

**SIMON TUGWELL O. P., *Was Paulus Hungarus really Dalmatian?*, in «Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum» (ISSN 0391-7320), 79, (2009), pp. 5-21.**

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.



## WAS PAULUS HUNGARUS REALLY DALMATIAN?

BY  
SIMON TUGWELL OP

We learn about the friars whom St Dominic despatched to Hungary in 1221, no doubt at the general chapter, from the seemingly well-informed report by Suipert which is found in some manuscripts of the *Vitas fratrum* (ed. Tugwell, AFP 68 [1998] 87-92) and was probably sent to the 1260 general chapter; it was certainly written after the canonization of Peter Martyr in 1253, since his feast is mentioned (ibid. 92). Knowledge of its contents was boosted by the inclusion of a great deal of it in Gui's edition of Salanhac (ibid. 94-97), and part of it was also reproduced in Dietrich of Apolda's life of Dominic (ibid. 92-93) and retained at least in the first edition of Surius's humanist 'translation' of Dietrich.<sup>1</sup>

According to Suipert the mission was headed by 'Paulus Hungarus', who 'actu legens erat in iure canonico Bononie' when he entered the Order (AFP 68 [1998] 87). He can confidently be identified with the 'magister Paulus de Ungaria' who was one of the friars Dominic commissioned in 1220 to further the foundation of a monastery of nuns in Bologna (AFP 66 [1996] 142, 148), and he is almost certainly the 'Paulus' who is attested as prior of Bologna on 13 Jan. 1221 (MOPH XXV no. 139).<sup>2</sup> The last we hear of him is that, once numbers had increased after he and his party had reached Alba Regalis (Székesfehérvár) and apparently settled there and made a foundation, he sent some friars to Szörényi:<sup>3</sup> 'Tandem numero fratrum

---

<sup>1</sup> L.Surius, *De probatis sanctorum historiis* IV, Cologne 1573, 550-551. I have not checked the intervening editions, but the relevant text is missing in volume eight of the Marietti edition, Turin 1877, 163.

<sup>2</sup> There was a 'novus prior', Ventura, when Dominic returned to Bologna in late July 1221 (*Proc. canon. Bonon.* §7, MOPH XVI 127), which is consonant with the previous prior having just been sent to Hungary.

<sup>3</sup> Their mission there is attested by a letter addressed to them by Gregory IX on 16 May 1237 (ed. A.L.Tăutu, *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX*, Vatican City 1950, 300-301 no. 224).

accrescente missi a fratre Paulo intraverunt fratres in terram que Sceurinum vocatur, cuius habitatores scismatici pariter et publici heretici erant, ubi multis tribulationibus perpessis tandem convalescentes multos ab heresi ad veram fidem et a scismate ad ecclesie unitatem converterunt' (AFP 68 [1998] 88). No early source tells us anything about when, where or how he died.

It has become customary in some circles to maintain that Paul was actually Dalmatian, not Hungarian,<sup>4</sup> but the basis for this claim is shaky in the extreme.

The source is V.M.Fontana, who includes 'Paulus Dalmata' among the martyred inquisitors written up in his *Sacrum Theatrum Dominicanum*, Rome 1666; on p.508, under the heading 'Paulus Dalmata', he says:

Paulum in Dalmatia Generalem Inquisitorem ab Apostolica Sede institutum fuisse, atque proprio sanguine laureatum coelum conscendisse pro comperto habemus ex scriptoribus, tamen quo tempore id contigerit, silent. Paramus de Origine S.Inquisitionis lib. 2 tit. 2 cap. 28 de eo sic fatur. *Refert Franciscus Diacetus in cap. finali vitae S.Dominici in Dalmatia Sanctum Paulum eius Provinciae Inquisitorem ab impiis haereticis igne fuisse consumptum.*

He does not connect this Paul with the 'Paulus Hungarus' who led the Dominican mission to Hungary which he describes in *Monumenta Dominicana*, Rome 1675, 15; indeed, the lack of a connection is implied by his admission of ignorance about the inquisitor's date.

Despite the vague reference to *scriptores*, there is nothing to indicate that Fontana had any knowledge of this Paul beyond what could be inferred from Paramo.<sup>5</sup> The primary source is therefore Francesco Cattani da Diaceto (on whom see DBI XXII 510-511), who succeeded his Dominican uncle as bishop of Fiesole in 1570; his *Vita dell'inclito et santissimo Domenico* was published in Florence in 1572 under the name 'Francesco Diaceto'. In the final chapter he mentions various noteworthy Dominicans to illustrate Dominic's

<sup>4</sup> F.Banfi, 'Paolo Dalmata detto Ongaro', *Archivio storico per la Dalmazia* 27 (1939) 42-63 and 133-150; S.Krasić, 'Fr. Paulus Hungarus seu, ut alii volunt, Dalmata O.P.', *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 7-8 (1980) 131-156; id., *Dominikanci*, Zagreb 1997, 7 etc.; F.Šanjek, 'Pavao Dalmatinac (1170/75-1255)', *Starine* 61 (2000) 21-121, esp. 35-40.

<sup>5</sup> Ludovicus a Paramo, *De origine et progressu officii sanctae inquisitionis*, Madrid 1595, 252-253, quoted exactly by Fontana.

'progenie non indegna di tanto padre' (pp.204-206); one of them is 'Il beato Paolo Inquisitore in Dalmazia legato per lo collo ad uno stipite et abbrusciato'.

Cattani and Paramo only say that Paul was inquisitor in or of Dalmatia, and Fontana himself echoes this in the body of his notice; it seems, then, that he had no grounds for calling him 'Paulus Dalmata' except the need to provide his notice with a concise title.

