, et ecce nouem matrone nobiles ex eodem castro intrantes ecclesiam ad pedes eius prociderunt dicentes, Serue dei 5 adiuua nos; si uera sunt que hodie predicasti, iam diu mentes nostras erroris spiritus excecavit. Nam istis quos tu hereticos uocas, nos autem bonos homines appellamus, usque in hodiernum diem credidimus et adhesimus toto corde, nunc autem in medio fluctuamus. Serue dei adiuua nos et ora dominum deum tuum ut notam nobis faciat fidem suam in qua uiuamus, moriamur, saluemur. Tunc uir dei stans aliquamdiu et intra semetipsum orans post aliquantulum dixit eis, Constantes estote et expectate intrepide; confido in domino deo meo quod ipse qui neminem uult perire iam ostendet uobis quali domino hactenus adhesistis. Statimque uiderunt de medio sui cattum unum teterrimum prosilire, qui magni canis preferens 15 quantitatem habebat grossos oculos et flammantes, linguam longam latamque atque sanguinolentam et protractam usque ad umbilicum, caudam uero habens curtam sursumque protensam posteriorum turpitudinem quocunque se uerteret ostendebat, de quibus fetor intolerabilis exalabat. Cumque circa matronas illas se per aliquam horam huc illucque uertisset, 20 ad cordam ex qua campana pendeat exiliens et per eam usque ad superiora conscendens tandem per campanile lapsus disparuit feda post se uestigia derelinquens. Conuersus autem ad matronas illas uir dei Dominicus et consolans eas, Ecce inquit per hoc quod coram oculis faciente deo figuratiue comparuit potestis aduertere qualis est ille cui hactenus sequentes hereticos 25 seruiuistis. Ille uero deo gratias referentes ab illa hora ad fidem catholicam perfectissime sunt conuerse. Quarum etiam alique apud sorores de Pruliano religionis habitum assumpserunt.

8 conscientiarum] conscientiarum suarum *Tr* 9 creuerint] creuerunt *C<sup>1</sup>C<sup>2</sup>*

(9b) 1 quod] qui *P* 3 multipliciter *om.* *C<sup>1</sup>* 7 istis] istos *C<sup>1</sup>*, istis *corr.* ex istos ut videtur *C<sup>2</sup>* 8 homines *om.* *C<sup>1</sup>* appellamus] appella<sup>9</sup> uimus *C<sup>1</sup>* in *om.* *C<sup>2</sup>* 11 saluemur] et saluemur *C<sup>1</sup>* 15 cattum ... prosilire] prosilire teterrimum cattum unum *To<sup>4</sup>To<sup>5</sup>* unum *om.* *C<sup>1</sup>* 17. et *om.* *C<sup>1</sup>C<sup>2</sup>* 19 uerteret] uertebat *To<sup>1</sup>* 20 illucque] illuc *C<sup>2</sup>* 21 ex qua *corr.* in que ex *To<sup>4</sup>* 23 derelinquens] relinquens *To<sup>1</sup>* 28 assumpserunt] sumpserunt *C<sup>1</sup>C<sup>2</sup>*

## (10) Admonition of the Dominican General chapter of 1259

Ed.: B.M.Reichert, MOPH III.

Ms.: Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1535 (an early manuscript of Gui's compilation, not used by Reichert).

The *uita beati Dominici* in question is that of Humbert (supra 9a), though some manuscripts of Jordan and Ferr. were also affected (supra 1a, 3a).

(a) p.98.

In *uita beati Dominici*, in rubrica ubi dicitur Qualiter episcopus exomensis instituit monasterium de Pruliano, deletur episcopus exomensis et dicatur beatus Dominicus; similiter ibidem in textu, ubi dicitur dei seruus Didacus, deletur hoc totum et dicatur beatus Dominicus.

(11) Humbert of Romans OP, *De eruditione praedicatorum*

Mss.: Avignon, Musée Calvet 327. Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 2323. Donaueschingen, Fürstenberg, Hofsbibl. 342. Frankfurt, Stadt- und Univ. Bibl. Praed. 29. Michelstadt, Kirchenbibl. D 685. Munich, Staatsbibl. Cln 186 and 544 and 21204. Nürnberg, Germ. Nat. Mus. 27985. Nürnberg, Stadtbibl. Cent. II 17. Rheims, Bibl. Municipale 612. Salamanca, Bibl. Univ. 773. Segovia, Catedral Estancia B 331. Vatican, Pal. lat. 368.

On the structure of this work see Tugwell, in T.L.Amos, E.A.Green, B.M.Kienzle, edd., *De ore Domini*, Kalamazoo 1989, 105-109; the first two parts of the *materia praedicabilis* (VII ix 1-2) were published at Hagenau in 1508 as *Sermones ad diuersos status*, with an alternative implicit title, *De modo prompte cudendi sermones*; subsequent editions were based on this one.

(a) VII ix 1.48, 'Ad sorores de cura fratrum praedicatorum'.

Beatus Dominicus ... non solum ordinem fratrum creauit, sed et ordinem sororum. Ad creationem autem huius ordinis sororum mouit eum, tanquam zelatorem maximum animarum, sanctissima intentio salutis animarum, et hec fuit duplex. Una fuit uitatio infectionis heretice. In partibus enim albigensibus nobiles pauperes tradebant filias suas hereticis ad sustentandum eas et ad erudiendum, et sic fiebant heretice. Ideo statuit monasterium de Pruliano, ut ibi ponerentur a predictis nobilibus filie predictae.

(11a) 1 Dominicus] Benedictus *Mi*, Benedictus in Dominicus *corr. D* fratrum] fratrum praedicatorum *FMu<sup>1</sup>Mu<sup>2</sup>* et] etiam *DFMiMu<sup>1</sup>Mu<sup>2</sup>V*, *om. LS* 2 ordinem *om. Mu<sup>1</sup>* huius] huiusmodi *ABMiMu<sup>3</sup>SaSe* mouit] nouit *N<sup>1</sup>V* 3 zelatorem] creatorem (!) *Mu<sup>3</sup>* sanctissima] et hec sanctissima *N<sup>1</sup>* 3-4 salutis animarum] salutis earum *DMiMu<sup>1</sup>Mu<sup>2</sup>Mu<sup>3</sup>N<sup>2</sup>V*, salutis eorum (!) *F* 4 hec] hoc *Mu<sup>2</sup>Mu<sup>3</sup>N<sup>2</sup>V*, *om. N<sup>1</sup>* uitatio] uisitatio *FMu<sup>1</sup>Mu<sup>2</sup>*, intentio *B* infectionis heretice] heretice infectionis *R* 5 pauperes] persone *FMu<sup>1</sup>Mu<sup>2</sup>Mu<sup>3</sup>* tradebant *om. A* 6 sustentandum] sustinendum *R* eas *om. A* ad erudiendum] ad erudiendum eas *A*, erudiendum *N<sup>1</sup>SaSeV* sic *om. F* ideo] item *Mi* 7 Pruliano] Prudiano *V*

(12) James of Varagine OP, *Legenda aurea*

Ed.: G.P.Maggioni, Florence 1998.

Maggioni notes a few variants, most of them insignificant; I have only reproduced those in Padua, Bibl. Univ. 1229, which is, according to Maggioni, the best representative of the first redaction of *Leg. aur.*

James's source is clearly Const. or Humb. (supra 6b, 9b). In the fourteenth-century Italian translation edited by A.Levasti, *Legenda aurea*, Florence 1925, 914-915, and in J.Bataillier's revision of Jean de Vignay's French translation, ed. B.Dunn-Lardeau, *La légende dorée*, Paris 1997, 703-704, *teterrimum* (12b.5) is taken as 'black'. The episode is omitted in the text edited by M.Tausend, *Die altokzitanische Version B der <Legenda aurea>*, Tübingen 1995.

## (b) pp.731-732.

Predicante autem eo aliquando quedam matrone ab hereticis deprauate eius pedibus prouolute dixerunt, Serue dei adiuua nos; si uera sunt que hodie predicasti, iam diu mentes nostras erroris spiritus excecauit. Quibus ille, Constantes estote et expectate paulisper ut uideatis quali domino adhesistis. Statimque uiderunt de medio sui cattum unum teterrimum 5  
prosilire, qui magni canis preferens quantitatem habebat grossos oculos et flammantes, linguam longam latamque atque sanguinolentam et protractam usque ad umbilicum, caudam uero habens curtam sursumque protensam posteriorum turpitudinem quocumque se uerteret ostendebat, de quibus 10  
fedor intolerabilis exhalabat. Cumque circa illas matronas se aliquamdiu huc illucque uertisset, tandem per cordam campane in campanile conscendens disparuit feda post se uestigia derelinquens. Ille igitur matrone deo gratias agentes ad catholicam fidem sunt conuerse.

(13) Anon., *De beato Dominico*

Ms.: Trier, Stadtbibl. 1271/576.

On this manuscript see *Analecta Bollandiana* 52 (1934) 247-249. In spite of the relatively late date of the compilation, I include the relevant text here because the life of Dominic is simply a collection of poorly adapted extracts from the *Legenda aurea* (cf. supra 12b).

(b) f.6<sup>v</sup>

Predicante autem eo aliquando quedam matrone ab hereticis deprauate eius pedibus prouolute dixerunt, Serue dei adiuua nos, si uera sunt que hodie predicasti, quod tam diu nos malignus spiritus excecauit. Quibus ille, Constantes estote et expectate paulisper ut uideatis quali domino adhesistis. Statimque uiderunt de medio sui canem unum teterrimum 5

(12b) 1 deprauate] deluse P 3 erroris spiritus] spiritus erroris P 5 sui om. P 7 latamque] latam P

prosilire habentem grossos oculos et flamantem linguam latam ac sa<n>guinolentam, protractam usque ad umbilicum, caudam uero curtam sursumque protensam, qui posteriora turpitudinis quocunque se uerteret ostendebat, de quibus fetor intolerabilis exalabat. Cumque circa illas  
 10 matronas se aliquamdiu huc illucque diuertisset, tandem per cordam campane in campanile conscendens disparuit feda post se uestigia relinquens. Ille igitur matrone deo gratias agentes ad fidem catholicam sunt conuerse.

(14) Rodrigo de Cerrato OP, *Vita beati Dominici*

Ed.: T.M.Mamachi, *Annalium Ordinis Praedicatorum tomus I*, Rome 1756, App. 312-334.

Mss.: London, British Library Add. 30057. Madrid, Bibl. Univ. 146. Segovia, Catedral Vitrina 29.

The three manuscripts represent respectively the first, second and third editions of Rodrigo's *sanctorale*, but none of the variants in the passages quoted appears to be editorial.

Whether §8 comes from Ferr. or Humb. (supra 3a, 9a), it reflects the change made in 1259 (supra 10a); the adaptation of the text to mention Madrid as well as Prouille is original to Rodrigo. §33 must come essentially from Const. or Humb. (supra 6b, 9b) (*procidentes ... dixerunt* and *proferens* in lines 3 and 9 correspond to variants in Const., as does S's *uiam* in line 6, but this hardly proves dependence on Const.); Rodrigo's narrative includes details which are not in *Leg. aur.* (supra 12b), but he conceivably substituted Toulouse for Fanjeaux under its influence, since the story as told there has no location but follows and precedes events located 'in partibus tolosanis'.

(a) §8.

Erant autem in illis locis nobiles quidam qui egestate compulsi filias suas dabant hereticis nutriendas, quibus compatiens beatus Dominicus monasterium in loco qui dicitur Pruillanum ad earum susceptionem instituit. In Yspania etiam aput Maioricum aliud monasterium monialium  
 5 instituit, ubi usque hodie ancille Christi gratum deo exhibent famulatum.

(b) §33.

Cum quadam die apud Tolosam fidem probans hereticorum perfidiam inprobasset, post predicationem more solito in oratione in ecclesia permansit. Et ecce .ix. matrone nobiles procidentes ad pedes eius dixerunt ei, Serue dei adiuua nos, nam istis quos tu hereticos uocas usque modo

---

(14a) 2 suas om. L

(14b) 4 adiuua] adiuuas L tu om. M

adhesimus, nunc autem fluctuamus. Ora ergo deum ut notam faciat nobis 5  
 fidem in qua uiuamus et saluemur. Tunc uir dei astans et intra se aliquamdiu  
 orans dixit eis, Expectate intrepide, nam ostendet uobis dominus quali  
 actenus domino adhesistis. Statimque uiderunt de medio sui catum unum  
 terribissimum prosilire, qui magni canis proferens quantitatem grossos habebat  
 oculos, linguam latam atque sanguinolentam et protractam usque ad 10  
 umbilicum, et caudam sursum protensam. Fetor intolerabilis ab eo exalabat.  
 Cumque circa matronas se per horam huc illucque uertisset, ad cordam  
 campanae exiliens per campanile lapsus disparuit feda post se uestigia  
 relinquens. Ecce inquit uir dei matronis, per hanc figuram potestis auertere  
 cui hactenus seruiuistis. Ille uero gratias agentes conuerse sunt ad fidem. 15

(15) Dietrich of Apolda OP, *Libellus de beato Dominico*

Ed.: W.Cuyppers, *Acta Sanctorum, Aug. I*, Antwerp 1733, 562-632.

Mss.: Brussels, Bibl. Royale 7825. Florence, Bibl. Laur. Plut. 36 sin.  
 4. Florence, BN conv. soppr. D 2.76. Frankfurt a/M., Stadt- u. Univ. Bibl.  
 Praed. 15. Göttingen, Univ. Bibl. 109b. Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibl.  
 379. Leipzig, Univ. Bibl. 833 and 846. Madrid, Bibl. Univ. Complut. 147.  
 Modena, Bibl. Estense Campori App. 59. Munich, Clm 18427. Paris, BNF  
 Res. D.1740. Parma, Bibl. Palatina 89. Rome, Bibl. Casanatense 168.  
 Salamanca, Bibl. Univ. 65. Toulouse, Bibl. Mun. 485. Trier, Stadtbibl.  
 1168/470. Vat. lat. 1218 and 10152. Vienna, Palat. 3604. Würzburg, Univ.  
 Bibl. M p.th.q.55.

The bulk of the manuscript tradition in §32 shows that Dietrich's source was unaffected by the 1259 decree (supra 10a), and his text corresponds to that of Ferr. (supra 3a) with the readings of B<sup>2</sup>. Allowing for his modest rewriting, there is no way of telling whether §43-44 comes from Const. or Humb. (supra 6b, 9b).

I have only consulted one vernacular manuscript, Cgm 186; its sole interesting eccentricity is that in §43-44 *nouem matrone nobiles* turns into an unspecified number of 'edelhuse vrowan'. The story ends with them all being so perfectly converted to christian belief that 'some of them espoused religious life with the sisters at Prouille' ('also das etlich under inen bi den swestran ze Pruliano an sich namen geischlich leben').

(a) §32.

Erant autem illis in locis nobiles quidam qui egestate compulsi filias suas tradebant hereticis nutriendas et erudiendas, immo reuera erroribus

5 deum *om. L* faciat nobis] nobis faciat *M* 6 fidem] uiam *S* 7 eis *om. M* 8 statimque] statim *L* 10 usque *om. L* 11 sursum *om. S* 13 post se uestigia] uestigia post se *S* 14 auertere *sic codd. pro* aduertere

(15a) 1 illis in] in illis *Fl<sup>1</sup>PiVa<sup>2</sup>* nobiles *om. Fl<sup>1</sup>Fl<sup>2</sup>MoPmRTVa<sup>1</sup>Va<sup>2</sup>* qui *om. Fl<sup>1</sup>* 2 suas *om. Fl<sup>1</sup>MoPmToTVa<sup>2</sup>* et erudiendas] erudiendas *MaS, om. W*

- pestiferis eludendas. Quarum pernitiosum miseratus opprobrium dei seruus  
 Dydacus episcopus monasterium quoddam ad earum susceptionem instituit  
 5 in loco qui dicitur Prulianum, ubi usque hodie ancille Christi gratum deo  
 exhibent famulatum.

(b) §43-44.

- Cum enim apud castrum quod dicitur Phanium Iouis predicans  
 aliquando, fidem probans catholicam, hereticorum perfidiam multipliciter  
 improbasset, post predicationem in ecclesia more solito ad orandum  
 remansit, et ecce nouem matrone nobiles de eodem castro intrantes  
 5 ecclesiam ad pedes eius prociderunt dicentes, Serue dei adiuua nos; si uera  
 sunt que hodie predicasti, iam diu mentes nostras erroris spiritus excecauit.  
 Nam istis quos tu hereticos uocas, nos autem bonos homines appellamus,  
 usque in hodiernum diem credidimus et adhesimus toto corde, nunc autem  
 in medio fluctuamus. Serue dei adiuua nos et ora deum tuum ut notam  
 10 nobis faciat fidem suam in qua uiuamus, moriamur et saluemur. Tunc uir  
 dei stans aliquamdiu et intra semetipsum orans, post aliquantulum dixit  
 eis, Constantes estote et exspectate intrepide; confido in domino deo meo  
 quod ipse qui neminem uult perire iam ostendet uobis quali domino  
 hactenus adhesistis. Moxque uiderunt de medio sui cattum teterrimum  
 15 prosilire, qui magni canis preferens quantitatem habebat grossos oculos et  
 flammantes, linguam longam, latam atque sanguinolentam et usque ad  
 umbilicum protractam, caudam curtam sursumque protensam, posteriorum  
 turpitudinem quocumque se uerteret ostendebat, de quibus fetor  
 intollerabilis exalabat. Cumque circa matronas illas se per horam huc  
 20 illucque diuertisset, ad cordam que ex campana pendeat exiliens et per

3 eludendas] illudendas S, seducendas *Fl<sup>1</sup>Fl<sup>2</sup>MoPmRTToTrVa<sup>1</sup>Va<sup>2</sup>* 4 Dydacus episco-  
 pus] episcopus Didacus R, Dominicus *KMaMuSToVi*, beatus Dominicus *Pi* monas-  
 terium quoddam] quoddam monasterium *KMuVi* susceptionem] receptionem (*in*  
*margin.* uel susceptionem) *Va<sup>2</sup>* 5 loco] locum G qui] ubi *Va<sup>2</sup>*

(15b) 1 Phanium *om.* R 2 multipliciter *om.* W 3-4 ad orandum remansit] reman-  
 sit ad orandum *KMuVi*, adorans remansit *Va<sup>2</sup>*, ad horam remansit *Mo*, ad hora(m)  
 (*supra lin.* dum) remansit *Pm* 4 eodem] orum (!) R, eorum *Fl<sup>2</sup>* 5 ad pedes eius]  
 ad pedes *Mu*, ad (*supra lin.* pedes eius) K, *om.* Vi 6 erroris] heresis *MaSa* 7 istis]  
 istos *Fl<sup>1</sup>GMaMoPmSa<sup>V2</sup>* tu *om.* *KMu* nos ... appellamus *om.* *Fl<sup>2</sup>RVa<sup>1</sup>* autem *om.*  
*Sa* appellamus] uocamus W 8 usque] et usque *MaSa* in] ad *Fl<sup>1</sup>Fl<sup>2</sup>MoPmRTToTrVa<sup>1</sup>Va<sup>2</sup>*  
 credidimus] credimus *BrFrL<sup>1</sup>Va<sup>2</sup>W*, credimus *in* credidimus *corr.* *Mu* post credidimus  
*add.* nos autem bonos homines appellamus *Fl<sup>2</sup>Va<sup>1</sup>*, nos autem bonos homines  
 appellabamus R et adhesimus toto corde *om.* *Fl<sup>2</sup>RVa<sup>1</sup>* corde *om.* *Fl<sup>1</sup>* 9 in medio  
*om.* R tuum *om.* R 10 nobis faciat] faciat nobis *MoPmVa<sup>2</sup>* moriamur] et moria-  
 mur *Fl<sup>2</sup>Va<sup>1</sup>*, morimur *KMu* 11 et *om.* *MoPm* semetipsum] seipsum *Pi* 12 confido]  
 confido enim *Fl<sup>2</sup>RVa<sup>1</sup>* deo *om.* *KMuVa<sup>1</sup>Vi* 13 neminem] non *KL<sup>1</sup>Vi* ostendet uobis]  
 uobis ostendet *MoPmVa<sup>2</sup>* 15 preferens] proferens *Va<sup>2</sup>W* grossos oculos] oculos  
 grossos *Fl<sup>1</sup>Fl<sup>2</sup>MoPmRTToTrVa<sup>1</sup>Va<sup>2</sup>* 16 et *om.* *L<sup>1</sup>* 19 circa matronas illas se] se circa  
 matronas illas W

eam ad superiora conscendens, tandem per campanile lapsus disparuit, feda post se uestigia derelinquens. Conuersus autem ad matronas sanctus Dominicus territas nimis consolabatur dicens, Ecce per hoc quod coram oculis uestris faciente deo figuratiue apparuit potestis aduertere qualis est ille cui credentes hereticis seruiuistis. Ille uero deo gratias referentes ad fidem catholicam perfectissime sunt conuerse. Quarum etiam aliquae apud sorores de Pruliano religionis habitum assumpserunt. 25

(16) Bernard Gui OP, *Catalogus magistrorum (Dominicus)*

Ed.: S. Tugwell, in MOPH XXVII.