Fontana ignored and was perhaps unaware of an earlier reference to the inquisitor supposedly martyred in Dalmatia. The third distinction of the third book of Taegio's *De insigniis* contains a chapter 'De hiis que fratres provincie Ungarie pro fide Iesu Christi fecerunt et pro ea passi sunt in diversis locis' (AGOP XIV 54 ff.126<sup>v</sup>-127<sup>r</sup>). The first five paragraphs are adapted from Taegio's own account of the Hungarian mission in his *Cronica magistrorum*,<sup>6</sup> and paragraph six tells the story of an Hungarian duke turned Dominican who was killed by the Tartars,<sup>7</sup> with a sentence added at the end to indicate that the ninety or so Dominicans massacred by the Tartars, already mentioned in paragraph four, died in the same persecution as the duke; paragraph seven consists of a list of martyrs, the sixth and last of whom is our inquisitor, explicitly identified as Hungarian:

Fratr Paulus Hungarus prior et heretice pravitatis inquisitor in prefata Dalmatie provincia pro catholica fide ab hereticis comprehensus ad pallum cum cathena ligatus et igne crematus acceptissimum Deo holocaustum in odorem suavitatis obtulit.

This is linked to the general account of the Hungarian Dominicans' missions by *prefata Dalmatie provincia*, which harks back to paragraph five 'De missione fratrum in Bosna et Dalmatia et

---

<sup>6</sup> Bologna 1894 ff.61<sup>v</sup>-63<sup>r</sup>, AGOP XIV 51 f.24. No source is indicated for the beginning of the story, and though the ultimate source is Suipert (AFP 68 [1998] 87-88 lines 1 to 14) it looks as if Taegio took it from an intermediary which I have been unable to identify. From the run-up to the despatch of friars to Szörényi onwards the explicit source is Bernard Gui (AFP 68 [1998] 94-97 beginning at line 6); the relevant text from Gui is transcribed in Taegio's notes preserved in AGOP XIV 53 (ff.98<sup>v</sup>-99<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>7</sup> The ultimate source is Thomas of Cantimpré, *De Apibus* 2.44.2, but Taegio may have taken it from Borselli's *Cronica magistrorum*, where Thomas's text is transcribed under the year 1242 (Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1999 f.41<sup>r</sup>). As usual Taegio does not follow his source exactly, but (for what it is worth) he sides with Borselli in the few places where Borselli's text differs from that of the Douai 1605 edition of *De apibus*.

conversione hereticorum ibidem facta et passione quorundam fratrum ordinis predicatorum'; but Taegio makes no explicit connection between Paulus Hungarus the inquisitor and the one whom Dominic sent to Hungary in 1221.

As was noted by R.Loenertz,<sup>8</sup> there is a significant overlap between *De insigniis* III iii, book two of Leandro Alberti's *De viris illustribus ordinis Praedicatorum* (Bologna 1517), the first six names in a motley collection of Dominicans culled from goodness knows where and included in Taegio's notes as found in AGOP XIV 53 f.142,<sup>9</sup> and Cattani's examples of Dominic's 'progenie'.

The sixth person named in Taegio's notes is 'Frater Paulus de Ungaria prior et inquisitor Bruensis (*sic*) in Dalmatia ligatus cum cathena in collo ad palum et crematus ab hereticis'; he re-appears in *De insigniis*, does not feature in Alberti, but is plainly the same as Cattani's 'beato Paolo Inquisitore in Dalmazia'.

The first person in these notes is 'Frater Berdegarius archiepiscopus Cracoviensis in provintia Polonie martir'; he does not feature among either the primates or the archbishops in Taegio's catalogue of Dominican prelates (and no such archbishop of Kraków is known), or in his catalogue of Dominican martyrs (AGOP XIV 54 ff.81<sup>r</sup>-82<sup>r</sup>, 87<sup>r</sup>-89<sup>v</sup>, 127<sup>v</sup>-132<sup>v</sup>), but he is mentioned by Alberti under a slightly different name ('Berengarius Cracoviae urbis Archiflamen in latere dextro transfixus pro Christo occubuit', f.59<sup>r</sup>) and in fairly similar terms by Cattani ('Grandissimo et molto notabile fu il fervore del beato Beldegario Arcivescovo di Cracovia, che allegramente sostenne che gli fusse dalli heretici passato il cuore et la testa con aguto coltello').

The second person in the notes is 'Frater Nicholaus de Ungaria inquisitor martir', who also appears in *De insigniis* ('Frater Nicholaus Hungarus episcopus et heretice pravitatis inquisitor ab infideli populo dum Christi fidem tueri contendit comprehensus et ab eo

<sup>8</sup> 'Un catalogue d'écrivains et deux catalogues de martyrs dominicains', AFP 12 (1942) 279-303, at 281-303.

<sup>9</sup> Apart from dubious eastern European martyrs the list comprises a genuine Perugian, Andreas de Catherano, wrongly said to have been killed by heretics 'in territorio Perusino' (he was actually killed by Saracens at Kaffa; see A.Maiarelli, ed., *La Cronaca di S.Domenico di Perugia*, Spoleto 1995, 46-48), followed by generally rather trivial information about friars drawn from the highest French nobility, a 'comes Hystrie', a motley collection of Italians, an improbable sounding 'Frater Gallus Theutonicus', a Pole, a German laybrother, and two Hungarian laybrothers. It seems unlikely that Taegio would have found them all in any single source.

decoriatus crudeliter celos petivit sanguine laureatus', f.127'), Alberti ('Nicolaus Hungarus Episcopus et haereticorum censor decoriatus fuit', f.59'), and Cattani ('Il beato Niccolò Unghero Inquisitore scorticato').