Mss.: Agen, Bibl. Mun. 3. Barcelona, Bibl. Univ. 218. Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1535. Bordeaux, Bibl. Mun. 780. Frankfurt a/M, Praed. 82. Rome, AGOP XIV A 2 and A 3. Rome, Minerva A.p.4. Toulouse, Bibl. Mun. 488, 489 and 490.

Gui's account of the foundation of Prouille is manifestly based on Humb. as emended in 1259 (supra 9a, 10a); on the inspiration of the rest of this passage see MOPH XXVII 65-67. Petrus Amelii is out of place since he only became archbishop of Narbonne after Arnaud Amaury died on 29 Sept. 1225 (HC I 356); he is attested as *electus* in April 1226 (*Hist. gén. de Languedoc*, rev. ed. VIII 821, 844).

(a) §5.

Anno domini .m.cc.vi. sanctus Dominicus monasterium quoddam instituit quod dicitur Prulianum in dyocesi tholosana ad susceptionem monialium sub clausura perpetua, propriis manibus laborantium. Et extunc fortius cepit de ordinis institutione tractare. Cuius propositum dominus Petrus Amelii, archiepiscopus narbonensis, et dominus Fulco, episcopus tholosanus cisterciensis ordinis, et uir inclitus dominus Symon comes Montis Fortis, ducti zelo fidei, fouere ceperunt. 5

(17) Bernard Gui OP, *Fundatio monasterii Pruliani*

Ed.: P.A. Amargier, MOPH XXIV.

Mss.: Agen 3. Avignon, Musée Calvet 1437. Bordeaux 780. Prouille, Cambefort LDP. Toulouse 488 and 490. I have also collated the texts edited in *Gallia Christiana* XIII i 315-316 ('G') and Martène-Durand VI 437-438 ('M').

21 eam] illam Sa conscendens] scandens *KMuVi* per] ad *L<sup>1</sup>L<sup>2</sup>* lapsus *om.* W 23-24 coram ... deo] faciente domino coram oculis uestris *F<sup>2</sup>RVa<sup>1</sup>* 24 uestris] nostris *BrK* potestis] cum potestis *Va<sup>2</sup>* 25 hereticis] cum hereticis *KMuVi* deo gratias *L<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup>*] gratias deo *cett.* 27 Pruliano] Prunatio *KMu*

(16a) 1 quoddam *om.* *R<sup>3</sup>* 3 extunc] tunc *FR<sup>3</sup>T<sup>1</sup>* 4 fortius cepit] cepit fortius *FR<sup>2</sup>R<sup>3</sup>T<sup>1</sup>* 7 ducti] ductus *T<sup>2</sup>*

Gui's narrative is a compromise between his named authority, Jordan (supra 1a and *Lib.* §28), and the post-1259 text of Humbert (supra 9a, 10a), whose eulogy of Prouille is quoted extensively in what follows (MOPH XXIV 8.16-24). The testimony of Agen 3 in lines 3-5 implies that Fulk was originally not mentioned; this suggests that the insertion was prompted by something Gui found when he visited Prouille in 1307, specifically something which attested Fulk's *patrocinium* without actually saying that he gave the site to Dominic. It is tempting to surmise that Gui saw one or both of the deeds whose existence I have postulated to explain the three surviving false deeds which purport to document Fulk's gift of the church of Prouille to or for the 'convert ladies' who lived there.

(a) pp.7-8.

Anno domini .m.cc.vi. beatus Dominicus opitulante sibi uiro dei Didaco episcopo oxomensis, eo scilicet tempore quasi biennio quo in partibus manserat tholosanis, necnon patrocinante uiro per omnia memorando domino Fulcone episcopo tholosano, cuius ope et patrocinio in hac parte, 5 precipue in sua dyocesi, opus erat, monasterium quoddam instituit quod dicitur Prulianum, situm inter Fanum Iouis et Montem regalem, in dyocesi tholosana, ad susceptionem quarumdam nobilium feminarum quas parentes earum ratione paupertatis egestate compulsi tradebant hereticis, qui illo in tempore in eisdem partibus et locis circumuicinis plurimi habitabant, 10 erudiendas et nutriendas ab eis, immo re uera erroribus potius deludendas et in anima perimendas, sicut de tempore et de causa institutionis satis colligitur et habetur ex libello uenerabilis patris fratris Iordanis magistri ordinis quem fecit et intitulauit de principio ordinis predicatorum.

(18) Bernard Gui OP, *Legenda sancti Dominici*

Ed.: S.Tugwell, in MOPH XXVII.

Mss. and variants: see ed.

It looks as if Gui took his text of Humbert's *legenda* from Toulouse, Bibl. Mun. 485 (MOPH XXVII 120, 155-157).

(a) §17.

= no. 9a except: 1 qualiter ... Pruliano *om.* Gui 4 eludendas] deludendas Gui 4-5 dei seruus Didacus episcopus] seruus dei beatus Dominicus Gui 6 sub clausura perpetua *om.* Gui

(17a) 1 dei] domino P 2 quasi biennio quo] quo AgT<sup>l</sup>, quo quasi biennio G 3 manserat tholosanis] tholosanis manserat P 3-5 necnon ... opus erat in marg. habet Ag 3 patrocinante] et AgT<sup>l</sup> 6-7 in dyocesi tholosana] dyocesis tholosane AgT<sup>l</sup> 8 egestate compulsi in marg. habet Ag illo in] in illo AgGPT<sup>l</sup> 9 eisdem] illis T<sup>l</sup> 10 immo] immo et M 11 de tempore et de causa] de causa et de tempore T<sup>l</sup> 12 patris *om.* G 13 ordinis] ordinis nostri secundi AgGT<sup>l</sup>



(b) §64-65.

= no. 9b except: 1 post Fanum Iouis *add.* in partibus tholosanis *Gui* 2 idem *om.* *Gui* 7 istis] istos *Gui* tu *om.* *Gui* 9 adhesimus] eis adhesimus *Gui* 11 uiuamus moriamur *om.* *Gui* 15 cattum ... prosilire] prosilire teterrimum catum unum *Gui* 21 ex qua] que ex *Gui* 24 oculis] oculis uestris *Gui* 25 comparuit] apparuit *Gui* 26 ab illa hora *om.* *Gui* 27 post conuerse *add.* mentes igitur femineas errore spiritus delusas facilius reducere potuit tam terribilis uisio ipsis oculis foris exhibita quam sola uerborum persuasio per aures infusa (*cf. supra 6b*) *Gui*

(19) Nicholas Trevet OP, *Annales*

Ed.: T.Hog, London 1845.

Trevet's source seems to be Humb. as emended in 1259 (*supra* 9a, 10a).

(a) pp.177-178.

Cum autem eo tempore nobiles quidam egestate compulsi filias suas traderent haereticis nutriendas, beatus Dominicus earum perniciosum miseratus opprobrium monasterium pro earum receptione instituit in loco qui dicitur Prulianum, ubi ancillae Dei sub perpetua clausura, sub arto silentio, iocundum suo Creatori exhibent famulatum.

5

(20) Galvano della Fiamma OP, *Cronica ordinis predicatorum*

Ed.: B.M.Reichert, MOPH II.

Mss.: Ravenna, Bibl. Classense 347. Toulouse, Arch. OP (a modern copy of an otherwise unknown manuscript). These manuscripts were not used by Reichert.

Galvano's unwarranted merging of two originally separate stories, one about Dominic's conversion of some heretically inclined ladies by a display of ascetic prowess (derived ultimately from Ferr. §22), the other about the Fanjeaux converts, suggests that his source was Dietrich §42-44 where the two episodes are juxtaposed in this order. Dietrich (*supra* 15a) is also as likely a source as any for what Galvano says about the founding of Prouille.

(a) p.3.

Et quia multe nobiles puelle propter inopiam sunt ab hereticis prostitute et heresi deprauate supradictus episcopus Didacus monasterium de Pruliano instituit ubi nobiles puellas posuit.

(b) p.4.

Per totam unam quadragesimam in pane et aqua ieiunauit ... Quo comperto multe nobiles domine, licet heretice, ad ueram fidem sunt conuerse, quibus ait beatus Dominicus, Volo uobis ostendere deum hereticorum albigensium quem et uos longo tempore adorastis. Et ducens eas ad ecclesiam, diabolus in forma gatti apparuit qui erat niger super carbones, linguam habebat protensam et longam ualde, cum qua terram

5

lingebat. Posteriora erant denudata et fecibus stercorata. Qui per cordam companilis perrepens disparuit, et fetorem intollerabilem ibidem dimisit. Ex quo quamplures ex illis dominabus monasterium de Pruriano (*sic*)  
10 intrauerunt.

(21) Petrus Calò OP, *Legenda de translatione beati Dominici*  
Ed.: S.Tugwell, in MOPH XXVI.  
Mss. and variants: see ed.

(a) §30.  
= no. 9a except: 1 qualiter ... Pruliano *om.* Calò 3 et erudiendas *om.* Calò 4-5 dei seruus Didacus episcopus] beatus Dominicus Calò 10 diffundentes] fundentes Calò

(22) St Antoninus OP  
Ed.: *Tertia pars historiarum domini Antonini archipraesulis Florentini*, Lyons 1543.  
Mss (for a2 and b): Florence, BN II.I 376. Paris, BNF lat. 8591. Vat. lat. 1968 is a copy of F, of no independent value.

22 a1 (for which I have not been able to consult any manuscript) comes from Antoninus's life of Innocent III. I have no idea what prompted him to attach the motive for the foundation of Prouille (from Humbert, supra 9a) to the story of Dominic proposing to sell himself to help someone who could not leave the heretics 'nam ipsi uictum ei, quem aliunde habere non poterat, ministrabant' (from Humb. §25, well after Diego's departure and death).

22 a2, from the life of Dominic, is derived from Humb. (supra no. 9a). Having dealt with the whole of Diego's involvement in the antiheretical mission at the end of the previous chapter, up to his death and the consequent departure of his other *socii* and the ensuing ten years in which Dominic continued preaching 'solus cum paucis', Antoninus gives the impression that the foundation of Prouille occurred after Diego's death, but this was perhaps unintentional.

I see no way of telling whether the source of 22b is Constantine, Vincent or Humbert (supra 6b, 8b, 9b), but it does not seem to derive from the Italian manuscript tradition of Dietrich (supra 15b). Since it comes in the *tractatus de virtutibus* with which Antoninus begins his treatment of Dominic, it is not inserted chronologically into the life of Dominic.

(a1) *Hist.* III xix 1.4.

Permansit autem ipse beatus pater annis decem in illis partibus in predicationis officio et heresis extirpatione, aliis ad propria redeuntibus, et Didaco episcopo prefato iam defuncto, qui prius cessionem postulauerat a papa Innocentio episcopatus sui ut se totum daret predicationi contra  
5 hereticos sed non obtinuit. Quum quidam fideles nobiles filias suas traderent ipsis hereticis erudiendas in perfidia ut uel sic uictum quem

aliunde habere non poterant consequerentur, deliberavit dei seruus Dominicus seipsum uenundare ut precio sui illis subueniretur ne perirent in anima, saluatoris nostri et redemptoris imitatus exemplum. Quod utique fecisset, sed deus qui ad maiora eum elegerat miserie illorum prouidit. 10

(a2) *Hist.* III xxiii 4.2.

Erant in illis locis nobiles quidam qui egestate compulsi filias suas tradebant hereticis nutriendas ymmo uero erroribus pestiferis eludendas, quarum permitiosum miseratus obprobrium beatus Dominicus monasterium quoddam ad earum susceptionem instituit in loco qui dicitur Prulianum, ubi ancille Christi sub clausura perpetua, sub obseruantis mirabilibus, sub arto 5 silentio manibus laborantes in puritate conscientiarum creatori suo iocundum exhibent famulatum. Que cum numero et merito creuerint in inensum odorem suum longe lateque diffundentes multas deo deuotas ad imitationem sui sanctam feminas prouocarunt ad similia cenobia construenda.

(b) *Hist.* III xxiii.2.1.

Semel una dierum post predicationem suam accedentes ad eum quedam matrone que heresim sapiebant dicunt ei, Serue dei adiuua nos; si uera sunt que predicasti nos in eo errore fuimus, nam quos tu hereticos declarasti nos sanctos uiros extimabamus. Quas pius pater consolatus inquit, Nolite timere, confido in deo quia ipse qui neminem uult perire 5 ostendet uobis quali domino hactenus adhesistis. Factaque oratione ab eo uiderunt mulieres cattum unum de medio earum prosilire qui magni canis preferens quantitatem habebat grossos oculos et flammantes, linguam longam latamque atque sanguinolentam protractam usque ad umbilicum, caudam curtam sursumque protensam, posteriorum turpitudinem 10 quocumque se uertebat ostentans, de quibus fetor intollerabilis exalabat. Cumque per horam circa illas matronas se huc illucque uertisset, demum per cordam campane ascendens ad summum campanilis inde dilapsus non comparuit, feda post se relinquens uestigia. Conuersus ergo ad mulieres sanctus Dominicus ait, Ex eo quod coram oculis nostris apparuit figurate 15 potestis deprehendere qualis ille est cui sequendo hereticos deseruistis. Que ad ueram fidem sunt conuerse ad penitentiam, quinymo alique earum sunt religionem ingresse.

(23) B.Mombritius, *Sanctuarium*

Ed.: Paris 1910.

I have not seen the original edition, published in Milan c.1478; on Mombritius, see S.Spanó Martinelli in G.Philippart, ed., *Hagiographies II*,

(22a2) 2 ymmo ... eludendas *om. F et ed.*

(22b) 5 deo] domino *ed.* 10 protensam] extensam *F et ed.* 15 Dominicus *om. P*  
17 ad penitentiam] penitentiam suscipientes *ed.*

Turnhout 1996, 79. He does not identify the provenance of his life of Dominic, but it can be recognized as an occasionally paraphrased text of Ferr. with significant affinities to the Florence manuscript, though this cannot be his actual source.

(a) p.432.

= 3a except: 1 qualiter ... Pruillani *om. Mom.* 2 illis locis] locis illis *Mom.* 3-4 pestiferis erroribus] erroribus pestiferis *Mom.* 6 qui dicitur Pruillanum] quod Prulianum (*sic*) *Mom.*

(24) Francesco da Castiglione, *Vita sancti Dominici*

Ms.: Florence, BN Magliabech. Cl. XXXVIII 142.

On Francesco da Castiglione († 1484), secretary and biographer of St Antoninus, see DBI XLIX 713-715 and F.Bausi, 'Francesco da Castiglione fra umanesimo e teologia', *Interpres* 11 (1991) 112-181. As a guarantee of the historicity of his life of Dominic he bids his readers know that 'haec me ex commentariis sanctissimi uiri Antonii archiepiscopi Florentini quae manu eius conscripta erant collegisse' (ff.2<sup>v</sup>-3<sup>r</sup>); the influence of 22 a2 is clear, but *ob inopiam* and *prostitute* seem to be inspired, directly or indirectly, by Galvano (supra 20a). On the manuscript, finished on 14 Aug. 1482 (f.133<sup>r</sup>), see P.O.Kristeller, *Iter Italicum* I, London-Leiden 1963, 143.

(a) f.7<sup>r</sup>.

Contigit ea tempestate ut uiri quidam, etsi genere nobiles, paupertate oppressi filias suas ob inopiam hereticis nutriendas traderent. Quam rem detestatus Dominicus quod honestissime uirgines tam turpiter pene prostitute uiderentur, monasterium instituit ubi uirgines illae reciperentur  
5 in quo loco conclusae sanctam ac coelibem uitam agerent, manibus et labore uictum querebant. Factumque est ut breui in magnum excrescerent numerum ac omnibus egregium de se sanctitatis exemplum preberent.

(25) Dominican *Breviaria de camera*

Eds.: Venice 1487, Venice 1494.

On these breviaries see MOPH XXVI 140-141.

The reading on the foundation of Prouille conflates Dietrich (the Italian tradition of whose text must have contributed *seducendas* in 25a.3, cf. 15a.3 app. crit.) and Humb. (supra 9a and 15a); that on the Fanjeaux matrons appears to be paraphrased from Dietrich with two of the Italian tradition's distinctive readings, 'usque *ad* hodiernum diem' and 'oculos grossos' (25b.5 and 11, cf. 15b.8 and 15 app. crit.).

(a) 1st day of the octave of St Dominic, 2nd reading.

Erant autem illis in locis quidam nobiles qui egestate compulsi filias suas tradebant hereticis nutriendas et erudiendas, immo reuera pestiferis erroribus *seducendas*. Quarum pernitiosum miseratus obprobrium seruus

dei Dominicus monasterium quod de Pruliano dicitur ad earum  
 susceptionem instituit. Ubi ancille merito et numero in immensum 5  
 creuerunt et sub artissimo silentio opere manuum atque sanctissimis  
 institutis gratum domino exhibent famulatum.

(b) 2nd day of the octave, 3rd reading.

Aliquando etiam dum predicasset apud castrum quod dicitur Fanum  
 Iouis et heresim mirabiliter improbasset, post predicationem in ecclesia ad  
 orandum remansit, et ecce nouem matrone nobiles de eodem castello  
 ecclesiam intrantes ad pedes eius prociderunt dicentes, Serue dei adiua 5  
 nos et ora deum pro nobis, quia vsque ad hanc diem hereticis credidimus  
 quos bonos homines credebamus, nunc autem propter predicationem tuam  
 fluctuamus. Adiuua igitur nos, quia cupimus in fide vera mori et saluari.  
 Tunc sanctus Dominicus stans et aliquantulum inter (*sic*) se orans dixit eis,  
 Constantes estote, quia confido in domino quod ostendet vobis cui domino 10  
 seruiiistis. Moxque viderunt de medio sui cattum teterrimum prosilire  
 magni canis preferens quantitatem, qui habebat oculos grossos et  
 flammantes, linguam longam, latam et sanguinolentam et vsque ad  
 vmbilicum protractam, caudam curtam sursumque protensam, et  
 posteriorum turpitudinem quocumque se verteret ostendebat, de quibus 15  
 fetor intolerabilis exalabat. Cumque per horam circa illas se volutasset,  
 tandem per cordam campane ad superiora conscendens disparuit feda post  
 se vestigia derelinquens. Beatus igitur Dominicus conuersus ad matronas  
 illas dixit, Ecce quali domino seruiiistis. Que domino gratias agentes  
 monasterium de Pruliano sunt ingresse et habitum sancte religionis 20  
 assumpserunt.

(26) Giovanni Garzoni, *Vita divi Dominici*

Ed.: Leandro Alberti, ed., *De viris illustribus ordinis Praedicatorum*,  
 Bologna 1517.

Mss.: Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 744 and 1622.

On the Bologna humanist, Garzoni, see R. Ridolfi in DBI LII 438-440,  
 and L.R. Lind, ed., *The letters of Giovanni Garzoni*, Atlanta 1992. On the  
 two manuscripts cited, see A. Poncelet, *Analecta Bollandiana* 42 (1924) 329,  
 346-348 (cod. 744 antedates Alberti's publication of the *Vita*; cod. 1622, a  
 large collection of Garzoni's works, was written later).

The Life of Dominic was certainly composed in time to be mentioned  
 by Borselli in 1493 (Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1999 f.9<sup>v</sup>). In B<sup>1</sup> and B<sup>2</sup> it is prefaced  
 by a letter addressed 'Vincenzio Malmignato Ferrariensi' (Lind 49-50 no. 67,  
 where for some reason *Malmignato* is omitted without even being mentioned  
 in the apparatus); in it Garzoni explains why the proemium to the Life is  
 'nimium longum' despite Cicero's teaching that this should be avoided (*ad*  
*Herenn.* 1.11—Garzoni defended Cicero's authorship of this work, Lind 327-  
 330, no. 414)). Nothing seems to be known about Vincenzo Malmignato,  
 but Lind identifies him with the Vincenzo of Ferrara who is referred to as  
 dead in a letter which appears to have been written to Savonarola soon

after the latter's arrival in Bologna in 1475 (Lind 159 no. 182); he accordingly dates Letter 67 to 'before 1476' (see his comment on Letter 66 on p.441). But the Vincenzo of Ferrara who was dead by 1475 or soon afterwards was not the only Dominican of that name: the 1474 chapter of the province of San Domenico had to specify that it was making 'Fratrem Vincentium de Feraria *antiquiorem*' a preacher general (AFP 29 [1959] 167), and Fr Michael Tavuzzi has identified several more belonging to the Congregation of Lombardy; nor does the Vincenzo of whom Garzoni laments in Letter 182 that he would have become a great *contionator* if he had lived sound like the Vincenzo of Letter 67 to whose verdict on the proemium Garzoni says he will defer: 'Acquiescam sententiae tuae qui oratorum, philosophorum ac theologorum nostri temporis nullis existis secundus; si qua deleveris non inimico feram animo'.

One reason which Garzoni gives for the long proemium is the need to praise the dedicatee, Vincenzo Bandello, but in the early 1470s Bandello was not yet the luminary he was to become. The proemium which follows Letter 67 in Mss 744 and 1622, the same as the one which Alberti published, refers to Bandello being made a Master of Theology by Innocent VIII (in 1484: MOPH VIII 382), and to his appointment as inquisitor (on 18 October 1490: AGOP IV 9 f.62'). So the earliest possible date for the Life of Dominic is late 1490.

We can probably fix the date even more precisely with the help of Letter 69, dated 22 July, in which Garzoni thanks Bandello for inviting him to what was evidently a special dinner at S.Domenico, Bologna, attended by a large number of distinguished visitors; during the meal Garzoni's Life of Dominic was read, and it is more than likely that the occasion was its presentation to the dedicatee. Bandello's invitation was issued with the consent of the prior ('monasterii principe minime dissentiente'), so Bandello himself was not prior of Bologna at the time; but he was almost certainly prior well before 22 July in 1491: Tommaso of Brescia, who is attested as prior on 1 March 1491 in the convent's *Liber consiliorum*, was confirmed as vicar general of the Congregation of Lombardy on 20 May (AFP 32 [1962] 244), and Bandello succeeded him as prior (ASOP 1 [1893] 146). However, Bandello was confirmed as vicar general on 7 May 1493 (AFP 32 [1962] 244), and Antonio of Cremona is attested as prior on 20 July in the *Liber consiliorum* (I am grateful to Fr Tavuzzi for the references to AGOP IV 9 and *Lib. cons.*). This suggests that the Life was presented to its dedicatee in July 1493, in which case it was presumably completed not too long before that; Garzoni could therefore have used the 1487 breviary (*supra* 25), and this is the most likely source of 26b (though he drew on his own imagination to enliven the tale with the sort of speeches which humanist historiography required).

The statement in 26a that Diego 'ordered' the foundation of Prouille must be a compromise between a source which named Dominic as the founder (e.g. the breviary, *supra* 25a) and another which named Diego (probably Dietrich or Mombritius, *supra* 15a, 23a).

(a) f.9<sup>v</sup>.

Accedebat alia calamitas. Nam quibus nullae erant opes nullaeque facultates, hi filias haereticis educandas atque eorum praeceptis erudiendas tradiderant. Id Didacus inique ferens in loco quod Prulianum uocant monasterium ubi puellae habitarent iussit extrui.

(b) ff.10<sup>v</sup>-11<sup>r</sup>.

Phanum Iouis, ita incolae uocant, oppidum est non longe distans a Tolosa. Id infinita haereticorum multitudo incolebat. Cum igitur ad illam prosternendam omni studio duceretur, commonendae ipsius gratia illuc iter contulit. Descendenti ex suggesto mulieres nouem mira pollentes nobilitate se obiiciunt. Quae grauis erat annis ad eius genua procidens, Nos inquit 5 virorum sapientum quos haereticos uocas uestigia sequimur; ab illorum opinione mirum in modum dissentis. Nobis quam sententiam secuturae sumus iniicitur scrupulus ac dubitatio quaedam. Tu pater optime animum nostrum tanta suspicione libera. Tuus iste deus de quo tam grandia praedicas, qui praeceptis suis fidem habendam putabunt, his coelestem ac diuinam 10 domum ultro pollicetur. Tu si ea de re signum edideris profecto eae sumus quae nunquam tua de sententia decedemus. Vir sanctus incredibilem quandam percepit animo uoluptatem quod nec oleum nec impensam, ut tritum est uulgi sermone prouerbum, perdidisset.<sup>1</sup> Igitur paululum se colligens, Si inquit constantiae uestrae minime defueritis, a domino edetur 15 signum quo compulsae falsam istam religionem uestram sempiterna obliuione delendam censebitis. Cui antehac seruitutem seruieritis res ipsa declarabit. Cum hanc orationem locutus esset, repente feles, quem musionem uoco,<sup>2</sup> erat is tantae magnitudinis ut in se omnium oculos conuerteret, ex illarum medio prosiliit. Praeterea uultus adeo deformis erat ut eum nemo 20 sustinere posset. Omitto quem exhibebat odorem ingratum, ut prope omnes se inde abdicare cogerentur. Semel, iterum, tertio mulieribus obambulauit. Tandem ad turrin iter intendit, ubi reste nolae suspensa in summum euasit. Cum aliquantulum constitisset, ab oculis et in caliginosas descendit tenebras. Dominicus in mulieres oculos coniciens, Quid inquit timuistis? Cur tantus 25 uos opprimit timor? Vobis in Christo optimo maximo spes omnis constituenda est. Igitur mulieres beneficii memoriam minime abiicientes errores abiecerunt sequae sanctae religioni addixerunt.

(26b) 17 res ipsa] re ipsa B<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'Perdere l'olio e la spesa: impegnarsi con fatica senza ottenere alcun risultato' (S.Battaglia, *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana* XI 876).

<sup>2</sup> *Feles* is classical, but covers a range of animals; *musio*, unclassical but more respectable than the vulgar *cattus* (Isidore, *Etym.* 12.2.38; Balbi s.v. *musio*), unambiguously means 'cat', which is presumably why Garzoni adds 'or, as I call it, a mouser'—not a nice 'pussy' (Italian *muçi*; Battaglia s.v.), but a mean beast which plays with its prey (cf. Thomas of Cantimpré, *De natura rerum*, ed. H.Boese, Berlin 1973, 151; Battaglia s.v. *gatto*).

(27) Girolamo Borselli OP, *Cronica magistrorum generalium*  
Ms.: Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1999.

The section on Dominic was written in 1493: 'Quecumque memoratu digna gesta sunt in ordine predicatorum incipiendo a beato Dominico primo fundatore ordinis predicti usque ad tempora nostra que sunt circa annum domini 1493 quo hec scribere incepti hoc libello narrabuntur' (B f.1<sup>r</sup>); the latest writer on Dominic is Garzoni who 'nunc uiuit scilicet anno domini 1493' (f.9<sup>r</sup>).

Borselli certainly used the Bologna manuscript of Gui's compilation (cf. AFP 70 [2000] 6), and Gui is recognizably the inspiration of what he says about Prouille here (cf. supra 16a).

(a) f.2<sup>r</sup>.

Anno domini 1206 monasterium quoddam instruit beatus Dominicus quod dicitur Plurianum in dyocesi tholosana ad recipiendum moniales que in claustro propriis manibus laborarent et deo immaculate seruirent.

(28) Alberto di Castello OP, *Cronice de magistris generalibus*  
Ed.: (Alberto di Castello), *Tabula priuilegiorum* etc., Venice 1504.

On the authorship of this compilation see R.Creytens, AFP 30 (1960) 239-241; the *Cronice* were included in the Rome 1566 edition of the Constitutions and in several subsequent editions. The main avowed source was James of Soest (f.130<sup>v</sup>), but since his chronicle has not survived it is impossible to gauge the extent of his influence; he may have been responsible for detaching the nuns' growth 'in numbers and merit' from the foundation of other monasteries 'ad imitationem sui' (cf. supra 9a) and integrating it into the general excellence of their service of God (a trait found also supra 24a and 25a). *Calamitatem*, however, looks like an echo of Garzoni (supra 26a).

(a) f.132<sup>r</sup>.

Hoc tempore videns beatus Dominicus quod aliqui nobiles in partibus tholosanis egestate compulsi tradebant filias suas hereticis nutriendas et erudiendas, immo potius pestiferis erroribus imbuendas, earum miseratus calamitatem instituit monasterium de Pruliano ad earum susceptionem. Ubi  
5 ancille dei virtutibus et numero plurimum excrescentes deuotum altissimo exhibent famulatum. Et hoc fuit primum monasterium sororum ordinis.

(29) Ambrogio Taegio OP, *Cronica magistrorum generalium*  
Ed.: ASOP 5 (1901-1902).  
Mss.: Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1894. Rome, AGOP XIV 51.

Taegio's 'Cronica fratrum ordinis predicatorum uidelicet magistrorum generalium' continues up to 1505. 'Frater Iustinus' is the name he attached to Humbert's legenda; this was suggested by T.Käppeli, 'Deux prétendus biographes de saint Dominique', *Antonianum* 20 (1945) at 230-234, and a



more thorough examination of Taegio's sources fully confirms it. Cf. supra 9a and 9b. The date for the foundation of Prouille was presumably taken either directly from Gui (supra 16a) or from Borselli (supra 27a), both of whom were consulted by Taegio in Bologna.

(a) Ed. p.92 (wrongly placed after 29b); B f.8<sup>r</sup>, R f.3.

Anno domini 1206 beatus Dominicus monasterium monialium instituit ac fundauit in loco qui dicitur Prulianum. ... Causa autem institutionis prefati monasterii hec fuit. (Fr. Iustinus in Legenda) Erant tunc temporis in locis illis nobiles quidam qui egestate compulsi filias suas tradebant hereticis nutriendas et erudiendas, imo re uera erroribus pestiferis eludendas. Quarum perniciosum miseratus opprobrium beatus Dominicus monasterium quoddam ad earum susceptionem instituit in loco qui dicitur Prulianum, ubi ancille Christi sub clausura perpetua, sub obseruantis mirabilibus, sub arto silentio, manibus laborantes, in puritate conscientiarum creatori suo iocundum exhibent famulatum. Que cum numero et merito creuerint <in> immensum odorem suum longe diffundentes multas Deo deuotas ad imitationem sui sanctam feminas prouocauerunt ad similia cenobia construenda.

(b) Ed. p.92; B f.8, R f.3<sup>v</sup>.

(Ex eodem) Cum aliquando apud castrum Fani Iouis iisdem temporibus in predicatione quadam beatus Dominicus, fidem probans catholicam, hereticorum perfidiam multipliciter improbasset, post predicationem more solito in ecclesia ad orandum permansit, et ecce nouem matrone nobiles ex eodem castro intrantes ecclesiam ad pedes eius prociderunt dicentes, Serue Dei adiua nos; si uera sunt que hodie predicasti, iam diu mentes nostras erroris spiritus excecavit. Nam istis quos tu hereticos uocas, nos autem bonos homines putabamus, usque in hodiernam diem credidimus et adhesimus eis toto corde, nunc autem in medio fluctuamus. Serue dei adiua nos et ora pro nobis Deum tuum ut notam nobis faciat fidem suam in qua uiuamus, moriamur et saluemur. Tunc uir dei stans aliquandiu et intra semetipsum orans post aliquantulum dixit eis, Constantes estote et expectate intrepide, confido in Domino Deo meo quod ipse qui neminem uult perire iam ostendet uobis quali Domino hactenus adhesistis. Statimque uiderunt de medio sui cattum unum teterrimum prosilire, qui magni canis preferens qualitatem (*sic*) grossos habebat oculos et flamantes, linguam longam latamque atque sanguinolentam et protractam usque ad umbilicum, caudamque habens curtam sursumque protensam posteriorum turpitudinem quocumque se uertebat ostendebat, de quibus fetor intolerabilis exalabat. Cumque circa matronas illas se per aliquam horam huc illucque uertisset, et ad cordam ex qua campana pendeat exiliens et per eam usque ad superiora conscendens tandem per campanile lapsus disparuit feda post se uestigia derelinquens.

(29a) 10 in immensum] immensum *codd.* 12 sanctam] sanctas *R*

(29b) 16 atque *om. B*

Conuersus autem ad illas uir Dei Dominicus et consolans eas, Ecce inquit  
 per hoc quod coram oculis faciente Domino figuratiue comparuit potestis  
 25 aduertere qualis est ille cui hactenus seruiuistis. Ille uero Deo gratias  
 referentes ab illa hora ad catholicam fidem conuerse sunt. Quarum etiam  
 alique apud sorores de Pruliano religionis habitum assumpserunt.

(30) Ambrogio Taegio OP, *De insigniis ordinis predicatorum*  
 Ed.: ASOP 5 (1901-1902).  
 Ms.: Rome, AGOP XIV 54.

*De insigniis* was certainly not finished before 1519, the date attached  
 to one of Columba of Rieti's miracles (f.188<sup>v</sup>). It draws heavily on Dietrich  
 for the life of Dominic (cf. Tugwell, *Mediaeval Studies* 47 [1985] 51-52);  
 Dietrich was not used in *Cron. mag.*, so we may be sure that at least this  
 part of *De insigniis* was composed after the corresponding part of *Cron. mag.*

Up to *famulatum* in line 6, 30a is based on the Italian tradition of  
 Dietrich (supra 15a); the rest comes from Humb. (supra 9a). 30b is taken  
 from Dietrich (supra 15b); it is unclear whether Taegio meant to omit 'serue  
 dei adiuua nos ... fluctuamus' in line 5 or whether he or the 18th-century  
 copyist accidentally jumped from the first 'serue dei adiuua nos' to the second.

(a) Ed. p.83; R f.22<sup>r</sup>.

Erat in illis regionibus quidam qui egestate compulsi filias tradebant  
 hereticis nutriendas et erudiendas, imo re vera erroribus pestiferis  
 seducendas. Quorum pernitiosum miseratus opprobrium servus Dei  
 Dominicus monasterium quoddam ad earum susceptionem instituit in loco  
 5 qui dicitur Prulianum, ubi usque hodie ancille Christi gratum Deo exhibent  
 famulatum sub clausura perpetua, sub observantiis mirabilibus, sub arto  
 silentio, in puritate conscientiarum manibus operantes. Que cum merito  
 et numero creverint in immensum odorem suum longe lateque diffundentes  
 multas Deo devotas ad imitationem sui sanctam feminas provocaverunt  
 10 ad similia cenobia construenda.

(b) Ed. p.91; R f.23<sup>v</sup>.

Quum enim apud castrum Phani Iovis predicans aliquando, fidem  
 probans catholicam, hereticorum perfidiam multipliciter improbasset, post  
 predicationem in ecclesia more solito ad orandum remansit, et ecce novem  
 matrone nobiles de eodem castro intrantes ecclesiam ad pedes eius  
 5 prociderunt dicentes, Serue Dei adiuua nos et ora Deum tuum ut notam  
 nobis faciat viam suam in qua vivamus, moriamur et salvemur. Tunc vir  
 Dei stans aliquantulum et intra semetipsum orans post modicum temporis  
 spatium dixit eis, Constantes estote et expectate intrepide; confido in  
 Domino meo quod ipse qui neminem vult perire iam ostendet vobis quali  
 10 Domino servistis hactenus. Moxque viderunt in medio cattum prosilire

(30b) 10 servistis *scripsi*] fuistis *cod.*

teterrimum qui magni canis preferens quantitatem grossos habebat oculos et flamantes, linguam longam, latam et sanguinolentam et usque ad umbilicum protractam, caudam curtam sursumque protensam, posteriorum turpitudinem quocumque se vertebat ostendentem, de quibus fetor intollerabilis exalabat. Quumque circa matronas illas per horam huc illucque se vertisset ad cordam que ex campana pendeat applicuit et per eam ad superiora conscendens tandem per campanile lapsus disparuit feda post se vestigia derelinquens. Conversus autem beatus Dominicus ad matronas nimis conterritas consolabatur dicens, Ecce per hoc quod coram oculis vestris favente Domino figurative apparuit advertere potestis qualis est ille cui credentes hereticis servivistis. Ille vero Deo gratias referentes ad fidem catholicam perfectissime sunt converse. Quarum etiam aliquae apud sorores de Pruliano religionis susceperunt habitum.