The third is 'Frater Ioannes de Ungaria inquisitor, episcopus et martir', who also appears in *De insigniis* ('Frater Ioannes Hungarus episcopus similiter et hereticorum inquisitor fidem catholicam predicando et defendendo ab hereticis lapidatus et gladio transfixus ad Christum cum palma martirii feliciter evolavit', f.127'), Alberti ('Ioannes Hungarus Episcopus et Censor errorum lapidibus obrutus et gladio confossus ad Christum evolavit', f.59), and Cattani ('Il beato Giovanni Unghero Inquisitore lapidato').

The fourth is 'Frater Franciscus Tholosanus sagitis transfixus et spinis coronatus martir', who features in *De insigniis* among those who suffered for the faith *in partibus Tholosanis*: 'Frater Franciscus Tholosanus fidem Christi predicando et defendendo ab hereticis captus ab eisdem spinis coronatus ad instar salvatoris et sagitis ac telis transverberatus cum palma martirii ad celestia regna feliciter evolavit pro terrenis celestia, pro perituris eterna commutans' (f.129). He also appears in Alberti ('Franciscus Tholosanus ab haereticis spinis coronatus et spiculis ac telis confossus martyrii palmam adeptus est', f.59'), and he can probably be recognized in Cattani's 'beato Stefano da Tolosa saettato dalli heretici et piagato nelle mani et ne piedi', though the name is different and the imitation of Christ's passion has shifted from a crown of thorns to pierced hands and feet. Loenertz suggests that the name 'Franciscus' could have been generated by a misinterpretation of 'fr.' (art. cit. 287), and in some scripts it would not be all that difficult to misread 'fr.' as 'st.' or vice versa, so abbreviations of the two names could be confused even if there was a preceding 'fr.' meaning 'frater'; in any case there is no previous literary record of such a martyr under either name or any other name.<sup>10</sup> I wonder whether Taegio and Cattani were independently inspired by some painting showing a friar marked with signs of Christ's passion (a crown of thorns and wounds in his hands and feet) being finished off with arrows.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> I am not convinced that the similarities are sufficient to warrant Loenertz's suggestion that the martyrdom of Francis/Stephen derives from Thomas of Cantimpré's story of the death of the unnamed Hungarian duke turned friar (art. cit. 287-288).

<sup>11</sup> I have no idea what could have given rise to 'Franciscus Tholosanus', but a Stephanus who could be described as 'Tolosanus' was one of the people killed by the heretics at Avignonet (MOPH I 232, XXII 24); he was a Franciscan, though, not a

The fifth name in Taegio's notes is even more problematic: 'Frater Sadoch Polonus gladio transfixus cum nonaginta quatuor fratribus'. A Sadoch is mentioned by Suipert as one of the people sent to Hungary with Paul, and he features as such in Taegio's accounts in *Cronica magistrorum* and *De insigniis*, but nothing is said about him being Polish or about him being martyred; all that Suipert tells us of his subsequent career is that he became prior of Zagreb (AFP 68 [1998] 88.9-10), a detail not picked up by Taegio. His ninety-four companions could be related to the 'circiter nonaginta fratres' whose death at the hands of the Tartars is reported by Suipert (ibid. 90.63-66) and Taegio in connection with the mission to the Cumans.

The list of martyrs in paragraph seven of the Hungarian chapter in *De insigniis* is headed by a Sadoch who is not said to be Polish and is firmly situated in the context of the Hungarian Dominicans' missions: 'Frater Sadoch vir devotus et sanctus quum in prenominitis provinciis Christi fidem verbo et exemplo predicaret cum quadraginta octo fratribus iugulatus cum martirii palma celos gloriosus ascendit' (AGOP XIV 54 f.127<sup>r</sup>); this is echoed by Alberti: 'Sadoch cum fratribus quadraginta octo iugulatus palmam martyrii reportavit' (f.59<sup>v</sup>). Taegio might not have considered it necessary to identify Sadoch as Polish in *De insigniis*, and, as Leonertz remarks (art. cit. 289), textual confusion between 'xciiii' and 'xlvi' is not hard to imagine; but *iugulatus* is most naturally taken to mean 'having had his throat cut'

---

Dominican, and I am unaware of any evidence that he attracted any special attention or that he was ever described or depicted in a way which might underly the complementary accounts given by Taegio and Cattani. The Dominican bishop killed by the Saracens in Antioch is sometimes called Stephen: Gui inherited the notice on him from Salanhac, so he noted 'fr. Stephanus' in the margin, and since he could not discover the bishop's name he left a blank space for it (MOPH XXII 28-29); both the marginal 'fr. Stephanus' and the blank space are there in Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1535 f.3<sup>v</sup>, the manuscript which Taegio says he used (AGOP XIV 53 f.84<sup>r</sup>), but in his notes Taegio incorporated 'Stephanus' into the text as the name of the bishop (AGOP XIV 53 f.99<sup>r</sup>), so 'Stephanus episcopus' duly appears in the accounts of his death in *Cron. mag.* (Bologna 1894 f.288<sup>r</sup>, AGOP XIV 51 f.121<sup>v</sup>) and *De insigniis* (AGOP XIV 54 f.129<sup>r</sup>). The same mistake was made in Germany: 'Steffanus' was written into the space left for the name in Gui's text in Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Univ. Bibl. Praed. 82 f.6<sup>v</sup>, and 'Stephanus episcopus' features in the *De viris illustribus* of Meyer (QF 12 [1918] 41) and Georgius Epp (f.7<sup>v</sup> in the undated edition of which the Dominican Historical Institute possesses a copy). Alberti (f.57<sup>v</sup>) preferred to follow Borselli (Bologna 1999 f.71<sup>v</sup>) and calls the bishop 'Christianus'. Whatever his name, though, he was not killed by heretics, and there is no tradition of describing the manner of his death or calling him 'Tolosanus'.



or 'having been strangled',<sup>12</sup> neither of which would readily be understood from *gladio transfixus* (having been transfixed by a sword), so it is far from certain that the two texts refer to the same story.