(31) Ambrogio Taegio OP, *Cronica brevis*

Ed.: ASOP 5 (1901-1902).

Ms.: Rome, AGOP XIV 53.

Although the *Cronica brevis* only continues up to 1513, the section on Dominic must be dated later than the corresponding section of *De insigniis* since the reader is referred to it for further details on the Blessed Virgin's *beneficia* towards the Dominican order (f.9<sup>v</sup>); nevertheless the passages quoted here seem to be based on *Cron. mag.* (supra 29).

(a) Ed. p.85; R f.2.

Anno domini 1206 ... Ipse beatus Dominicus monasterium quoddam instituit quod dicitur Prulianum in diocesi tholosana ad susceptionem monialium sub perpetua clausura propriis manibus laborantium. ... Causa autem institutionis huius monasterii hec fuit. Erant tunc temporis in partibus illis nobiles quidam qui egestate compulsi filias suas tradebant hereticis nutriendas et erudiendas, immo re vera erroribus pestiferis eludendas. Quarum pernitiosum miseratus opprobrium beatus Dominicus monasterium prefatum instituit ubi ancille Christi sub clausura perpetua, sub observantiis mirabilibus, sub arto silentio, manibus laborantes in puritate conscientiarum creatori suo iocundum exhiberent famulatum, que numero et merito creverunt in immensum odorem suum longe late diffundentes, multas Deo devotas ad imitationem sui sanctas feminas provocaverunt ad similia cenobia construenda.

(b) Ed. p.85; R f.2<sup>v</sup>.

Per idem tempus beatus Dominicus apud castrum Fani Iovis predicans novem matronas nobiles que ab hereticis seducte erant ad veram fidem sua predicatione convertit. Quibus et demonem in forma catti teterrimi ostendit. Ex quibus nonnullae in prefato monasterio sancte religionis habitum assumpserunt.

(32) J.A. Flamininus, *Vita beati Dominici*

Ed.: J.A. Flamininus, *Vitae patrum inclyti ordinis praedicatorum*, Bologna 1529.

Ms.: Florence, BN conv. soppr. D.3.501 (dedicated to the Dominicans' new cardinal protector on St Dominic's day 1524).

On Flamininus (1464-1536) see V. de Matteis, DBI XLVIII 278-281. He was one of Alberti's main collaborators in the preparation of *De viris illustribus* in 1516 (cf. Tugwell, *Mediaeval Studies* 7 [1985] 63) and in 1520, on Alberti's advice, he took up residence in Bologna, where he was evidently able to make use of historical material available at S. Domenico, including the original of St Dominic's canonization process (cf. Alberti, *De divi Dominici calaguritani obitu et sepultura*, written and published in 1535; f.7<sup>r</sup> in the manuscript, Milan, Bibl. Braid. A.F.IX.62, f.5<sup>v</sup> in the unfoliated Bologna edition).

The *Vita beati Dominici* was undoubtedly based on a range of sources, but we can surely recognize the influence of Garzoni (supra 26) in 'indignissime ferens' in 32a.3 and 'hilari facie' in 32b.7, and of Galvano (supra 20) in 'inquinarentur' in 32a.4 and 'qua terram lambebat' in 32b.13. The breviary (supra 25a) may perhaps explain why silence is singled out from other features of Prouille's observance (32a.9), and its statement about Prouille's expansion (without the traditional reference to the foundation of other monasteries) may have inspired Flamininus's apparently original elaboration on the number of its recruits and the welcome to be given to all who wanted to serve God there (32a.7, 9-10).

The siting of Prouille 'inter Carcasonam ac Tholosam' (32a.6) looks like an echo of Jordan's 'inter Fanum Iouis et Montem Regalem' (supra 1a) adapted for a readership unfamiliar with the details of local geography, in which case it was presumably prompted by a reading of the *Libellus* itself since there does not seem to be any intermediary through which Flamininus could have known this text (the *Fundatio Pruliani*, supra 17a, is not included in any of the Italian manuscripts of Gui's compilation); a copy of the *Libellus* was made for San Domenico, Bologna, in the latter part of the fifteenth century (now Venice, Marciana lat. IX 61, on which see I. Taurisano, *Fontes selecti vitae S. Dominici*, Rome 1922, 6-8).

The bulk of Flamininus's account of the Fanjeaux matrons, with its orthodox ending, was clearly drawn from a traditional source such as Constantine, Humbert or Dietrich (supra 6b, 9b, 15b). There was almost certainly a copy of Dietrich in Bologna (he is one of Garzoni's sources), and it is quite likely that Constantine was available there too: though the 1487 and 1494 breviaries were published in Venice, the compiler of their 'legenda' of Dominic appears to have worked in Bologna (MOPH XXVI 141, 198-199), and some of his material comes from Const. S. Domenico also possessed a copy of Vincent of Beauvais's *Spec. hist.* (supra 8b) (M.H. Laurent, *Fabio Vigili et les bibliothèques de Bologne*, Vatican City 1943, 32 no. 127, 226 no. 334); nor can we exclude the possibility that there was a text of Humbert there.

(a) f.5<sup>r</sup>.

Multi erant in iisdem locis uiri quidem nobiles, qui ob tenuitatem rei familiaris filias haereticis alendas et instituendas traderent. Quod ubi Dominicus rescuiit rem indignissime ferens et simul earum misertus quod foedissimis erroribus atque fallaciis inquinarentur, modum quo de illa eximi 5  
monasterium inter Carcasonam ac Tholosam urbes in loco cui Pruliano est nomen extruxit ac illas et alias simul quamplurimas ibi conclusit ac deo dicauit sub exquisitis religionis et obseruantiae institutis, praecipueque silentio. Caeteris etiam quaecunque uellent ibi deo famulari benignum et 10  
facilem esse aditum uoluit, ne amplius essent quae catholicae fidei hostibus ob inopiam uictus traderentur.

(b) f.7<sup>r</sup>.

Die quadam, post sacram concionem quam habuerat, ut orationi uacaret in ecclesia remanserat et orabat, cum nouem ad illum matronae uenerunt quae paulo ante concionanti affuerant, deceptae ab haereticis et illorum erroribus infectae, quae ad pedes illius procumbentes dixere, Serue 5  
dei, si uera sunt quae modo ex te audiuius, magnis certe hucusque fuimus tenebris inuolutae. Quare precamur te ut nostri misereare ac opem feras. Conuersus ad eas hilari facie uir sanctus annuit facturum se libenter quod poscerent ac monstraturum aperte cuinam deo suasu et fraude haereticorum adhaesissent. Breuique interiecta oratione hortatus est ut paulum 10  
expectarent ac intrepido animo essent. Vix haec dixerat cum de medio illarum horribilis bellua felis habens effigiem sed magnitudine canis erupit, ipso etiam colore qui erat nigerrimus terrorem incutiens, tumentibus oculis, linguam habens longam ac latam et sanguinolentam qua terram lambebat, et caudam breuem ac sursum erectam ut pudenda foede paterent. Qui mox 15  
abiens ac per funes campanarii repens in altum euanuit relicto fetore intolerabili. Tunc uir sanctus ad matronas conuersus terribili aspectu belluae territas ait, En pius uoluit deus uobis ostendere cui secutae dolos haereticorum hactenus famulatae fueritis. Quae tanquam ex dira redemptae captiuitate deo quas decuit gratias egere et ad uerum fidei lumen rediere. Etiam ex illis quaedam terrenis renuntiantes rebus Pruliani monasterii 20  
claustra licentiosae libertati praetulere.

(32a) 3 rescuiit] accepit *ed.* 6 monasterium *om. hic et post nomen in marg. suppl.*  
F 11 uictus *om. ed.*

(32b) 5 hucusque fuimus] fuimus hucusque *ed.* 6 precamur te] te precamur *ed.*  
7 facie] uultu *ed.* facturum se] se facturum *ed.* 13 ac latam et] latamque ac *ed.*  
14 erectam] retractam *ed.* 15 campanarii] tintinabulorum *ed.* 17 pius uoluit]  
uoluit omnipotens *ed.* cui] cuinam *ed.* 19 egere] egerunt *ed.*

(33) L.Surius, *De probatis sanctorum historiis* (1573)

Ed.: Turin 1877.

Ms.: Cologne, Hist. Archiv GB 8°131.

I have not seen any of the older editions of Surius, but the Cologne manuscript of the life of Dominic was copied from one of them. This life is a 'translation' of Dietrich into more humanist Latin.

In 33a Surius has expanded what Dietrich said about the foundation of Prouille (supra 15a) to incorporate more of Humbert's eulogy (supra 9a). In 33b.20 it is probably just a coincidence that he echoes Garzoni (supra 26b.23) in using the word *restis*: the medieval sources' *corda* (supra 6b etc.) was unacceptable to humanists since its use to mean 'rope' was unclassical, and *rudens* had primarily nautical connotations; this left a simple choice between *restis* and *funis* (favoured by Flaminius, supra 32b.15).

(a) §32 (p.114).

Erant illis in locis nobiles aliquot qui inopia adacti filias suas tradebant haereticis nutriendas et erudiendas, immo vero erroribus pestiferis corrupendas. Earum exitiale opprobrium miseratus Dei servus beatus Dominicus monasterium quoddam in quod reciperentur instituit in loco quem Prulianum vocant, ubi Ancillae Christi perpetuo inclusae, admirandas constitutiones et observantias, arctumque silentium sectarentur, et laborantes manibus suis in conscientiae puritate Creatori suo iucundum exhiberent famulatum.

(b) §43-44 (p.118).

Cum in Tolosae partibus apud castrum quod Fanum Iovis vocant praedicaret vir Dei et aliquando, fidem catholicam egregie adstruens, haereticorum perfidiam multis modis confutasset, absoluta concione more solito in ecclesia precandi causa remansit, et ecce novem matronae nobiles ex illo castro veniunt, intrant in templum, cadunt ad pedes eius et dicunt, Serve Dei adiuva nos; si vera sunt quae hodie pro concione dixisti, iam pridem mentes nostras necesse est spiritus erroris ut excaecarit, nam istis quos tu haereticos vocas, nos homines bonos appellamus, usque in praesens credidimus et adhaesimus toto corde, nunc vero prorsus animis fluctuamus. Serve Dei adiuva nos et ora Deum tuum ut notam nobis faciat fidem suam in qua vivamus, moriamur et salvae fiamus. Tum vir Dei stans et aliquamdiu intra se orans, paulo post dixit ad eas, Constantes estote et expectate intrepidae; confido enim in Domino Deo meo quod ille qui neminem vult perire iam declarabit vobis cuiusmodi domino hactenus adhaeseritis. Moxque viderunt e medio sui felem terrimum prosilire canis magnitudine, crassis oculis et igneis, lingua oblonga, lata, sanguinolenta et usque ad umbilicum producta, cauda brevi et in sublime erecta ita ut

loci eius turpitudinem quocumque se verteret hominum oculis ostenderet, foetore intolerabili inde exhalante. Cumque apud matronas illas sese hora una huc illucque agitasset, ad restim quae a campana pendeat insiliens et per eam sursum scandens tandem disparuit foeda post se vestigia derelinquens. Conversus autem ad matronas sanctus Dominicus nimium territas consolabatur ita dicens, En ex eo quod coram oculis vestris Deo volente apparuit potestis animadvertere qualis sit ille cui hucusque serviistis. At illae gratias Deo agentes ad fidem catholicam integerrime sese receperunt, et quaedam ex eis apud sorores de Pruliano religionis habitum induerunt.

## (34) Serafino Razzi OP

Ed.: *Vite dei santi ... del sacro Ordine de' Frati Predicatori*, Florence 1577.

Razzi's brother and editor, Don Silvano, says in the preface that Serafino sent him the manuscript of the *Vite dei santi* from Perugia where he was 'Reggente dello Studio' (later corrected to 'Maestro dello Studio'), and then, 'andatosene nell'Abruzzi', never mentioned it again (p.2; pp.1-2 in the Palermo edition of 1605). Razzi left Perugia, where he had been Master of Studies, on 12 July 1574, and arrived in Penne (in Abruzzo) on 28 July to assume office as prior (*Viaggi in Abruzzo*, ed. B.Carderi, L'Aquila 1968, 37, 40); this shows that the manuscript was completed by mid July 1574, but probably not much earlier.

According to Razzi's brother the work was the fruit of 'molti e lunghi viaggi ... per meglio trovare di molte cose il vero' (p.2); this must refer to the 'journey of 900 miles' which Razzi undertook in northern Italy in 1572, of which he left a description (ed. G. Di Agresti, *Diario di viaggio di un ricercatore*, MD NS 2, 1971). He could have consulted material on Dominic in many different places; it is also chronologically just possible that he used Surius's edition of Dietrich, and at first sight 34a suggests that he had done so. His life of Dominic follows the sequence of events in Dietrich's *Libellus* fairly exactly, with the story of the Fanjeaux matrons coming immediately after that of Dominic's conversion of some other heretically inclined ladies (hence 'un' altra volta' at the beginning of 34b); there can be no doubt that in some form Dietrich was an important source, and 34a is very similar to Surius's expanded version of Diet. §32 (supra 33a). However, there is at least one place where Razzi follows a reading which he could not have got from Surius: at the time of Dominic's death, he says, 'fra Gualla da Bergamo' had his famous vision 'dopo l'orazione' (p.23), but *de Pergamo* and *post orationem* are interpolations peculiar to the Italian tradition of Diet. §240. He also incorporates material which does not come from Dietrich at all, for example the detail that Dominic was forced by Diego to abandon his total abstention from wine (p.4).

In the course of his travels in 1572 he spent a few days at S.Maria delle Grazie, Milan (ed. Di Agresti 116-124), where he could have consulted Taegio's compilations, and there are reasons for believing that Taegio was

in fact his primary source for the life of Dominic. The influence of Dietrich, and of the Italian textual tradition in particular, could perfectly well have been mediated by Taegio's *De insigniis*, and the non-Dietrich material could come from his *Cronica magistrorum*; and there are features of Razzi's text which echo Taegio rather than his sources: for example, Razzi describes the miracle of fire reported (from Cernai §54) in Humb. §17-18, with its concluding comment that something similar is said to have happened at Fanjeaux, and then proceeds to give a full account of the Fanjeaux miracle (p.5), which is exactly what we find in *Cron. mag.* (Bologna 1894 f.6, AGOP XIV 51 ff.2<sup>v</sup>-3<sup>r</sup>); and the story of Dominic's vision of Peter and Paul begins 'hauuta la confermazione dell'ordine' (p.10) which translates a link inserted by Taegio at a point where he omits part of Dietrich's text (AGOP XIV 54 f.26<sup>v</sup>). The immediate source of 34a and 34b may therefore be identified as 29a (which would incidentally account for Dominic rather than Diego being named as the founder of Prouille) and 30b.

## (a) p.5.

Ne' medesimi tempi vedendo il beato Domenico che molti nobili da pouertà costretti dauano le loro figliuole nelle mani de gl'heretici, accioche da loro fussero instrutte et ammastrate, anzi, per piu vero dire, sedotte e male informate, fondò il Monasterio di Puliano (*sic*), accioche in esso fussero  
 5 riceuute le dette figliuole e instrutte nella vera e santa cattolica fede. Dentro al qual Monasterio sono poi sempre viuute e viuono le Suore in perpetua clausura, procacciandosi, secondo la loro santissima Regola, con le proprie mani, in silenzio et angelica purità, il vitto e altre cose necessarie.

## (b) p.7.

Vn'altra volta hauendo in vn certo castello predicato contra gl'heretici, rimaso che fu dopo la predica, secondo l'usanza sua, in Chiesa à fare orazione, se gli gettarono humilmente à i piedi alcune donne di quella terra, ringraziandolo infinitamente che l'hauuea cauate d'errore, conciofusse che  
 5 da gl'heretici sedotte alquanto tempo haueuano malamente creduto. All'hora il seruo di Dio, ringraziando la Diuina bontà di tanto dono, Voglio, disse, figliuole, che veggiate à cui hauete infino ad hora creduto. E ciò detto, facendo in silenzio breue orazione, si vidde vscire di mezzo à dette donne vn gatto bruttissimo, di altezza quanto vn gran cane, con occhi grossi et  
 10 infiammati, e con lingua smisuratamente lunga e larga e sanguinosa, et in somma in tutte le fattezze sozzo e mal fatto quanto dire si possa. Il quale mostro, dopo essersi per ispazio di mezza hora intorno alle dette donne aggirato, finalmente salendo et inarpicandosi su per la fune d'una campana si fuggì, dopo se lasciando grandissima puzza e fetore. Il che seguito,  
 15 racconsolò il padre le donne, che tutte erano per cotal vista spauentate, et elle da lui partite vissero poi sempre in pace e nel timore di Dio, fattesi alcune di loro religiose nel Monasterio di Pluriano (*sic*), e rimase l'altre nel secolo.



## (35) Hernando de Castillo OP

Ed.: *Primera parte de la historia general de Sancto Domingo y de su orden de Predicadores*, Madrid 1584.

Castillo's *Historia* was soon translated into Italian by Timoteo Bottoni; there are two editions: Venice 1589, and Palermo 1626. In 1729 an anonymous work entitled *Vita e glorie del patriarca S. Domenico ... raccolte da diversi autori* was published in Venice by Andrea Poleti, who was probably himself the 'divoto di S.Domenico' (f.\*5<sup>v</sup>) who was moved, as he says, not just to 'dare alle stampe' Castillo's life of Dominic, but also 'ad ornarla con una Raccolta di varie cose alle sue Glorie appartenenti' (ff.\*2.\*3<sup>r</sup>); the sections on the founding of Prouille and the Fanjeaux matrons (pp.89-91, 130-132) reproduce Bottoni's translation of Castillo verbatim.

Flaminius is included in the sources listed in Castillo's prologue, and his influence is recognizable, for instance, in 'entre Carcasona y Tolosa' (35a.11, cf. 32a.6), 'a todas las que querian ...' (35a.18-23, cf. 32a.9-11), 'boluiose à ellas con muy alegre semblante' (35b.9, cf. 32b.7) and 'con la qual yua lamiendo la tierra' (35b.16, cf. 32b.13); indeed, there is little in either passage which could not have been taken from Flaminius. Castillo has reintroduced, though in a distorted form, Humbert's statement about Prouille inspiring the foundation of other monasteries (35a.19-21); among his named sources this could come from the Madrid codex (cf. supra 9a) or Antoninus (supra 22 a2). The precise *tres bueltas* in 35b.16 can only come from Garzoni (supra 26b.22); Alberti's *De viris illustribus* is another acknowledged source.

Castillo's account of the background to the foundation of Prouille may have been influenced by the situation in Spain in his own day, in which the poor *hidalgo* with his half-shod son and with more linen than food on his table was proverbial; Hernán Nuñez cites 'El hijo del hidalgo, un pie calçado y otro descalço' and 'La comida del hidalgo poca vianda y mantel largo' (*Refranes o proverbios en romance*, first published in 1555; I quote from Madrid 1619 pp.42a, 59a). L.Martínez Kleiser, *Refranero general ideológico español*, Madrid 1953, has a whole section (30.163-205) on 'hidalgos pobres'.

The claim that impoverished nobles wanted to raise money by selling their daughters, not just to save it by disburdening themselves of them (35a.4-5), seems to be original to Castillo, though it was perhaps suggested by Antoninus (supra 22 a1).

(a) I i 8, ff.17<sup>v</sup>-18<sup>r</sup>.

Era increíble el estrago que el Demonio hazia entonces en aquellas prouincias, y para acabarlo todo de perder se ofrecio ocasion muy grande, y fue la mucha necesidad y pobreza en que se vieron algunas personas nobles, á causa del nueuo leuantamiento de la tierra. Y era de manera que venian à vender sus propias hijas y darlas à criar à los heréges, compelidos de la extrema necesidad que passauan. Por donde la secta yua preualeciendo y echando rayzes en la gente noble desde la niñez. Fuera irreparable el daño que por este camino se hazia, si el Spiritu Sancto no inspirara en el

coraçon de su sieruo Sancto Domingo á hazer vn monasterio donde se  
 10 recogiesse la gente noble y necessitada. Deparole el Señor vn sitio muy á  
 proposito para ello, entre Carcasona y Tolosa, que se llama el Prulliano,  
 donde en breue tiempo se encerraron gran numero de donzellas, con vna  
 cierta forma de biuir que el les dio. Y fue de tan gran prouecho para ellas  
 15 y para las otras este encerramiento, que con el cuydado que Sancto Domingo  
 tenia en enseñarlas, predicarlas y doctrinarlas, y con la gran diligencia en  
 proueellas de lo necessario, no tardo nada en verse que era obra mas del  
 Cielo que de hombres, creciendo (cosa espantosa) en Sanctidad, en medio  
 de las guerras y heregias. A todas las que querian ser allí enseñadas y  
 20 criadas, recebia Sancto Domingo con entrañas de Padre, y á imitacion suya  
 se mouieron algunas personas ricas y Catholicas á hazer otras casas de  
 doctrina y honestidad como la del Prulliano, que fueron el reparo y remedio  
 venido del cielo para mugeres que entonces corrian en su virtud y en la fe  
 tan euidente riesgo entre soldados y hereges.

(b) I i 12, ff.26<sup>v</sup>-27<sup>r</sup> (Castillo has just told us that Dominic's miracles were both 'muy publicos' and effective).

Desta manera fue lo que le succedio, acabando de predicar, vn dia que  
 se quedó en la yglesia para hazer de su espacio oracion. Ca estando en  
 ella, vinieron de concordia nueue mugeres de las engañadas por los hereges,  
 que aquella mañana auian oydo el sermon. Las quales echandose á sus  
 5 pies con mucha congoxa le dixeron, Sieruo de Dios, si es verdad lo que oy  
 aueys predicado, ciertamente emos estado hasta agora en tinieblas  
 grauissimas. Doleos de nosotras y de nuestro desconsuelo. Tomad vn poco  
 de trabajo, enseñadnos y desengañadnos, demanera que salgamos de tanta  
 confusion como traemos. Boluiose à ellas con muy alegre semblante el  
 10 bienaventurado Sancto Domingo y dixoles que era muy contento. Y  
 poniendose vn poco en oracion, boluioles à dezir que tuuiessen buen animo  
 sin turbarse de cosa que viessen. En acabando estas palabras, se leuanto  
 de entre ellas vn fiero animal á manera de gato en la figura, aunque en el  
 cuerpo tan grande como vn gran perro muy negro en la color, y en el aspecto  
 15 ferocissimo, los ojos grandes è hinchados. La lengua sacada de espantoso  
 tamaño, toda sangrienta, con la qual yua lamiendo la tierra. Dio tres bueltas  
 allí delante de todos, y fuesse corriendo á asir de la sogá de la campana, y  
 trepando por ella desaparecio, dexando en la yglesia vn infernal hedor.  
 Quedaron atemorizadas las tristes mugeres, y medio muertas de espanto de  
 20 lo que auian visto. Y el bienaventurado Sancto Domingo les dixo, Ya veys  
 aqui como el todo poderoso Dios y Señor nuestro os ha querido mostrar la  
 maldita y abominable criatura del Demonio, quien siguiendo la doctrina  
 de los hereges aueys seruido, y en cuyo poder estauades. Leuataron los  
 ojos y el grito al Cielo las mugeres, dando gracias á Dios que de tal tirania  
 25 las libraua. Y reconociendo sus misericordias, se dieron á entender y seguir  
 la doctrina que su sieruo las enseñaua, y algunas dellas dexando sus  
 haziendas y haziendo renunciacion del mundo se fueron al Prulliano á ser  
 monjas en el monasterio que tenia el bienaventurado Sancto Domingo hecho  
 segun arriba esta dicho.

## (36) Antonius Senensis OP

Ed.: *Chronicon fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum*, Paris 1585.

This appears to derive entirely from Gui (supra 16a). 'Per idem tempus' merely indicates the time before the confirmation of the Order.

(a) p.12.

Per idem tempus, vt ab huius saeculi nequam tenebris et laqueis foeminei sexus personas eriperet, beatus Dominicus vnctione spiritus edoctus, excogitauit, vt quae soli Deo vacare cuperent, in monasteriis reclusae manerent ab omnibus saeculi sequestratae tumultibus, et ibi tria religionis vota emitterent, et in hunc finem Prulianum monasterium adeptus, quod est in Tolosana prouincia situm, in quo plures virgines quae se Deo dicarunt, recepit et conclusit, vt spiritualibus armis et contra principem tenebrarum illius regionis hominibus dominantem dimicarent, et ad id pientissimi domini Fulco, Tolosanus episcopus, et Amelius, Archiepiscopus Narbonensis, et Comes Montisfortis multum praestitere fauorem et auxilium. 5 10

## (37) T.Malvenda OP

Ed.: *Annalium sacri ordinis Praedicatorum centuria prima*, Naples 1627.

On Malvenda see L.Robles, 'Documentación para un estudio sobre Tomás Maluenda, O.P. (1565-1628), *Revista Española de Teología* 38 (1978) 113-140. His *Annales* were published without his consent long after other duties had forced him to return to Spain leaving his historical work in what he felt to be an unsatisfactory state; as he noted at the end of his manuscript (Valencia, Bibl. Univ. 679 f.216<sup>v</sup>), 'Hos annales a me Fratre Thoma Maluenda Ordinis Praedicatorum hucusque perductos, affectos tamen nec emendatos, pro meis haberi nolo; desii eos scribere anno salutis 1608 mense Maio'.

I have not thought it necessary to reproduce all his quotations at length. At 37a.8-9 he quotes 22 a1, adding *Dominicus* after *pater* in line 1, omitting 'et Didaco ... non obtinuit' and turning *quum* into *cumque* (22 a1.2-5); in line 7 he has *deliberat* for *deliberauit*, and he seems to have a better text at lines 9-10, 'Quod utique fecisset nisi qui ad maiora eum elegerat aliter miseriae illorum prouidisset'. At 37a.11-12 he quotes Dietrich as rewritten by Surius (supra 33a), except that in 33a.2 he has *nutriendas et enutriendas* for *nutriendas et erudiendas*.

In 37a.12-16 he quotes the text of Gui (supra 16a) as it appears in the Minerva manuscript and nowhere else (on Malvenda's use of this manuscript, cf. Kaeppli, MOPH XXII xiv n.14). 'Anno Domini 1207' is not in italics, so it was not meant to be part of the quotation; the Minerva manuscript, like all the others, has 'anno domini .m.cc.vi'.

Malvenda's date for the founding of Prouille, 1207, is original to him and was no doubt a compromise between his different sources. Having begun with Antoninus, it seems (hence the placing of his discussion of Prouille), he then modified Antoninus's statement (quoting 22 a1 without

its reference to Diego's death) to accommodate evidence from other sources that the foundation was made before Diego left the region, notably Dietrich §33 as interpreted by Surius, according to which one of Diego's purposes in returning to Spain was to bring back *quaedam subsidia* for the monastery 'quod sanctus Dominicus in Pruliano construxerat' (Surius, ed. cit. 114; notice the tense). Malvenda has just argued (p.70) that Diego died in 1207, probably towards the end of the year; if the foundation of Prouille occurred before he left the region, but only shortly before, it too must be dated 1207.

'Iacobus Susatus', cited in 37a.17, refers to Alberto's chronicle (supra 28a); Alberto says that James of Soest's chronicle was his primary source, and his *Cronice* were often cited thereafter as if they were James's chronicle; cf. R.Creytens, AFP 30 (1960) 235-238, 257-258.

On the Fanjeaux matrons (37b) Malvenda simply quotes Vincent of Beauvais (supra 8b): 'Vincentius ... lib. 30 cap. 76 res S.Dominici in Tolosana regione per haec tempora gestas in litteras mittens haec scribit ...'.

(a) AD 1207 cap. VII (p.73).

Hoc eodem anno institutum erectumque a S.Dominico celebre illud monasterium Pruliani Bernardus Guido ... in commentario de rebus ordinis anno 1304 conscripto diserte affirmat, Theodoricus, Garzo, Flaminius et alii satis innuunt ante discessum Didaci a Gallia caeptum illud Monasterium fundari; immo Garzo addit iussu Didaci extractum; Theodoricus vero, vti vidimus, ait Didacum Episcopum cogitantem redire in Galliam Narbonensem etiam de subsidiis Monasterio Pruliani a S.Dominico constructo adferendis egisse. Occasionem erigendi Monasterii S. Antoninus 3.p. Hist. cap. 1 §4 in hunc modum exponit ... At quanam ratione Sanctus Pater tanto malo obuiam ierit inopiaque illustrium foeminarum tantarum, non (*sic*) haeresi prostitutarum, opem tulerit, Theodoricus lib. I cap. 6 in hanc sententiam narrat ... Bernardus quoque Guido haec habet. Anno Domini 1207. *Sanctus Dominicus monasterium instituit quod dicitur Prulianum in dioecesi Tolosana ad susceptionem Monialium sub clausura perpetua, propriis manibus laborantium. Et tunc coepit fortius de ordinis institutione tractare.* Eadem de fundatione Monasterii Pruliani produnt Iacobus Susatus, S.Antoninus, Garzo, Flaminius et alii Recentiores.

(b) AD 1211 cap. VI (p.96).

= 8b except (with reference to the line-numbering of 6b): 9 *Malv. does not add haec* 19 *preferens*] *perferens Malv.* 26 *derelinquens*] *relinquens Malv.* 28 *Deo*] *Domino Malv.*

(38) A.Bzovius OP

Eds.: *Annales Ecclesiastici XIII*, Cologne 1616, Antwerp 1617; revised ed. Cologne 1621.

There is abundant evidence that Bzovius, the first continuator of Baronius, had access to Malvenda's as yet unpublished *Annales*. His account of Diego's death in 1207 was certainly taken from Malvenda (AFP 73 [2003] 129-131), and it was no doubt under the same influence that he placed his

account of the founding of Prouille after his report of Diego's death and dated it too to 1207. Ignoring the apparent conflict between the sources cited by Malvenda on when the foundation actually occurred, he simply repeats the text from Dietrich (Surius) which Malvenda had quoted (supra 33a, 37a), but with one curious alteration (38a.5-6): where Surius states that Dominic *instituit* the monastery, Bzovius says that he 'monasterium ... erigi iussit'. This must be a deliberate echo of Garzoni's assertion that *Diego* 'monasterium ... iussit extrui' (26a.3-4), but its purpose is unclear. If Bzovius was worried about authorities which suggested that Prouille was founded before Diego's departure from the region, he ought rather to have rewritten Surius's remark about Diego setting off with the intention of bringing back funds for the monastery which Dominic 'had built'; he was perhaps more concerned to secure Dominic's exclusive right to be seen as the founder of Prouille.

The revised edition of *Annales* XIII lacks *erigi iussit* in 38a.6, but it is unclear whether this is due to a typographical accident or to a deliberate suppression of alien matter from the text of Surius; in any case, *instituit* was not restored nor is any other way of completing the sentence supplied.

Bzovius's account of what happened in 1207 sits uncomfortably with what he has already reported under the year 1204; and Prouille is not the only problem. Malvenda cited evidence to show that the legate Peter of Castelnaud was killed early in 1208 (*Annales* 74-75); Bzovius accordingly says that he 'followed' Diego in death (AD 1207 §5). However, he has already effectively dated Peter's death to 1204 in connection with the first engagement of Diego and Dominic in the Languedoc mission (AD 1204 §22). His source there is clearly Antoninus, *Hist.* III xxiii 19.3, which is both cited and echoed.

According to Antoninus, 'eo tempore cepit crux predicari in Francia in partibus Tolosanis contra Albigenes hereticos', but first the pope sent Peter of Castelnaud as his legate to excommunicate the Count of Toulouse, which he did; he was then killed by two of the count's *armigeri*. This prompted the pope to despatch Cardinal 'Gualo' to the kingdom of France to call for military intervention in Languedoc, and twelve Cistercian abbots were sent with him to preach a crusade against the Albigensians; 'superuenit autem ex Hispania Didacus Oxomensis episcopus ...'. The chapter opens with the date '1206' but introduces '1208' in the course of the story; 'eo tempore' could refer to either, but since 1208 is the correct date of Peter's murder and of Guala's legation to France—where one of his tasks was to campaign for a crusade to the Holy Land, not against the Albigensians (PL 215:1401-1402)—we may suppose that this was also meant to be the date of Diego's intervention (I am slightly modifying what I said in AFP 73 [2003] 125).

Since Bzovius accepted Malvenda's evidence that Diego died in 1207, he could not adopt Antoninus's account as it stood. He was also probably aware that Guala's legation occurred in 1208: in AD 1208 §5 he mentions the Albigensian crusade being preached in France by a legate; though he does not name him, he probably had Guala in mind. Anyway, he removed Guala from Antoninus's story, leaving unidentified the legate with whom the twelve abbots were sent to preach the crusade against the Albigensians.

Thanks to the interest shown by the curia in his work Bzovius was able to use the papal archives, as he mentions in his 'Praescriptio ad lectorem'. He could thus cite letters from Innocent III's registers concerning the legation of 'the abbot of Cîteaux and two monks from Fontfroide' (one of whom was Peter of Castelnau) in 1204; in particular, he cites 'Ep. 76, 77, 78' and 'Lib. 6 ep. 243' (i.e. O.Hageneder, ed., *Die Register Innocenz' III VII*, Vienna 1997, 118-127; VI, Vienna 1995, 405-407). This evidently suggested to him a new setting for what Antoninus said about the twelve abbots and the arrival of Diego and Dominic on the scene, which he accordingly dated to 1204.

Having introduced Dominic like this, he proceeds to relate the miracle of his book jumping out of the fire at Fanjeaux (taken from Vincent of Beauvais, *Spec. Hist.* XXIX 96), and the similar miracle reported by Cernai (§54, quoted in Malvenda's retroversion from Sorbin, Malvenda 72-73), followed by a generous selection from the episodes belonging to Dominic's time in Languedoc assembled in book I of Dietrich's *Libellus*, though he arranged them in a sequence which does not correspond to that of any known source, and he ignored the fact that Dietrich places them after Diego's death (AD 1204 §24-25). One such episode is the conversion of the Fanjeaux matrons.

Bzovius may or may not have intended to ascribe all this material to 1204, but he certainly gives the impression that the Fanjeaux conversions occurred some years before the foundation of Prouille. He must have been aware of the story's traditional ending as found in Surius and Malvenda; it was probably in an attempt to reconcile it with his own implied chronology that he substituted his seemingly original claim that the Fanjeaux conversions helped Dominic convert other women and that it was many of them, rather than some of the Fanjeaux matrons, who became nuns at Prouille (38b.24-28). The designation of the ladies as *matronae* comes directly or indirectly from Surius (supra 33b), but Bzovius's main source is recognizably Garzoni (supra 26b),<sup>1</sup> and Garzoni does not say where the Fanjeaux matrons themselves 'se sanctae religioni addixerunt'; it obviously suited Bzovius's narrative to exploit the possibility that they became nuns somewhere else, not at Prouille.

(a) AD 1207 §6.

Hoc tempore D. Dominico in Galliis contra Albigenses praedicante, Monasterium Sanctimonialium apud Prullianum ex hac causa extractum est. Erant in illis locis nobiles plurimi qui inopia adacti filias suas tradebant haereticis nutriendas, imo vero erroribus pestiferis corrumpendas. Eorum

<sup>1</sup> In 38b.1 he substitutes *ex suggestu* for *ex suggesto* (supra 26b.4), though *suggesto* is restored in the 1621 ed.; in humanist Latin both *suggestum* and *suggestus* (4th decl.) were used for 'pulpit' (R.Hoven, *Lexique de la prose latine de la Renaissance*, Leiden 1994, 353). Bzovius missed the point of 'quem musionem uoco' in 26b.18-19.

(sic) exitiale opprobrium miseratus Dei seruus B. Dominicus monasterium in quo recipere in loco quem Prullianum vocant erigi iussit, vbi ancillae Christi perpetuo inclusae, admirandas Constitutiones et obseruantias, arcumque silentium sectarentur, et manibus suis laborantes in conscientiae puritate Creatori suo iucundum exhiberent famulatum. *Theodoricus in vita S. Dominici l.1 c.6.*

(b) AD 1204 §25.

Aliquando apud Phanum Iouis ex suggestu a Concione descendenti nouem nobiles matronae occurrentes ad pedes acciderunt. Inter eas grauior annis prostrata, Nos inquit virorum sapientum quos haereticos vocas vestigia consequimur. Ab illorum opinione mirum in modum tu Pater dissentis. Ea propter nobis de sententia quam sequamur magnus scrupulus ac dubitatio ingens iniicitur. Tu porro animum nostrum elibera. Tuus iste Deus, de quo tam grandia praedicat, his qui praeceptis suis fidem habendum putabunt Diuinam ac coelestem domum vltro pollicetur. Tu si ea de re signum edideris, profecto eae sumus quae numquam de tua sententia decedemus. Audiuit haec Dominicus et paululum se colligens, Si inquit constantiae vestrae minime defueritis, a Domino edetur signum quo compulsae falsam istam religionem vestram sempiterna obliuione delendam censebitis. Cui ante hac seruitutem serueritis res ipsa declarabit. Cum hanc orationem locutus esset, repente felis, quem musionem vocant, ingentis magnitudinis ex illarum medio prosiliit. Huic tam deformis vultus erat vt nemo sustinere posset. Odorem praeterea tam tetrum exhalabat vt prope omnes ab eo refugerent. Semel, secundo et iterum circum mulieres deambulauit. Tandem ad turrim iter intendit, vbi reste nolae suspensa in summum euasit. Cumque aliquantulum constitisset, ab oculis in caliginosas tenebras euanescens disparuit. Tunc Dominicus ad mulieres conuersus, Quid ait timuistis? Cur tantus vos oppressit timor? Vidistis quam vultu horrendus, quam vanus metu, quem hactenus coluistis? Abiicite et ad veritatis fontem accedite. Non vana fuit Dominici praedicatio. Statim enim matronae illae errores eiurarunt seque Sanctae religioni addixerunt. Iuuit ea res Dominicum ad alias mulieres, praesertim eas quae propter paupertatem sese Albigenisibus addixerant atque ab eis pestiferum virus attraxerant, conuertendas. Quarum plurimas, cum ad rectae fidei semitam traduxisset, et castitatis amorem eis persuasisset, in monasterio Prulliani extracto eas conclusit et religionem in commune profiteri induxit.