Loenertz connected Sadoch the Pole with two items in Cattani's list, 'Il beato Martite Pollacco stracciato co pettini' and 'I novanta Frati in Ungheria tormentati in varii modi, con lancia, saette, fuoco, et coltelli' (art. cit. 284, 288-289), but this is unconvincing. 'Martite' must be a misprint for 'Martire',<sup>13</sup> 'Polacco' does echo 'Sadoch Polonus', and it is possible that a name was accidentally omitted; but being torn to shreds with combs ('stracciato co pettini') is not the same as being *gladio transfixus* or *iugulatus*. And 'i novanta Frati' are separated from the 'martire Pollacco' by 'il beato Stefano avvelenato dalli heretici',<sup>14</sup> and they are patently derived directly or indirectly from Suipert ('circiter nonaginta fratres nostri ordinis, alii gladio, alii sagittis, alii lanceis interfecti, alii ignibus concremati, ad regnum celorum convolarunt').<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> It is unlikely that *iugulatus* would have been taken in the generic sense 'slaughtered', though the verb is so used in the vulgate where the Hebrew has מָרַח and the LXX ἀποκτείνω or σφάζω (e.g. Num. 31:17, Is. 22:13). Its more precise meaning in classical Latin is 'kill by cutting the throat' (there are clear examples in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* s.v. *iugulo*), and this is how Balbi explained the verb s.v. *iugulo* ('in iugulo incidere'); it is distinguished from *strangulare* by Ulpian (Justinian, *Dig.* 29.5.1.17), but when Aquinas lists 'iugulatio, lapidatio et perforatio' as ways of killing someone (*Summa theol.* I.II q.72 a.6) the distinction between *iugulatio* and *perforatio* suggests that the former means 'strangling', and the medieval German translator used 'wirgen' (modern German 'erwürgen', 'strangle') for it (B.Q.Morgan-F.W.Strothmann, ed., *Middle High German translation of the Summa Theologica by Thomas Aquinas*, Stanford 1950, 172). Two fifteenth-century dictionaries edited by B.Merrilees and W.Edwards in *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* 4° I and III, Turnhout 1994 and 2002, give 'coper la gorge' and 'estrangler' as the French equivalents of *iugulare*, and the same two meanings passed to Italian *iugulare* (Grande Battaglia s.v.).

<sup>13</sup> *Martire* is printed with a capital M earlier on p.205.

<sup>14</sup> Loenertz (art. cit. 294) suggested that the intended reference was to the inquisitor Poncius who was poisoned by heretics in Seo de Urgel, and that he is misnamed 'Stephanus' because the report of his death is part of Salanhac's original text and is therefore marked 'fr. Stephanus' in the margin of Gui's manuscripts (MOPH XXII 24-25). Under the name 'Pontius Hyspanus' he features in Taegio among the brethren who suffered for the faith 'in diversis provinciis', and Taegio dates his death 'circa annum domini 1242' (AGOP XIV 54 f.129<sup>r</sup>); Taegio's notice, complete with its date (but without *circa*), was adopted by Alberti (f.17<sup>r</sup>). If Loenertz's explanation of Cattani's misnaming of him is correct, Cattani's information must derive from Salanhac-Gui rather than from Taegio or Alberti.

<sup>15</sup> Via Gui (AFP 68 [1998] 96.60-62) Suipert's words are quoted almost verbatim in *De insigniis* (AGOP XIV 54 f.127<sup>r</sup>), and they are paraphrased in more humanist Latin in Alberti (*De viris* f.59<sup>r</sup>).

It is perhaps just possible that there is nevertheless a link between Cattani and Taegio's 'Sadoch Polonus': Cattani's 'martire Pollacco' is preceded by an otherwise unknown 'beato Riccardo Fiorentino Inquisitore, trafitto di pugnale nel capo'; conceivably Taegio's note conflates a Polish Dominican originally said to have been 'stracciato co pettini' and a Florentine inquisitor who was *gladio transfixus* or 'traffitto di pugnale'. Is it not more likely, though, that Taegio and Cattani were simply drawing on different sources?

Sadoch generates another puzzle in the catalogue of *virii illustres* appended to S. Ususmaris's collection of *Privilegia*, Rome 1556. In the list of martyrs Ususmaris says that 'F. Sadoch Polonus et cum eo octo et quadraginta Fratres gladio iugulati martyrium consumauerunt' (f. 15<sup>v</sup>), which appears to merge Taegio's two notices, with *Polonus* and *gladio* coming from the list in AGOP XIV 53 and the rest from *De insigniis* or Alberti; and the combination of *gladio* and *iugulatus* brings the text closer to Cattani's 'traffitto di pugnale nel capo', though having one's throat cut with a sword is still not the same as having one's head transfixed with a dagger. Alberti is undeniably one of Ususmaris's sources, probably the most important source,<sup>16</sup> but there are some details which cannot come from Alberti and could come from Taegio;<sup>17</sup> was the notice on Sadoch cobbled together from Alberti and Taegio's notes?

Even this is not the last mystery. In his life of St Hyacinth the fanciful Severinus identified Ususmaris's 'Sadoch Polonus' and companions with the Dominicans killed by Tartars in Sandomierz.<sup>18</sup> On 11 Nov. 1295 Boniface VIII granted an indulgence to those who visited the church of St Mary in Sandomierz on 2 June in honour

<sup>16</sup> Alberti's influence is clear, for example, in the date 1262 attached to the death of the Hungarian ex-duke (f. 14<sup>v</sup>; cf. Alberti f. 57<sup>r</sup>, where 'MCCLXII' is presumably a misprint for 'MCCXLII'), and 'Berengarius' as the name of the alleged archbishop of Kraków (f. 15<sup>r</sup>, Alberti f. 59<sup>r</sup>); Alberti is at least a likely source for most of what Ususmaris says about martyrs.