(39) N.Janssenius OP

Ed.: *Vita S.Patris Dominici*, Antwerp 1622.

Like Bzovius, Janssenius places the story of the Fanjeaux matrons before the foundation of Prouille, and Bzovius (supra 38b) was plainly his main source for it, though *fluctuantibus* (39b.8) suggests a more traditional inspiration (e.g. supra 25b or 33b). The account of the actual foundation (39a) seems to be based on Flaminius and Senensis (supra 32a and 36a); its dating 'paullo ante quam Didacus abscederet' reflects its placing in Flaminius immediately before the report of Diego's departure.

## (a) pp.25-26.

Sub id tempus et paullo ante quam Didacus abscederet iacta sunt a B. Dominico initia monasterii quod Prulianum vocant, Carcasonam inter et Tolosam. Occasionem obtulerant quidam nobiles inopia rei familiaris agitati. Hi cum filias suas domi alere non possent, educandas committebant

5 ditioribus haereticis, cum manifesto salutis discrimine. Advertit S. Pater immane hoc detrimentum, et consilio inito rationem invenit obviandi, conquisitas undique piorum eleemosynas in monasterii praedicti erectionem contulit, quod brevi opera Fulconis Antistitis et Amelii Metropolitae Narbonensis ad eam amplitudinem excrevit ut immensa censeretur turba

10 virginum, quae spretis mundi voluptatibus ac terno Religionis vinculo adstricta caelesti sponso sese devoverat.

## (b) pp.19-21.

Porro id temporis quo ille frequenter in Fano Iovis praedicabat, dimissa aliquando concione nobiles matronae novem interpellant, inter quas maior natu aditus sui caussam edisserens, Nos inquit virorum sapientum, quos tu velut haereticos traducis, vestigia sequimur; sed horum tuaque doctrina

5 toto caelo differunt, et cum te prorsus contraria pro concione adferentem audierimus maximus nostros omnium animos scrupulus insedit, deque Albianorum (*sic*) dogmatibus vehementer dubitamus, ac veremur uti vera sint.<sup>1</sup> Quapropter accessimus ad te, quo fluctuantibus pateat ipsa veritas. Tuus ille Deus, de quo tam grandia et praeclara asseris, omnibus quotquot

10 eius fidem et praecepta fuerint complexi praemium aeviternum pollicetur. Quae res si per te aliquo nobis indicio constiterit, profecto eae sumus quae ab hac tua religione et sententia numquam discedemus. Haec atque alia huiuscemodi dixerant, cum B. Pater re tacitus considerata post paullo, Si inquit praedicta constanter asseritis, Deus caeli verus idemque unus et trinus

15 signum edet luculentum ex quo ipsae iudicaturae estis Albigensium sectam vanissimam esse adeoque stirpitis evellendam. Manifestum illico evadet cui hactenus vos mancupio tradideritis, et quem Deum veneratae sitis. Vix ista Dominicus, cum (horrendum visu!) e medio felis quidam ingenti magnitudine prosiliit. Oculi ardentes, vultus taeterrimus, odor ingratus in

20 fugam coniciebant omnes. Ille uno alteroque rotatu circumactus in proximam turrin per campanae restem evadens repente disparuit. Et mox Sanctus, Cur timuistis? Cur subitus hic horror exanimavit? Insignem vero Deum, qui hac specie se videndum exhibet, et illa ipsa se Deum non esse fatetur. Colite illum deinceps, qui coegit cacodaemonem testem esse

25 falsitatis verique assertorem; nam eiusmodi potestate Deum esse, neque alium eius iniussu, necesse est. Nihil frustra; matronae istae incredibili studio proscriptis erroribus in veram Christi fidem concessere.

<sup>1</sup> *Veretur uti* is used in its correct classical sense here (= 'I fear that not'); the clause means 'We fear that they are not true'.



(40) Luís de Sousa OP

Eds.: *História de S.Domingos*, Bemfica 1623 (also Lisbon 1767, Porto 1977).

Sousa's *História*, on his own account, was largely based on the 'mountain of undigested and shapeless material' left by Luís Cacegas († 1610) (on whom see António do Rosário, *Dominicanos em Portugal, repertório do século XVI*, Porto 1991, 160 no. 1451). Cacegas spent nearly twenty years going round the province (of Portugal, that is, which was separated from Spain in 1418, BOP II 533-534) investigating 'antiguidades dos Conventos'; but the only time he is reported to have travelled elsewhere is when he went to the general chapter in Rome in 1571 as socius to the diffinitor. Thanks to Cacegas's labours, Sousa remarks, he himself was able to work in the tranquillity of his cell (Sousa, Prol. and II iv 7).

Castillo's *Historia* is mentioned with praise in Sousa's Prologue and it is periodically cited as a source; although it is not so cited in connection with the foundation of Prouille, its influence can be recognized in several features of Sousa's text, not least *vendidas* in 40a.6 (cf. supra 35a.5). However, neither Castillo nor any of the sources so far collected in our dossier can explain the statements that the church of Prouille was given to Dominic by Fulk and that it was dedicated to Our Lady (40a.8-11), that the nuns soon came to number 100 (40a.14-15), that the monastery is now a 'casa sumptuosissima' (40a.15-16), that it was not just the Dominicans' first house of nuns (as in 28a) but the first that any mendicant order had, and that it was the first nunnery in France to practise enclosure (40a.16-17).

Sousa, or more probably Cacegas, certainly had access, presumably indirectly, to some unlikely sources. In I i 7 he says that Simon de Montfort gave Dominic the *senhorio temporal* of 'a good town called Fanjeaux', and the bishop gave him the *rentas* of the church of St Mary in the same town and some other churches and a sixth of the tithes of his diocese; a marginal note beside the bishop's gifts identifies the sources as 'Jordan chapter 20', Bernard Gui 'tit. Das Freiras de Prulliano', and Castillo I i 15 (in the modern edition these references are turned into a footnote and wrongly attached to Simon's gift of Fanjeaux).

Castillo, loc. cit., was certainly responsible for the claim that Simon de Montfort gave Dominic Fanjeaux, though it derives ultimately from Surius's mistranslation of Dietrich §55: Dietrich reproduced the traditional statement that Simon gave Dominic the town of Casseneuil (cf. Jordan, *Lib.* §37), but Surius turned it into 'castrum insigne quod Cassawel sive Fanum Iovis appellatur' (ed. cit. 121). But Castillo does not account for some other details or for the references to Gui and Jordan; indeed, Castillo's one apparent quotation from Jordan shows that he was not actually acquainted with the *Libellus*: in *Historia* I ii 5 he attributes to the *Libellus* Jordan's story of seeing Henry 'en medio de muchos Angeles' after his death, but this is due to a misunderstanding of a passage found in Spanish manuscripts of the *Vitas fratrum* (cf. MOPH I 116).

'Das Freiras de Prulliano' can only refer to Gui's *Fundatio Prulliani*, which could indeed have supplied the information (which does not come from Castillo) that Fulk gave Dominic the church of Fanjeaux and that it was dedicated to Our Lady, as well as confirming what Castillo says about the gift of tithes (MOPH XXIV 8.5-6, 16-17, 18.22); but it is extremely unlikely that there was any copy of this work outside the South of France, so how was Sousa able to cite it?

The precise reference to 'chapter 20' of Jordan's *Libellus* is even more intriguing. There was as yet no printed edition and the *Libellus* appears to have been largely unknown. In the three surviving manuscripts it is divided in exactly the same way into clearly demarcated sections with titles (or gaps for titles in the second Würzburg text); the sections are not numbered, but the 'chapters' concerning Fulk's gifts of the church of Fanjeaux, other churches, and a share in the diocese's tithes are respectively the 15th, the 18th and the 17th (or, in the Venice manuscript which omits the opening section, the 14th, 17th and 16th). The Osma manuscript has disappeared, and the chapters in the Bollandists' edition of it are undoubtedly due to the editor, as are those in the accompanying text of Dietrich; however, Dietrich's original divisions are noted in the margin and there are no corresponding notes in the edition of the *Libellus*, so we may doubt whether the Osma manuscript was divided into chapters at all. The one known manuscript which did apparently have chapter-numbers and an eccentric division of the text is the one which Gui gave to Prouille: Cambefort cites 'chapter 16' for the heretics' threat to kill Dominic (*Lib.* §34), which would be number 14 in what seems to be the standard arrangement, 'chapter 18' for Simon's gift of Casseneuil (*Lib.* §37), which should be no. 15, and 'chapter 22' for the gift of S.Romain (*Lib.* 44), which should be no. 19 (LDP ff.102<sup>v</sup>, 44<sup>r</sup>, 36<sup>r</sup>); this means that the gift of tithes would have come in 'chapter 20'.

There may, of course, have been other copies of the *Libellus* of whose existence we are now ignorant; but it is suggestive that the only known text which makes sense of Sousa's reference is that contained in the Prouille manuscript.

Returning to Sousa's account of the founding of Prouille, the claim that it was the mendicants' first house of sisters and the first enclosed nunnery in France may plausibly be conjectured to have originated among the Dominicans in the vicinity, if not at Prouille itself; and knowledge of the present-day 'casa sumptuosissima' must derive ultimately from someone who had seen it. The only evidence of which I am aware for the belief that there were soon 100 nuns at Prouille is Humbert's letter of 1258 setting 100 as the limit for their number (AFP 65 [1995] 167). Gui included this letter in his edition of the acts of the general chapters; there is no particular reason to suppose that he had discovered it at Prouille, though this is possible, but we may presume that the monastery possessed a copy of it, whether or not it was contained in its manuscript of Gui's compilation. As for the contention that Fulk gave Dominic the church of Our Lady at Prouille, the only possible source we have encountered for it is the false deeds of donation as interpreted by Rechac and, with some reluctance, by Cambefort (cf. supra pp. 45-46).

I have no idea whether this material was contained in some published work or whether Cacegas came across it in notes taken by some Portuguese friar who had visited the Midi, but if it really did originate in Prouille it confirms the local interpretation of the deeds of donation; and the curtness of 40b suggests that the conversion of the Fanjeaux matrons had not yet become part of the local story of the monastery's foundation.

40b is too compressed to permit identification of its source, but if the concluding observation, that fear of the demonic apparition achieved what fear of God could not (40b.5-6), was modelled on the moral drawn by Constantine (supra 6b.35-37) the intermediary was probably Vincent of Beauvais (supra 8b).

(a) I i 2 (Bemfica I f.5, Lisbon I 9, Porto I 25).

Andauão os Catholicos encolhidos e encantoados, outros fogidos, ou enuergonhados e abatidos: suas casas erão saqueadas, outros fogidos, ou enuergonhados e abatidos: suas casas erão saqueadas, as fazendas destruidas, tudo confusão e injustiças. Assi derão em tanta pobreza, que muitos nobres por sustentar a fé chegauão a desemparrar as casas, e as filhas donzellas: e tais auia que polas não ver padecer escolhião por menosmal entregallas como vendidas e catiuas aos hereges que reynauão. A este desemparrado acudio o Santo frey Domingos com hum desenho do Ceo, que sempre dos maiores males costuma Deos tirar grandes benes. Tinhahe dado o Bispo de Tholosa Fulcon varão religioso e santo huma Igreja entre Carcassona e Tholosa pera seu recolhimento (era a inuocação Nossa Senhora, e o nome do sitio Prulliano). Ordena frey Domingos nella hum recolhimento pobre por então, e mal reparado, conforme ao tempo que corria. Começa logo a pouoallo de donzellas nobres e pobres, pondo à conta de Deos o gouerno e sustentação: e chegarão em pouco tempo a numero de cento. De tão fracos principios veyo a ser, e he oje casa sumptuosissima, e o primeiro Mosteiro de Freiras que ouue nas Ordens mendicantes, e o primeiro de França que admittio clausura.

(b) I i 5 (Bemfica f.12, Lisbon I 22, Porto I 39).

A humas desauenturadas molheres, a quem o demonio trazia atolladas em torpezas, porque não podia acabar de as persuadir que se emendassem, offereceo darlhes vista, e conhecimento de quem as guiaua, e a quem seruião. Mandou ao enemigo que descubrisse a figura com que as acompanhaua. Tão fea e tèmpera era que acabou o medo della, quando a virão, o que o de Deos não fazia.

(41) Henricus Spondanus

Ed.: *Annalium ... continuatio* (1639), Paris 1659.

The sources indicated are Antoninus (the passages quoted above in 22 a1 and a2), Surius (the whole life of Dominic), Vincent of Beauvais (*Spec. Hist.* 'XXX' 94, the beginning of the life of Dominic), 'et alii'. There is nothing in the text to justify connecting the 'feminae e laqueis haereticorum eductae' specifically with the Fanjeaux converts.

(a) AD 1206 §10 (the subject is Dominic).

Qui et ipso praedicationis initio, antequam abscederet Didacus, quasdam nobiles feminas e laqueis haereticorum eductas monasterio ad hoc instituto in loco Pruliano dicto inclusit.

(42) Jean Court OP

Ms.: 'Memoyres pour enuoyer a Paris a Reuerend Pere fraire Jean de sainte Marie Jacobin, historien general de l'ordre saintct Dominique, enuoyees le 20 nouembre 1646'; Carcassonne, Archives départementales de l'Aude H 461.

On the relationship between Court, Rechac (fr. Jean de Sainte-Marie) and Cambefort, and on their sources, see above pp.8-12. The Latin text quoted in 42 b2 comes from the breviary (supra 25b) with Cambefort's wrong reading (infra 44 b1) *procidentes dicentes* for *prociderunt dicentes*.

(b1) f.1<sup>r</sup> (crossed out).

Sainct Dominique vingt a Fan Jaux l'an 1206 et (*supra lin.* en la mesme annee) fit le miracle suiuant dans l'eglize parroissielle de ladite ville dans laquelle par sa predication il conuertit neuf (*supra lin.* nobles) matrones, et furent les premieres Religieuses du deuot monastere de Prouille, qui receurent l'habit de ceste sainte profession des propres mains de saint Dominique.

(b2) f.1<sup>r</sup>.

La mesme Annee 1206 saint Dominique vint a Fan Jaux, lequel preschant dans l'Esglize parroissielle de ladite ville contre l'herezie des Albigeois, de laquelle lesdits habitans estoit infectz, saint Dominique conuertit neufs nobles matrones lesquelles furent les premieres qui receurent l'habit selon l'ordre de saint Dominique et les premieres qui entrarent dans le monastere de Prouille, qui fut le jour saint Jean l'Euangeliste. Aliquando etiam dum praedicasset apud Castrum quod dicitur Fanum Iouis, post praedicationem in ecclesia ad orandum remansit. Et ecce nouem Matronae nobiles de eodem Castello ecclesiam intrantes ad pedes eius procidentes dicentes, Serue dei adiuua nos etc. Quae domino gratias agentes Monasterium de Pruliano sunt ingressae et habitum sanctae religionis assumpservunt.

(43) Jean de Rechac OP

Ed.: *La vie du glorieux patriarche S. Dominique*, Paris 1647.

(a) VD 118-120.

Quelque Noblesse d'alentour, se voyant reduite dans l'extreme necessité, sans scauoir de quel bois faire flèche pour nourrir leurs filles, prirent cette malheureuse resolution de s'en decharger au peril de leurs ames et de celles de leurs filles, les donnant à éleuer aux Heretiques, lèquels aussi-tot les peruertissoient. Saint Dominique en ayant û connoissance, et blessé dans

son coeur d'une compassion plus que maternelle, entreprit de fonder et bâtir  
 un lieu, où dorénavant ces filles pourroient être bien élevées. A cet effet,  
 dit Bernard de Guy en la fondation du Monastere de Proutille, il supplia  
 l'Archevêque de Narbonne Dom Bernard, et Foulques Evêque de Toulouze,  
 et quelques-uns des mieux accommodés entre les Catholiques, de l'assister 10  
 en ce dessein. ... Avec cette invention donc de fonder cette maison, l'opprobre  
 des Catholiques fut essuyé, et les parens ne furent plus en cette extrémité  
 de se defaire si honteusement de leurs propres enfans.

(b1) VD 120-121 (Rechac has just said that Fanjeaux received Dominic's  
 particular attention and that history records the men and women he won there,  
 notably 'neuf femmes qui se rangerent à l'Eglise par un miracle qu'il y fit').

Elles assisterent par une providence de Dieu à un sermon, où le B.  
 Pere se mit à déchiffrer les meurs, impietez, abominations et hypocrisies  
 des Heretiques; sortant de la chaire, elles l'aborderent, et la plus ancienne  
 portant la parole pour toutes, luy tint ce discours.

Iusques icy, Predicateur de la Loy de Dieu, nous avons toujours vécu 5  
 dans cette ferme creance, que ceux dont vous nous avez écrit les meurs  
 étoient les nouveaux reformateurs du monde, les envoyés de Dieu, et les  
 doctrinaires de toute verité, cependant selon votre predication ce ne sont  
 que Ministres de Sathan, faussaires des Ecritures, monstres d'impieteé, idoles  
 d'abominations, pipeurs des ames, serpens envenimez, maudis Heretiques, 10  
 rebelles à Dieu et aux hommes. S'il étoit possible, ô Pere, qu'il vous plût  
 deliurer nôtre esprit de la perplexité dans laquelle vous l'avez reduit, nous  
 donnant quelque signe evident qui fit paroître la verité de vos paroles et  
 la fausseté de nôtre creance, afin que desormais nous n'ayons  
 communication aucune avec ceux que vous dites être sortis de l'enfer et y 15  
 deuoir pour un i jamais s'entrer, ains seulement avec les vrais serviteurs de  
 Dieu, dont vous semblez être.