<sup>17</sup> E.g. the Avignonet martyrs are rightly said to have been killed 'Avinonieti' (f. 14<sup>v</sup>); the name is correct in Taegio (AGOP XIV 54 f. 128<sup>r</sup>), but corrupted to 'Ammoneti' in Alberti (*De viris* f. 56<sup>v</sup>); Ususmaris says that 'a Raimundo Tolosano comite ... iussi sunt occidi' (f. 14<sup>v</sup>), which is closer to Taegio's 'de mandato baiuli Raymundi comitis Tholosani ... perimerunt' than to Alberti's 'a satelitibus haeticorum interempti sunt'. The same information could have come directly from Gui (MOPH XXII 24), but this is not the case with 'Bartholomaeus Cerverius' (Ususmaris f. 15<sup>r</sup>); Alberti simply calls him 'Bartholomaeus' (*De viris* f. 59<sup>v</sup>), but Taegio calls him 'Bartholomeus de Cerveriis' (AGOP XIV 54 f. 130<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>18</sup> *De vita, miraculis et actis canonizationis sancti Hyacinthi*, Rome 1594, 394 (which I have not been able to see for myself); cf. Loenertz, AFP 19 (1949) 68.

of the numerous christians slain there some thirty-five years earlier, thereby bestowing a kind of ecclesiastical recognition on them (BOP II 45-46). He did not mention any particular individuals or groups as having perished, but according to the Polish chronicler Joannes Długosz (1415-1480) the Dominicans' 'monasterium Sancti Iacobi tempore insultus Tartarorum aliquoties fuit desolatum et exustum, et quadraginta sex fratres ordinis Salve regina decantantes a Tartaris pro uno tempore et una die occisi, locusque illo sanguine fratrum et aliorum fidelium celebris est et sacratus'.<sup>19</sup> Was it just a coincidence that the forty-eight companions of 'Sadoch Polonus' in Ususmaris's catalogue were numerically close enough to the forty-six Dominicans mentioned by Długosz to enable Severinus to identify the two and thus attach a name to the leader of the Sandomierz martyrs? Or should we venture further into the domain of speculation and surmise that the ultimate source underlying Cattani's unnamed Polish martyr and Taegio's two incompatible notices on Sadoch was a tradition of forty-something Dominicans (with or without Sadoch) perishing at the hands of the Tartars in Sandomierz?

Apart from the six people named in Taegio's notes—all of them, as Loenertz says, 'inconnus à la tradition antérieure' (AFP 12 [1942] 282)—there are some further links between Cattani, *De insigniis*, and Alberti.

Cattani begins his account of Dominic's 'progenie non indegna' with the canonized saints, Thomas Aquinas, Peter martyr, Vincent Ferrer, and Antoninus. He then names 'il beato Beldegario Arcivescovo di Cracovia', 'il Beato *Bernardo da Ripa*', 'il beato Niccolò Unghero', 'il beato Giovanni Unghero', 'il beato *Bono Fiorentino*', 'il beato Stefano da Tolosa', 'il beato Riccardo Fiorentino', 'il beato Martire Pollacco', 'il beato Stefano avvelenato', 'i novanta Frati in Ungheria', 'il beato *Pagano*', 'il beato Paolo Inquisitore', 'il beato *Domenico* compagno di San Pietro Martire', and 'il beato *Antonio da Ripoli*'; the names in italics are those of the minor luminaries we have not yet considered, and they all feature in *De insigniis* and in Alberti, but once again the overlap is not perfect.

On 'il beato Pagano in Lombardia dopo molte ferite trapassato da lancia nel costato, a similitudine del Redentor nostro' Cattani adds

---

<sup>19</sup> *Liber beneficiorum* III, ed. A.Przedziecki, Kraków 1864, 456; according to Loenertz, this is the first mention of Dominicans being among the Tartars' victims (AFP 19 [1949] 68). On Długosz see DHGE XIV 530-531.

nothing to what can be found in Taegio's fuller report in *De insigniis* ('Qui multis confossus vulneribus tandem exemplo Salvatoris latere lancia perforato, manus in modum crucis super pectus iugiter tenens cum triumpho martirii celos ascensit' [*sic*], AGOP XIV 54 f.130<sup>v</sup>) or its source in Bernard Gui (MOPH XXII 29-30).<sup>20</sup> Alberti says much the same, but omits the comparison with Christ: 'Sanctum virum manus in crucis formam super pectus tenentem multis vulneribus confoderunt, et ne quid crudelitatis deesset postremo lancea latus eius transfixere' (*De viris* f.58<sup>v</sup>).

'Il beato Antonio da Ripoli lapidato et insiememente ferito et gittato nel fuoco' was the subject of a short *vita* by Francesco da Castiglione (on whom see DBI XLIX 713-715),<sup>21</sup> which Taegio incorporated in *De insigniis* (AGOP XIV 54 ff.130<sup>v</sup>-132<sup>v</sup>) and Alberti published in *De viris illustribus* ff.59<sup>v</sup>-61<sup>v</sup>. It refers to his death by stoning ('stabilis perduravit donec magnis vulneribus gravibusque in primis lapidum ictibus oppressus occubuit') and to a subsequent attempt to burn his body, which was unsuccessful according to Castiglione ('sacrum martyris corpus immisso igne cremare conabantur, sed plus potest verbum domini ... fuit id sacratissimum corpus diu in igne ... non tamen postquam inde eductum est in eius capillis capitis aut barbae vis ignis apparuit ...').

'Il beato Bono Fiorentino segato dalla testa insino al mezzo' can be recognized as 'Boninsigna Florentinus' who 'serra a vertice capitis ad aures usque ab impiis sectus gloriose occubuit' (Alberti f.59<sup>v</sup>), though Cattani has shortened his name and increased the extent to which he was sawn in half. This time Taegio's account is significantly different, and he attaches 'Bonisigna' to his report of the death of Stephen and four other Dominicans when Antioch was captured by the muslims in 1270: 'Passus est in eadem civitate Frater Bonisigna Florentinus, vir constantissimus et sanctus, sed utrum fuisset ex hiis quatuor ... vel alius alio in loco prefate civitatis aut tempore peremptus fuerit haud compertum habeo; hoc solum nobis sufficere debet quod stollam in sanguine agni lavavit et cum Christo regnat

<sup>20</sup> Pagano of Lecco, inquisitor in Lombardy, was killed on 26 Dec. 1277; the general chapter of 1278 commanded 'quod fratres in suis predicationibus fratris Pagani martyrium populis studeant nuntiare et tam ipsius quam aliorum miracula conscribantur' (MOPH III 198.24-26). See Kaeppli's notes in MOPH XXII 29-30.

<sup>21</sup> On Bl. Anthony Neyrot see I.Venchi, *Catalogus hagiographicus Ordinis Praedicatorum*, Rome 2001, 93-94. On Castiglione's life of Antony and its close dependence on an eye-witness account of his martyrdom see F.Bausi, 'Francesco da Castiglione fra umanesimo e teologia', *Interpres* 11 (1991) 112-181, at 160-163.

in eternum' (AGOP XIV 54 f.129<sup>v</sup>). 'Hoc solum nobis sufficere debet' might suggest that Taegio was aware of a more elaborate story but decided to confine himself to the meagre information contained in the chronicle of Santa Maria Novella, 'Fr. Boninsegna lector, hic fuit interfectus a saracenis cum pluribus aliis fratribus in Anthioccia'.<sup>22</sup> It is unclear where the story of Boninsegna being killed with a saw comes from, but he is depicted carrying a saw in the horizontal 'tree' of Dominicans painted underneath Fra Angelico's crucifixion in the San Marco chapter room.<sup>23</sup>

'Il Beato Bernardo da Ripa Inquisitore della pravità heretica segato et gittato nel fuoco' must be the same as Alberti's plain 'Bernardus' who 'sera in duas partes sectus est et igni traditus pro Christi fide' (f.59<sup>v</sup>); Taegio did not know who he was and placed him in the category of brethren who suffered in defence of the faith 'in diversis provinciis', but he describes the same kind of martyrdom: 'Frater quidam Bernardus nomine, sed cuius nationis aut quo in loco passus sit haud compertum habeo, hoc tamen reperi quod sera sectus et igni traditus pro fide Christi martirium subierit' (AGOP XIV 54 f.129<sup>v</sup>). He must be the 'B.Bernardus martir' on the extreme right of the 'tree' in the San Marco chapter room, who is depicted holding a palm (indicating martyrdom) and a book, and whom Vasari identifies as 'il beato Bernardo Fiorentino';<sup>24</sup> no martyred Bernard of Florence is known, the picture just names him 'B.Bernardus martir', and Taegio's ignorance of his nationality suggests that 'of Florence' was not part of its traditional interpretation.

Cattani's more precise description of Bernardo as 'da Ripa' and 'inquisitore' suggests, as Loenertz argues (art. cit. 291-292), that he had been told that the martyr in question was the Bernardus who was killed at Avignonet with the inquisitor Guillaume Arnaud and Garsias de Aura in 1242, whose story was told in the *Vitas fratrum* (MOPH I 232), repeated by Gui (MOPH XXII 23-24), and picked up by Taegio (AGOP XIV 54 f.128) and Alberti (f.56);<sup>25</sup> all these sources

<sup>22</sup> S.Orlandi, "Necrologio" di S.Maria Novella, Florence 1955, 8 no. 96.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Loenertz, art. cit. 291. The painting is reproduced, for example, in W.Hood, *Fra Angelico at San Marco*, New Haven 1993, 169; Boninsegna is on the far left of the 'tree'.

<sup>24</sup> G.Vasari, *Vite de' più eccellenti pittori ... II*, Florence 1771, 217 (when he says that Bernard is on the left he means Dominic's left, not the viewer's); the image is reproduced in *Bibliotheca Sanctorum* II 647.

<sup>25</sup> On the Avignonet martyrs see Y.Dossat, 'Le massacre d'Avignonet', *CdF* 6 (1971) 343-359; Venchi, *Catalogus hagiographicus* (2001) 128-129.

call him 'Bernardus de Rupeforti', but, as Loenertz points out, Razzi translated his name as 'Bernardo da Ripaforte'.<sup>26</sup>

It is unclear why Bernard should have been chosen rather than the assassins' prime target, Guillaume Arnaud,<sup>27</sup> but there was a precedent for depicting a 'Blessed Bernard' in the chapter room: Blessed Bernard of the province of Toulouse is among the Dominicans painted by Tommaso da Modena in the chapter room at Treviso, though judging by the company he is keeping he was meant to be one of the two Bernards whose prowess as preachers and miracle-workers was celebrated in the *Vitas fratrum* and who feature in Gui's list of 'predicadores gratiosi et famosi'.<sup>28</sup>

The Bernard of San Marco may perhaps have acquired the manner of his martyrdom by confusion with Berardus, one of the Franciscans killed by the king of Morocco: their heads were split down the middle (with swords, though, rather than a saw), and an attempt was made to burn their bodies (*Analecta Franciscana* III 19-20, 590). Or, inasmuch as he is twinned with Boninsigna in the San Marco 'tree',<sup>29</sup> he may have acquired his manner of death by a kind of hagiographical *communicatio idiomatum*.