Le bien-heureux Pere leur repartit que leur demande luy étoit  
 extremement agreable, et que s'y (*sic pro si*) elles vouloient se mettre  
 presamment en oraison avec luy, il leur feroit voir à l'oeil le detestable 20  
 Maitre au service duquel leurs Ministres les avoient engagez. Elles le firent  
 ainsi, et le Saint ayant présenté à Dieu la conversion de ces neuf personnes,  
 à la place de ces neuf lepreux lesquels étans gueris de I.C. ne vindrent point  
 remercier leur bien facteur, il les avertit de ne s'effrayer aucunement de ce  
 que bien-tot elles alloient voir. 25

Il leur parloit encore, et voila Maitre Sathan, contraint de vider (*sic  
 pro vider*) païs, qui sort d'entre elles sous la forme d'un gros matou fort  
 hideux, d'une grandeur épouventable, aussi noir en couleur que la cheminée  
 d'enfer d'où il sortoit, roulant en tête de gros yeux étincelans et effarez,  
 desserrant ses griffes, grommelant et faisant en son gosier le hurle et le 30  
 siffle de dragon, en fin tirant d'un pié de long une langue toute ensanglantée,  
 dont il léchoit la terre; il fit en leur presence trois virades, puis se ruant  
 et s'agrippant à la corde des cloches, il grimpa iusques au haut du clocher,  
 et en fin disparut, laissant en l'Eglise une puanteur si horrible que les baumes  
 de l'Arabie n'ussent pu contrecarrer cette detestable senteur. 35

Alors ces pauvres femmes grandement epouuantées et marries d'auoir seruy vn si abominable maitre, ietterent les genoux en terre et leuerent les yeux au Ciel, remerciant ce Pere de misericordes qui par l'entremise de son fidelle seruiteur Saint Dominique auoit dissipé leurs nuages, leur auoit rendu  
 40 le iour de la grace, les auoit éclairé du beau soleil de iustice et de l'astre de la vraye foy, et en fin les auoit affranchis de la seruitude du Prince des tenebres.

Il y en ût entre icelles qui furent si bien touchées du Saint Esprit que non seulement elles quitterent, comme les autres, leurs erreurs, ains encore  
 45 les vanitez et voluptez du monde, se retirant à l'écart dans le nouveau Monastere de Prouille, afin d'y remercier avec plus de loisir leur Seigneur et Maitre Iesu Chrit.

(b2) VD 197 (Rechac has just related how Dominic was given the chapel of Our Lady, Prouille).

Le don de cette Chappelle fait à Saint Dominique, l'Euéque d'Osme contribua des reuenus de son Diocese pour faire quelque batiment qui pût suffire à la retraite de celles qui se presenteroient à être les premieres de cette Maison. ... Celles qui furent si heureuses d'être les premieres se  
 5 trouuent dans les anciennes pancartes du Monastere, onze en nombre, deux Damoiselles et ces neuf Dames Heretiques léquelles, ayans appris le miracle du liure de Saint Dominique ne brulant point au milieu des flammes, se vindrent ietter a ses piés et le prierent les éclairer de la vraye doctrine, et leur faire connoitre si le Dieu qu'ils (*sic*) adoroient etoit celuy qui les pouuoit  
 10 sauuer. Alors se mettant en prieres, il leur fit voir le Maitre qu'ils auoient seruy iusques à present, sous la figure d'un chat horriblement difforme, tel que nous l'auons decrit cy-dessus; ce qui les effraya et toucha si fort que non seulement elles quitterent leur pernicieuse doctrine et fausse Religion, ains encore se resolurent d'être les premieres Filles de ce nouveau  
 15 Monastere. Se joignant donc avec les autres deux, elles entrèrent dans iceluy le iour de Saint Iean l'Euangeliste, l'an 1206, et Saint Dominique ... leur donna l'habit de Religion.

(44) Pierre Cambefort, LDP.

Ms.: 'Livre contenant les plus remarquables choses de la vie et miracles du tres illustre patriarche Saint Dominique premier fondateur de l'Ordre des Fraires Precheurs, la fondation du devot monastere de Prouille et plusieurs conuants du dit Ordre'; Cambefort's autograph, Prouille.

The quotation at the end of 44 b1 comes from the breviary (supra 25b) with the following variants: 3 eodem castello] eodem castro Fani Iouis *Camb.* 4 prociderunt dicentes] procidentes dicentes *Camb.* 5 ora deum pro nobis] ora pro nobis deum *Camb.* hanc diem] hanc (horam *deleto*) diem 7 adiuua igitur] adiuua *Camb.* 17 vestigia derelinquens] relinquens vestigia *Camb.* 17-18 matronas illas] illas matronas *Camb.*

The text is repeated with the same variants at the end of b2 except that *eodem castello* is retained unaltered.

The first paragraph in b2 is patently taken from Rechac (supra 43 b2.1-10). In the French version of the breviary text I have italicized the places where it differs significantly from that in b1. The italicized words from 'nous vous prions' to 'horriblement difforme' (44 b2.24-29) are inspired by VD 197 (supra 43 b2.8-11), those from 'fort hideux' to 'lechoit la terre' (44 b2.29-32) and from 'il fit en leur presence' to 'touchées du saint Esprit' (44 b2.33-40) by VD 121 (supra 43 b1.27-32, 32-43).

(b1) (among Dominic's Fanjeaux miracles) ff.15<sup>r</sup>-16<sup>r</sup>.

Autre miracle que saint Dominique fit dans l'esglise parroissielle de ladite ville Fan Jaux l'an 1206 au moys de decembre lequel conuertit neufz matrones filles dudit Fan Jaux.

L'an 1206 saint Dominique vint a Fan Jaux, lequel preschant dans l'Eglise parroissielle de ladite ville avec ferueur et zelle contre l'herezie des Albigeois, de laquelle les habitans d'icelle estoient infectz, saint Dominique conuertit neufz matrones, cest a dire neufz vertueuses, nobles et honorables damoyelles d'honneur de ladite ville de Fan Jaux, lezquelles furent les premieres qui entrarent dans le deuot monastere de Prouille, qui fut le jour saint Jean l'Euangeliste, et receurent l'habit des propres mains de saint Dominique, comme est emplement recité et raporté dans le vieux Breuiaire de l'ordre en la 3<sup>e</sup> leçon du 3<sup>e</sup> jour infra octauam beati Dominici his verbis

...

#### En francois

Quelque temps apres que saint Dominique eut presché dans le Chasteau qui s'apelle Fan-Jaux et eut merueilleusement avec vigueur et blasme combatu l'herezie, il demura apres la predication dans l'esglise pour prier, sur ce voysi neufs nobles, vertueuses et honorables matrones, entrant dans l'esglise dudit Fan-Jaux, se jettent a ses pieds lui disant, Seruiteur de dieu aydes nous et pries dieu pour nous, car jusques a maintenant nous auons adiouste foy a ces heretiques que nous croyons qu'ils fussent gens de bien, toutesfoys a cause de vostre predication nous soumez dans le doubte, aydez nous s'il vous plait, nous desirons viure et mourir en la vraye foy. Pour lors saint Dominique s'arrestant et ayant faicte vne petite oraison, s'adressant auxdites matrones leur dit, Mes filles, soies constantes car dieu en qui est toute mon esperance vous fera voir a quel dieu vous auez serui. Soudain elles virent sortir dentre elles vn chat horrible et espouuantable, gros comme vn mouton, ayant les yeux gros et enflammez, ayant aussi sa langue longue, large et ensanglantee, allant iusques au nombril, vne queue courte, tendant en haut, monstrant de quelque costé qu'il tournat la vilainie de son dos, duquel exhaloit vne puanteur insupportable. Apres qu'il se fut ventré al'entour d'elles l'espace d'vne heure, enfin montant par la corde de la cloche disparut, laissant apres lui vne grande infection. Lors saint Dominique se tournant vers ses Matrones leur dit, Voila mes filles le dieu que vous auez serui. Lesquelles rendant graces a dieu se rendirent Religieuses au Monastere de Prouille et receurent l'habit de ceste sainte Religion comme est dit cy dessus.

(b2) (on the foundation of Prouille) ff.19<sup>v</sup>-20<sup>v</sup>.

Le don de ceste chapelle fait a saint Dominique, il commança de faire quelque bastiment qui peut suffire pour la retraicte des filles qui se presenteroient a estre les premieres de ceste sainte maison. Celles qui furent si heureuses de recevoir l'habit les premieres des propres mains de saint  
 5 Dominique se truuent nommees dans les actes anciens dudit monastere, qui sont onze en nombre, scauoir deux damoysselles et neufs dames heretiques de Fan Jaux, lesquelles ayant pris le miracle du liure de saint Dominique ne bruslant point au milieu des flammes, vindrent se jeter a ses pieds et le priaient les esclairer de la vraye doctrine, et leur faire cognestre si le dieu  
 10 qu'elles adoroient estoit le vray dieu qui les pouuoit sauuer. Nous fairons voir ce dessus par les actes suiuaus.

Premierement par le Miracle que saint Dominique fit dans l'Esglise parrochelle de ladite ville de Fan Jaux (apres le miracle du feu) par lequel il conuertit a la foy Catholique neufz dames heretiques et deux damoysselles  
 15 de ladite ville. C'est acte suiuant est raporte dans le breuiere de l'ordre en la 3<sup>e</sup> lecon du 3<sup>e</sup> jour infra octauam B.Dominici his verbis ...

#### En francoys

Quelque temps apres que saint Dominique eut presche dans le Chasteau qui s'apelle Fan Jaux et eut merueilleusement avec vigueur combatu  
 20 l'heresie, il demura apres la predication dans l'Esglise pour prier, et sur ce voyci neufs nobles ou onze dames verteuses, entrant dans l'esglise, se jettent a ses pies, lui disant, Seruiteur de dieu, aydez nous et pries pour nous, car jusques a maintenant nous auons adiousté foy a ces heretiques que nous croyons qu'ils fussent gens de bien, *nous vous prions de nous esclairer de la*  
 25 *vraye doctrine et nous faire cognestre si le dieu que nous auons adoré a leur persuasion est celuy qui nous peut sauuer. Alors saint Dominique se mettant en prieres et s'adressant ausdites matrones leur dit, Mes filles, soies constantes car dieu qui est toute mon esperance vous fera voir a quel dieu vous auez serui, et al'instant leur fit voir vn chat horriblement difforme et fort hideux et*  
 30 *d'une grandeur espouuantable, roulant en teste de gros yeux estincelans et farouches, ayant vne quüe courte et vne langue toute ensanglantee dont il lechoit la terre, monstrant de quelque coste qu'il tordnet la vilainie de son corps, duquel exhaloit vne puanteur insupportable. Il fit en leur presence deux ou troys tours et virades, puis se ruant <et a>griffant<sup>1</sup> a la corde de la cloche*  
 35 *il grimpa iusques au haut du clocher et enfin disparut, laissant en l'Esglise vne puanteur horrible. Alors ces pauures filles grandement espouuantées d'auoir serui a vn si abominable maistre, jett<ant><sup>2</sup> les genoux en terre et leuant les yeux au Ciel remerciarent dieu de ce que par l'entremise de saint Dominique auoit dissipé leur nuages et leur auoit rendu le jour de la grace, et estant*  
 40 *touchées du saint Esprit se rendirent Religieuses au Monastere de Prouille et receurent l'habit de ceste sainte Religion des mains de saint Dominique.*

<sup>1</sup> About 2 letters are illegible, presumably '& a'.

<sup>2</sup> The last few letters are illegible.



## (45) Michel'Arcangelo Nanni da Cagli OP

Ed.: *Vita del glorioso patriarca S.Domenico*, Urbino 1653.

The *Vita* was finished some time before it was published (the vicar general's imprimatur was issued on 28 Jan. 1647). Nanni's date for the foundation of Prouille and his statement that Prouille is four leagues from Carcassonne come from Malvenda (*Annales* 73), but otherwise his account was plainly inspired by Bottoni's Italian translation of Castillo (supra 35a).

(a) pp.196-197.

Il Monasterio di Prulliano fù fondato nel 1207 in Francia nella diocesi di Tolosa distante da Carcassona quattro leghe, e vicino al Castello detto *Phanum Iouis* ouero *Fangius*. L'occasione di questa fondatione fù che mentre S. Domenico disputaua e predicaua contra delli heretici nelle parti di Tolosa, alcuni nobili cattolici per la gran penuria che patiuano dell' viuere, vendeuano le proprie figliole alli heretici per sostentarsi col prezzo di quelle, le quali poi non solo stauano in pericolo dell'honestà, ma ancora della fede, perche l'educauano nella propria setta, la quale per questo andaua crescendo e preualendo, e cosi poneua la radice nella nobiltà, imprimendo li errori in quelle tenere donzelle, le quali poi cosi imbeute diuentando Madri notriuano i figlioli nella peruersità del'heresia. ... Per rimediare il Santo à danno cosi grande, che in progresso di tempo sarebbe stato inremediabile, pensò, con l'aiuto del Vescouo d'Osma e di alcuni pietosi cattolici, fondare vna casa di rifugio, doue si raccogliessero le fanciulle nobili e pouere; e perche il motiuo era da Dio, ben presto fù fondato vn nobile Monasterio al luogo sopradetto di Prulliano, doue prima furono introdotte molte fanciulle, poi spontaneamente ve n'entrarono dell'altre, le quali tutte, sotto vna forma di viuere che le diede il santo, in breue arriuarono à tal perfettione che presto il Monasterio si riempì di molta nobiltà, e tale perseuera insin' al giorno d'hoggi.

## (46) Juan Tamayo de Salazar

Ed.: *Anamnesis sive commemorationis sanctorum Hispanorum ... tomus quartus*, Lyons 1656.

This is manifestly based on Castillo (supra 35a).

(a) p.360.

Sub hoc tempus summa Prouincias illas annonae caritas<sup>1</sup> afflixit quae quotidie sic auxit ut multi nobiles etiam viri suasmets filias extrema necessitate coacti venundarent. His malis auertendis Dominicus situm quandam sibi delegit Pullianum (*sic*) Carcassam Tolosamque inter, vbi Monasterium aedificauit in quod inops nobilitas reciperetur. In hoc breui multae nobiles virgunculae admissae, quibus Beatus Vir certam religiose

<sup>1</sup> *Caritas* here must mean either 'dearth' or 'costliness'.

viuendi formulam praescipsit. Cuius exemplo moti sunt et alii Catholicorum diuitumque complures ad similes Domos aedificandas, quibus multarum virginum honestas et fides ab haereticorum et militum iniuriis  
10 vindicaretur.

(47) Odoricus Raynaldus

Ed.: *Annales ecclesiastici ex tomis octo ad unum pluribus auctum redacti*, Rome 1667.

This account was inserted into the main *Annales ecclesiastici* in J.D.Mansi's re-edition (I, Lucca 1747, 244 note to 1206 §28) as a titbit which Raynaldus had added 'in annalibus contractis'.

(b) AD 1206 §30.

= supra 33b, omitting the final clause (so that there is no mention of anyone becoming a nun at Prouille).

APPENDIX II  
Bérenger's deed, 17 April 1207

Since Bérenger's deed is a crucial piece of evidence for the beginnings of Prouille, it is worth re-editing here, especially as it is presented rather misleadingly and with some words missing in MOPH XXV no. 5. The original is lost, but BNF Doat 98 ff.27<sup>r</sup>-46<sup>v</sup> contains a copy, made in 1668, of 'un vidimus en parchemin trouué aux archiues de l'abbaye de Filles de l'ordre de Saint Dominique a Prouille'. In this vidimus, dated 29 March 1264, Bishops Raymund of Toulouse and William of Carcassonne attest the authenticity of ten documents concerning the disputed gift of St Martin's, Limoux, to Prouille:

- (1) Isarn of Aragón's deed of 19 March 1209 (MOPH XXV no. 9).
- (2) Archbishop Arnaud of Narbonne's deed of 26 Nov. 1218 (MOPH XXV no. 93).
- (3) Bishop Bernard of Carcassonne's deed of 13 April 1219 (MOPH XXV no. 98).
- (4) Cardinal Romanus's vidimus and confirmation of Archbishop Bérenger's original deed (of 17 April 1207), 30 Nov. 1229 (Guiraud, *Cartulaire II* 158 note 1).
- (5) Archbishop Arnaud's verdict, delivered on 6 Oct. 1222, including the text of Bérenger's original deed which William Claret, prior of Prouille, had produced ('cum sigillo pendente') as evidence (Guiraud, *Cartulaire II* 161-163 nos. 406-408).
- (6) Cardinal Conrad's vidimus and confirmation of Bérenger's deed, 28 March 1223 (Neininger, *Konrad von Urach* 554-555).
- (7) The verdict of R. of St Polycarp and Isarn of Aragón, delivered on 27 March 1224 (Guiraud, *Cartulaire II* 163-164 no. 409).
- (8) Gregory IX, *Exhibita nobis*, 25 May 1241 (Guiraud, *Cartulaire I* 7-8 no. 8).
- (9) Archbishop Peter of Narbonne's vidimus and confirmation of Bérenger's deed, 27 April 1231 (Guiraud, *Cartulaire II* 164-165 no. 410).
- (10) Archbishop William of Narbonne's vidimus and confirmation of Archbishop Peter's vidimus of Bérenger's deed (with allusion to other documents), 21 June 1252 (Guiraud, *Cartulaire II* 168-169 no. 422).

The vidimus thus contains five texts of Bérenger's deed which we may call D<sup>1</sup>, D<sup>2</sup> etc. in order of their appearance. It was itself in the archives of Prouille in 1668 but it has since disappeared, so all we now have is the authenticated copy made for Doat.

Bernard Gui gives a résumé of the same dossier with the items arranged in chronological order, ending with the 1264 vidimus, on which he says:<sup>1</sup>

Anno domini .m.cc.lxiiii. kalendas aprilis. Dominus Raymundus episcopus tholosanus et dominus Guill(el)mus episcopus carcassonensis omnes litteras contentas superius uiderunt integras, non uiciatas nec cancellatas, et sub sigillis suis fecerunt exemplari. A quibus extracta fuerunt omnia premissa per modum abreuiacionis et compilacionis compendiose diligenter, anno domini .m.ccc.vii. pridie kalendas aprilis in Pruliano.

It is unclear whether Gui's *abreuiacio* was based on the vidimus or on the originals, but a similar comment at the end of the dossier on the church of Fanjeaux suggests that the former was meant (MOPH XXIV 23):<sup>2</sup>

Anno domini .m.cc.lxiiii. kalendas aprilis. Dominus Raymundus episcopus tholosanus et dominus Guill(el)mus episcopus carcassonensis litteras omnes contentas superius uiderunt integras, non uiciatas nec cancellatas, et ab ipsis originalibus litteris exemplari fecerunt sub sigillis suis. A quibus exemplaribus extracta fuerunt ista anno domini .m.ccc.vii. pridie aprilis in Pruliano, excepto dumtaxat illo instrumento seu illa littera que de controuersia decimarum suborta et per dominum Fulconem et sanctum Dominicum terminata expressam continet mencionem, quia ipsam alibi et ex suo originali extraxi.

Although *exemplar* is in itself ambiguous and may refer to an original, a copy, or, more specifically, a copy intended to serve as a model,<sup>3</sup> it seems to be used here to refer to something other than the *originalia* which Gui also mentions, and the *exemplaria* from which he took most of the letters are contrasted with the *originale* from which he took the one *de controuersia decimarum* (MOPH XXIV 18).

Nevertheless, it looks as if he was aware of some of the originals. With the exception of Gregory IX's bull, all the pieces in the Limoux dossier *either* have the document's own reference to sealing included in the regest *or* they are followed by a comment to the effect that 'extat littera sigillata' (in the case of Bérenger's deed, 'extat ... in Pruliano').<sup>4</sup> This implies a distinction

<sup>1</sup> Cf. MOPH XXIV 15. I quote the text from Agen 3 f.87<sup>r</sup> and Cambefort's notes in Arch. dép. de l'Aude H 461; later versions have *superius contentas* and add *et studiose* after *diligenter* (I have checked this in Avignon 1437 f.7<sup>r</sup>, Bordeaux 780 f.50<sup>v</sup> and Toulouse 490 f.98<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> There are no significant variants in the manuscripts I have consulted (Agen 3 f.90<sup>v</sup>, Avignon 1437 f.9<sup>v</sup>, Bordeaux 780 f.52<sup>v</sup>, Toulouse 490 f.104).

<sup>3</sup> L.J.Bataillon, in Weijers, *Vocabulaire du livre* ... 211-219.

<sup>4</sup> *Extat littera* is also how Gui begins his comment on the one deed which he claimed to have copied from an original (MOPH XXIV 18.10-13).

between documents whose originals had to Gui's knowledge been preserved and others which he only knew about from the vidimus.<sup>5</sup>

In his notes preserved in Arch. dép. de l'Aude H 461, Cambefort copied the Limoux dossier from Gui, no doubt from the Prouille manuscript;<sup>6</sup> but he omitted the first piece, Bérenger's deed of 1207, though he left ample space for it between the heading, 'Donation de l'esglize saint Martin de Limoux' and the deed of '1208'. This must mean that he was planning to take Bérenger's deed from elsewhere, and 'elsewhere' certainly means Rechac (VD 201);<sup>7</sup> and that is exactly what we find in LDP, where Rechac's text of Bérenger's deed<sup>8</sup> is followed by the rest of the dossier from Gui.

Rechac does not identify the source of his text of Bérenger's deed, but he follows it with an allusion to subsequent confirmations including bulls from Nicholas IV and Boniface VIII (which are not in Gui's dossier), 'toutes léquelles Bulles sont au premier terrier du Monastere' (presumably the Prouille cartulary), 'et l'on y void encore d'autres de deux Legas qui vindrent en ces cartiers'. If the 'deux Legas' are Cardinals Conrad and Romanus, then at least some pieces from the 1264 dossier were in the 'terrier' as well as the papal bulls; this must make it likely that the other items to which Rechac alludes (the confirmations of 1218 and 1219) were there too, even though they were not bulls, in which case the whole dossier was probably there in one form or another. But this still leaves us with the question which we have no way to answer, did the cartulary contain a copy of Bérenger's original deed or just later pieces in which his deed was incorporated?<sup>9</sup> And did Rechac take Bérenger's deed from the cartulary anyway?

<sup>5</sup> Gui thus provides evidence that the original of the 1207 deed was in the Prouille archives in 1307, so the failure to get it vidimated in 1252 and 1264 does not mean, as it might appear to do, that it had disappeared by then.

<sup>6</sup> He later copied most of it from his notes into LDP ff.31<sup>v</sup>-33<sup>v</sup>, without correcting his mistakes (such as 'ultimo calendis decembris' and 'm.cc.li' at MOPH XXIV 9.29 and 14.22), but he extracted Gregory's bull from its proper place and put it immediately before Alexander's bull (Guiraud, *Cartulaire* I 19-20 no. 30) which Gui placed after the 1264 vidimus (MOPH XXIV 15-16).

<sup>7</sup> Cambefort was plainly using Gui's manuscript in tandem with VD: after transcribing the letter *de controuersia decimarum* from Gui, he returns to Limoux to copy Rechac's account of the founding of the convent there in 1324 which, as he rightly says, is on 'ful. 697' of VD.

<sup>8</sup> The one place where Cambefort's text diverges from Rechac's confirms its derivation from VD: Rechac reduced the opening to 'Notum sit omnibus etc.', and Cambefort filled out 'etc.' with a formula taken from a different letter, which he would certainly not have done if he had consulted any manuscript of the deed. It is inconceivable that he alone has preserved the correct text against the unanimous testimony of all five copies in Doat 98.

<sup>9</sup> Koudelka refers to a text of Bérenger's deed copied from the cartulary in AGOP XIV lib. K 800-801, but lib. K 800-809 actually contains Gui's *Fundatio Pruliani* (and it was not even copied from the Prouille manuscript).

Cambefort concludes the Limoux dossier in LDP with a marginal note that 'tous ces actes sont en original dans les archifs de Prouille avec leurs seaux' (f.33<sup>v</sup>), but this is probably just a careless generalization from Gui's periodic remark that 'extat littera'. However, there is a more precise note beside Bérenger's deed: 'Jay veu et leu ladite donation en son original dans les archifs de Prouille entre les mains du pere Craquet prieur' (f.31<sup>r</sup>). An examination of similar comments has convinced me that Cambefort never had independent access to Prouille's originals, but he was present when 'Craquet' (more correctly 'Carquet') showed some of them to Rechac; when he claims that the text of some deed was 'taken from the original' this really means that he has taken it from VD but had witnessed Rechac doing his best to transcribe it from the original in face of Carquet's evident eagerness to retrieve it.<sup>10</sup>

Cambefort does not expressly state that his (Rechac's) text of Bérenger's deed comes from the original which he saw and read in Carquet's hands, but Rechac's transcription is not just inaccurate, it is very incomplete, so we may well believe that he made it from an original with Carquet breathing down his neck, though this might, of course, mean the original of a later document in which Bérenger's deed was quoted. Sadly, though, even if Rechac took his text from Bérenger's actual deed, the poor quality of his transcription far outweighs any merit its derivation from the original might have given it.

The text in QE I 7 is patently taken from Rechac.

In sum, for the complete text of Bérenger's deed we have to rely on the Doat transcription of the 1264 vidimus, though for the gist of it we also have Gui's regest. Even if Rechac in principle brings us closer to the original, we cannot trust his testimony when it conflicts with that of other witnesses.

\*

- C Prouille manuscript of Cambefort, LDP f.31<sup>r</sup>
- D<sup>1</sup> Paris, BNF Doat 98 f.31 (Romanus's vidimus, 1229)
- D<sup>2</sup> *ibid.* ff.34<sup>v</sup>-35<sup>v</sup> (quoted in Arnaud's verdict, 1222)
- D<sup>3</sup> *ibid.* ff.37<sup>v</sup>-38<sup>r</sup> (Conrad's vidimus, 1223)
- D<sup>4</sup> *ibid.* ff.42<sup>r</sup>-43<sup>r</sup> (Peter's vidimus, 1231)
- D<sup>5</sup> *ibid.* ff.44<sup>r</sup>-45<sup>r</sup> (William's vidimus of Peter's vidimus, 1252)
- E QE I 7
- R Rechac, VD 201.

<sup>10</sup> We get an idea of Carquet's possessive attitude to the monastery's papers from Cambefort's comment on the documents cited in connection with the 'bastimens et achapts des places et maisons dans Prouille faicts par les prieurs': 'Toutes ces memoyres ont este tirees de leurs origineaux que le reuerend pere Carquet prieur de Prouille me fit voir dans sa chambre a Prouille, et n'eus moyen d'en faire extraits mais simplement remarquer les dattes desdits actes, tous escripts en parchemin et par actes separez' (LDP f.112<sup>r</sup>). The parallel text in VD 200 strongly suggests that Cambefort and Rechac were shown the same deeds in the same way at the same time.

In nomine domini. Notum sit omnibus praesentem paginam inspecturis quod nos B., Dei permissione Narbonensis archiepiscopus, consensu et uoluntate sociorum nostrorum, damus et libere concedimus per nos et successores nostros, in redemptione animarum nostrarum, Priorissae et monialibus nouiter conuersis monitis et exemplis fratris Dominici Oxomensis sociorumque eius, habitantibus nunc et in perpetuum in castro Fanoioiuis et in ecclesia beatae Mariae de Pruliano Tholosanae diocesis, ecclesiam beati Martini de Limoso nostrae diocesis in Redesio cum omnibus decimis et primiciis territorii beati Martini de Limoso et territorii de Taxo eidem contigui, cum oblationibus et cum omnibus iuribus suis et pertinentiis, iure perpetuo integre possidendam, et dictas moniales et per ipsas et nomine earum fratrem Dominicum et fratrem G.Clareti cum traditione praesentis cartae in possessionem mittimus, saluo tamen iure episcopali nobis et successoribus nostris tam in cathedratico quam in procurationibus et uisitationibus et in commissione curae animarum illi sacerdoti qui a dictis monialibus uel aliquo fratre loco earum nobis uel nostris successoribus fuerit praesentatus.

Ut autem omnia supradicta omni firmitate subnixta permaneant sigilli nostri munimine fecimus roborari.

Actum est hoc Carcassoniae in domo domini episcopi anno domini millesimo ducentesimo septimo, decimo quinto kalendas maii.

\*

Bernard Gui's text

A Agen 3 f.85<sup>r</sup>

B Bordeaux 780 f.49<sup>r</sup>

E Avignon 1437 f.6<sup>r</sup>

T Toulouse 490 f.95<sup>r</sup>

Anno domini .m.cc.vii. xv. kalendas maii. Dominus Bernardus narbonensis archiepiscopus de consensu et uoluntate canonicorum suorum dedit libere et concessit pro se et successoribus suis priorisse et monialibus nouiter tunc conuersis monitis et exemplis fratris Dominici oxomensis sociorumque eius habitantibus et in perpetuum habitaturis in castro de

1 in nomine domini *om. E post domini add. amen CR* 1-2 praesentem paginam inspecturis] praesentes litteras inspecturis *D<sup>5</sup>, etc. R*, tam praesentibus quam futuris *C, om. E 2 B.*] Berengarius *CER* permissione] gratia *CER* Narbonensis] Narbonae *D<sup>4</sup>D<sup>4</sup>* 4 redemptione] redemptionem *CER* 6 habitantibus *om. D<sup>2</sup>* 7 Fanoioiuis] Faniioiuis *D<sup>4</sup>D<sup>5</sup> CER* Tholosanae] Tholosanensis *D<sup>4</sup>*, Tholosae *D<sup>5</sup>* 8 Limoso] Limosio *E* 8-9 nostrae diocesis ... de Limoso *om. CER* 10 oblationibus et cum *om. CER* 11 integre] integro *D<sup>5</sup>* et<sup>1</sup>] per *CER* 12 et<sup>1</sup> *om. CER* earum] ipsarum *D<sup>2</sup>* 12 G.] Guillelmum *CER* 12-19 cum traditione ... roborari] etc. *ER, om. C* 15 et uisitationibus *om. D<sup>2</sup>* in *om. D<sup>2</sup>* 20 est hoc *om. CER* domini<sup>2</sup> (+*C*) *om. ER*

3 dedit] dedit et *T*

Fano Iouis et in ecclesia beate Marie de Pruliano tholosane dyocesis ecclesiam beati Martini de Limoso narbonensis dyocesis in Redesio cum omnibus decimis et primiciis territorii beati Martini de Limoso et territorii de Taxo eidem contigui cum oblationibus et cum omnibus iuribus suis et  
10 pertinenciis, iure perpetuo integre possidendam. Et nomine ipsarum fratrem Dominicum et fratrem Guill.mum Clareti cum tradicionem instrumenti in possessionem introduxit et misit, saluo iure episcopali in cathedratico, in procuracionibus et uisitacionibus et in commissione cure animarum illi sacerdoti qui a dictis monialibus uel aliquo fratre loco earum  
15 sibi et suis successoribus fuerit presentatus. Actum fuit hoc anno et die quibus supra Carcassone in domo episcopi. Extat inde littera prefati domini archiepiscopi sigillata.



APPENDIX III  
The Fanjeaux chapel.

I edit these royal letters here, though they are not directly relevant to the origins of Prouille, to illustrate the textual relationship between Cambefort and Court. King Charles's letter is printed in Guiraud, *Cartulaire* I 174 no. 156, both letters in A. Sabarthès, *Inventaire sommaire des archives départementales, Aude* IV, Carcassonne 1925, 92-93.

- A Arch. dép. de l'Aude H 460 nos. 2-3 (originals)  
B Arch. dép. de l'Aude H 460 (Cambefort's 1623 transcription)  
C Prouille manuscript of Cambefort, LDP f.14<sup>v</sup>  
D Arch. dép. de l'Aude H 461 (Court's 'Memoires')

(1)

Charles IV, October 1325

Karolus dei gracia Francorum et Nauarre rex. Notum facimus  
uniuersis tam presentibus quam futuris quod nos, ad supplicationem  
dilectorum nostrorum Consulium castris nostri Faniuouis dyocesis Mirapicis  
ac sindici monasterii Proliani asserencium quod dudum, tempore beati  
Dominici confessoris disputantis de fide catholica contra nonnullos hereticos 5  
qui tunc in illis partibus multipliciter pululabant, libris super ipsa fide  
confectis, libris eciam ipsorum hereticorum in igne de utrorumque uoluntate  
proiectis, tandem, sicut Altissimo placuit qui semper est in suis sanctis  
mirabilis et mirabilia operatur ubique, libris dictorum hereticorum in igne  
remanentibus et combustis libri orthodoxe fidei, licet bis uel ter in igne 10  
proiecti, exierunt inde semper integri et illesi, cuiusmodi miraculum in  
quadam domo sita in castro nostro predicto que nunc esse dicitur Raymundi  
de Duroforti domicelli fuit dominus operatus, prefatis supplicantibus tam  
ipsorum et aliorum habitancium in dicto loco quam religiosarum dicti  
monasterii Proliani nomine uolencium, ut asserunt, emere dictam domum 15  
ac in tanti memoriam miraculi quandam ibidem edificare capellam seu  
ecclesiam in qua diuinum officium perpetuo celebretur, de speciali gracia  
concedimus per presentes, ob nostre ac Marie quondam et Iohanne nunc

3 Mirapicis] mirapicensis BCD 4 Proliani] Pruliani CD, Prulhiani B 7 eciam om.  
BCD 8 suis sanctis (+B)] sanctis suis CD 9 ubique] ibique BCD, ante ubique inter-  
punxit A 10 libri (+BD)] libri uero C 12 sita ... predicto om. BCD esse (+B) om.  
CD 13 operatus] operatus etc. CD 13-29 prefatis ... saluo om. CD 15 Proliani]  
Prulhiani B

consortum nostrarum reginarum necnon parentum et germanorum dudum  
 20 nostrorum remedium animarum, quod ipsi domum predictam emere et in  
 ea construi et edificari facere possint ecclesiam seu capellam, absque eo  
 quod ministri seu persone alie que instituentur ibidem ad diuinum officium  
 faciendum compelli possint imposterum ad uendendum uel ponendum extra  
 25 suam manum locum ipsum in quo predicta fuerit edificata ecclesia seu  
 capella uel ad prestandum inde financiam qualemcumque, quinyimo dictum  
 locum tenere possint et teneant imperpetuum pacifice et quiete. Quod ut  
 ratum et stabile perpetuis futuris temporibus permaneat nostrum  
 presentibus licteris fecimus apponi sigillum, nostro in aliis et alieno in  
 30 omnibus iure saluo. Actum apud Petrafontem anno domini millesimo  
 trecentesimo uicesimo quinto, mense octobris.

(2)

John II, 22 Dec. 1353.

Iohannes dei gracia francorum rex receptori Tholose et comissariis  
 quibuslibet deputatis et deputandis in seneschallia Tholose super financiis  
 acquisitorum salutem. Querelam priorisse et conuentus de Pruliano ordinis  
 sancti Dominici recepimus continentem quod, cum dudum in quadam domo  
 5 situata apud Fanum Iouis que fuit quondam Raymundi de Duroforti scutiferi  
 beatus Dominicus de fide catholica contra quosdam hereticos disputaret,  
 contigit quod libri utriusque partis fuerunt in igne proiecti quodque libri  
 hereticorum remanserunt in combustionem et cibum ignis, libri uero  
 10 catholice fide (*sic*) de igne huiusmodi miraculose exierunt illesi operante  
 domino qui ubi uult mirabilia operatur. Unde clare memorie carissimus  
 quondam consanguineus et dominus noster Carolus rex Francie et Nauarre  
 graciose concessit dictis religiosis quod in dicta domo quam acquisierant  
 uel acquirere uolebant possent oratorium seu capellam construere in qua  
 15 posset perpetuo diuinum officium celebrari, quodque dicte religiose eam  
 possent tenere perpetuo pacifice et quiete absque coactione eam uendendi  
 uel extra manum suam ponendi seu prestandi financiam pro eadem, prout  
 in ipsius consanguinei nostri litteris plenius uidebitis continere. Nichilominus

29-30 actum ... octobris *om. C ad finem* Et sur le repli, Per Dominum Regem ad  
 relationem domini Andree de Florentia, barre, et apres vn grand seau cire verte dans  
 lequel est l'efigie du Roy tout entier et au rond dudit seau sont inprimes ces mots,  
 Carolus francorum et Nauarrae Rex, attaché ledit seau avec vn cordon de soye Rouge  
 et verte *B*, Et sur le repli, Per dominum Regem ad relationem domini Andree de  
 Florentia, avec son seau en cire verte dans lequel est l'effigie du Roy tout entier et  
 au rond dudit seau sont graues ces mots, Carolus francorum et Nauarrae Rex *D*

1 receptori] receptori nostro *BCD* 2 quibuslibet (+*B*)] quibuscumque *CD* et de-  
 putandis (+*B*) *om. CD* 4 recepimus (+*C*)] recipimus *BD* cum (+*BD*) *om. C* 7 igne]  
 ignem *BCD* 8 remanserunt (+*C*)] remanserint *BD* 9 fide] fidei *BCD* 10-29 unde  
 clare ... allocari] etc. *D, om. C* 12 acquisierant] acquisierunt *B*

uos receptor aut alii comissarii ex parte nostra super financiis huiusmodi  
 deputati dictas religiosas compulstis ad soluendum centum quadraginta  
 libras pro financia dicte domus, contra tenorem litterarum dicti consan- 20  
 guinei nostri et in ipsarum religiosarum preiudicium sicut dicunt, quod  
 nobis displicet si sit ita. Quare mandamus et precipimus uobis et vestrum  
 cuiilibet ut ad eum pertinuerit quot (*sic*) si ita est predictam pecunie  
 summam sic iniuste receptam uel exactam eisdem religiosis restituatis uel  
 eam in equipollenti moneta seu ualore de financiis in quibus nobis tenentur 25  
 aut teneri poterunt pro aliis per eas acquisitis uel acquirendis defalcetis et  
 deducatis sine contradictione qualibet et alterius expectatione mandati, et  
 eam in compotis illius uel illorum cuius uel quorum intererit precipimus  
 allocari. Datum Par. die xxii decembris anno domini millesimo ccc quinqua-  
 gesimo tercio. 30

---

23 pertinuerit quot] pertineat quod B 26 teneri] tenere B poterunt] potuerint B  
 28 compotis] computis B 29-30 datum ... tercio om. C