We may also suspect that some painting lies behind 'il beato Domenico compagno di San Pietro Martire trapassato il collo et le mammelle da pungente spada'. All that Taegio says is 'Fratrem Dominicum ipsius comitem ... mox ille carnifex se convertens quatuor illum letalibus vulneribus sautiavit',<sup>30</sup> and Alberti is even

<sup>26</sup> S.Razzi, *Vite dei sancti e beati ... del sacro ordine de' Frati Predicatori*, Florence 1577, 110.

<sup>27</sup> As Loenertz points out, Bernard is mentioned before Guillaume Arnaud in Meyer's *De viris illustribus* (QF 12 [1918] 41); the same is true in Epp's *De viris illustribus* (ed. cit. f.7<sup>v</sup>). Galvano may have helped to push Bernard to the fore; in his shorter chronicle the names of the Dominican Avignonet martyrs are reduced to 'fratres W. et Ber. de Rupeforti' in Ravenna, Bibl. Classense 347, and 'fratres W. et B. de Rupeforti et Carisias cura (sic)' in the manuscript from which Reichert edited the text (MOPH II 93).

<sup>28</sup> Bernard is accompanied by Pelagius the Spaniard, Petrus Sendre, Walter the German and Isnard of Vicenza (G.Milanese, *La chiesa monumentale di San Nicolò in Treviso*, Treviso 1905, 68); there are stories about all of these, including both Bernardus de Caucio and Bernardus de Traversa, in the *Vitas fratrum* (MOPH I 222-223, 227-228, 295-296, 299-300, 301-303), and both Bernards and the other four are among Gui's *predicadores gratiosi* (MOPH XXII 159-161).

<sup>29</sup> The images essentially go in pairs, beginning with a Dominican pope on either side of Dominic and ending with a martyr at each end (Bernard and Boninsegna).

<sup>30</sup> This comes in Taegio's life of Peter Martyr (AGOP XIV 54 f.110<sup>v</sup>; *Acta Sanctorum, Aprilis III*, Antwerp 1675, 698) and it is taken almost verbatim from the legenda by Thomas Agni of Lentini (Paris, BNF lat. 18309 f.17).

more vague: 'Dominicus sotiis Divi Petri Veronensis letaliter cum eo vulneratus quinta die post interitum Petri coelum petivit sanguine laureatus' (*De viris* f.58<sup>v</sup>).

The available evidence does not permit us to chart the exact connections between Taegio's notes, his *De insigniis*, Alberti, Ususmaris and Cattani; we clearly do not have all the pieces of the jigsaw. Alberti professedly made use of Borselli (ff.116<sup>r</sup>, 153<sup>r</sup>), and he admits to a particular obligation to praise Taegio 'eo maxime quod ex laboribus suis partem nobis subministravit' (f.153<sup>r</sup>); there are undeniable links between his *virii illustres* and those catalogued by Taegio in *De insigniis* (cf. AFP 77 [2007] 34-35), but this does not necessarily mean that he knew *De insigniis* as we have it in AGOP XIV 54-55.

The only copy of *De insigniis* we possess is the one made by Innocenzo Antonio Natali and Vincenzo Maria Monti in 1758,<sup>31</sup> and in AGOP XIV 54 Natali copied whatever he found in the original manuscript, making no distinction between Taegio's own text and later additions. We can recognize some additions because it is chronologically impossible for them to be ascribed to Taegio;<sup>32</sup> but how can we recognize additions or alterations made by Taegio himself?

Furthermore, at the end of AGOP XIV 55 Monti copied an index to book three 'in quo tractatur de illustri prole', apparently compiled by Paolo Castrucci in 1579, which does not tally with the contents of book three as found in AGOP XIV 54; the volume indexed by Castrucci evidently did not contain the sections on martyrs and writers. *De insigniis* originally occupied three volumes; if the martyrs and writers were in the first volume, together with the first two books, that could correspond to the 'chronica ordinis nostri in quatuor partes distincta' which Antonius Senensis Lusitanus reported finding 'in prima parte monimentorum ordinis',<sup>33</sup> and it would explain why Senensis repeatedly cites 'prima pars monimentorum' as a source for his own account of Dominican writers. What we have in AGOP XIV 54, then, appears not to reflect the structure of the work as it was

<sup>31</sup> I gave a brief account of the eighteenth-century copies of Taegio in *Mediaeval Studies* 47 (1985) 49-50.

<sup>32</sup> For example, on f.183<sup>v</sup> the list of *doctores* from the Polish province concludes with three from the seventeenth century.

<sup>33</sup> *Bibliotheca Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, Paris 1585, 12-13.

available in the late sixteenth century. Was the structure altered by Natali and Monti, or were there once two distinct versions of *De insigniis*?

We are faced with questions to which we do not know the answer, but we must at least reckon with the possibility that the version of, or material for, *De insigniis* which Taegio showed Alberti contained Berdegarius the alleged archbishop of Kraków, but did not yet contain Paulus Hungarus the alleged inquisitor in Dalmatia, which would explain the presence of the former and the absence of the latter in Alberti's account of the 'fratres per Haereticos in Bosina et Dalmatia interfecti'. A more evolved text of *De insigniis* could explain the presence of both of them in Cattani, and there is no reason why Cattani should not have been able to draw directly or indirectly on information derived from Taegio. Apart from the somewhat improbable hypothesis that Taegio's 'Sadoch Polonus' conflates two alleged martyrs whom Cattani kept separate, there are not really any grounds for postulating a common source for Taegio and Cattani rather than taking Taegio himself to be one of Cattani's sources.<sup>34</sup> Even if the inquisitor did reach Taegio and Cattani independently from a common source there is nothing to suggest that Taegio identified the Paulus Hungarus who was 'prior et inquisitor Bruensis' with the one who led the first Dominican mission to Hungary, so it is more likely that Cattani dropped *Hungarus* from his description than that Taegio added it.<sup>35</sup>

The big question concerning the inquisitor in Dalmatia is where Taegio got him from, and on that I see no glimmer of light.

An account of the Dominican mission to Hungary led by 'Paulus Hungarus' and of the brethren's subsequent labours was included by Alberto di Castello in the chronicle appended to the *Tabula privilegiorum* published in Venice in 1504 (ff.134<sup>v</sup>-135<sup>r</sup>); it is

<sup>34</sup> Most of Cattani's book is taken up with general reflections; the narrative content is so meagre that I see no way of identifying the sources he used for the life of Dominic.

<sup>35</sup> Unlike 'Niccolò Unghero' and 'Giovanni Unghero', 'Paolo inquisitore' is sufficiently defined by 'in Dalmazia'. Cattani twice dispenses with the qualification 'Veronensis' which is attached to Peter Martyr's name twice by Alberti (*De viris* ff.52<sup>v</sup>, 58<sup>v</sup>) and once by Ususmaris (*Privilegia* f.14<sup>r</sup>), and 'il vettorioso Vincenzio' is left with neither surname nor toponym, though he is called 'Valentinus' in Alberti (*De viris* f.156<sup>v</sup>) and 'Ferrarius Valentinus' in Ususmaris (*Privilegia* f.15<sup>r</sup>); it would not be surprising if Cattani reduced 'Paulus Hungarus inquisitor' to 'Paolo inquisitore'.



essentially based on Bernard Gui, a recognizable source of the chronicle. The expedition to Szörényi is covered in two sentences:

Multiplicatis ibidem fratribus missi sunt aliqui a dicto fratre Paulo in terram que Structium<sup>36</sup> dicitur, quam heretici et scismatici incolebant. Ubi post multas tribulationes tandem domino largiente mirabiliter profecerunt.

This was unchanged in the 1506 edition,<sup>37</sup> but in that of 1516 an extra sentence was added: 'Et tandem dictus fr. Paulus martyrio est coronatus in Dalmatia, igne combustus'.<sup>38</sup> This is unmistakably based on Taegio's account of the death of 'Paulus Hungarus inquisitor', and Alberto unambiguously identifies him with the Paulus Hungarus who headed the mission to Hungary in 1221.

The addition was ignored in the chronicle included in editions of the Constitutions, beginning with that of Rome 1566 (f.46<sup>v</sup>), but it was noticed by Antonius Senensis who accordingly incorporated Paul's death into his story:

Frater Paulus Hungarus, qui fuerat in Hungariam directus Apostolus cum sociis aliquot, postquam multum populum Domino acquisivit, et conventus aliquos ordinis in illo regno fundavit, apud regionem que dicitur Struthium ab hereticis fuit pro Christo occisus.<sup>39</sup>

But the two Pauls were soon separated again.

Castillo's chapter on Dominicans who suffered martyrdom after the death of Dominic begins with those killed 'en Bosina y en otros

<sup>36</sup> Suipert's *Sceurinum* is corrupted to *Structium* in the manuscripts of Bernard Gui, including Bologna 1535 f.3<sup>v</sup>, the manuscript used by Taegio, and f.6<sup>r</sup> of the Venice manuscript last heard of in Berlin (now known only from Kaeppli's photographs) which is probably the one Alberto used. Taegio persistently misreports Gui as having *Scrutium* (AGOP XIV 53 f.98<sup>v</sup>; Bologna 1894 f.61<sup>v</sup>, AGOP XIV 51 f.24; AGOP XIV 54 f.126<sup>v</sup>). Alberti, like Alberto, has *Structium* (*De viris* f.58<sup>v</sup>). In a German subfamily of *Vitas fratrum* manuscripts 'in terram que Sceurinum dicitur' is corrupted to 'in terram que Feurin. dicitur' (AFP 68 [1998] 88.17, apparatus criticus); this was picked up by Dietrich of Apolda as 'in terram que Feurinensis dicitur' (ibid. 93.16), and further corrupted to 'in civitatem Furiensem' by Surius (*De probatis sanctorum historiis* IV, Cologne 1573, 551).

<sup>37</sup> Reproduced in E.Martène-U.Durand, *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum ... amplissima collectio* VI, Paris 1724; for the Hungarian missions see cols. 350-351. On the authorship and editions of Alberto's chronicle see R.Creytens, AFP 30 (1960) 232-244.

<sup>38</sup> This is on f.146<sup>v</sup>; I take the reference and the text from Creytens, AFP 30 (1960) 307.

<sup>39</sup> *Chronicon fratrum ordinis Praedicatorum*, Paris 1585, 53-54.

lugares de Esclavonia' in 1222, 'en el qual fue tambien martyrizado el sancto fray Pablo de Ungria (como queda dicho) con otros mas de noventa religiosos que por la tierra de los Cumanos murieron a manos de infieles, unos degollados, y otros asados, y otros empalados'.<sup>40</sup> The fact that both sets of deaths are dated to 1222 shows that Castillo's source is Alberti (*De viris* f.59<sup>r</sup>),<sup>41</sup> but the inclusion of Pablo de Ungria among the ninety friars killed on the Cuman mission seems to be a pure invention (he was not so included on f.132<sup>r</sup>, to which 'como queda dicho' refers). Castillo was aware of Cattani's book (it is one of the works listed in the prologue), and he seems to have received some information indirectly from Taegio (cf. AFP 77 [2007] 31-34), so it is conceivable that he was influenced by an inaccurate memory of the supposed fate of Paul the inquisitor; but it is just as likely that he took it for granted that the head of the Hungarian Dominicans personally led the mission to the Cumans and perished with his brethren.

In the first edition of his *Huomini illustri* Piò included an account of the Hungarian Dominicans' missions, and he alludes to the discrepancy between Castillo and Senensis with regard to their leader's death; he chose to accept Castillo's account:

Tornando al B.F. Pavolo, egli fù finalmente da gli heretici ucciso non in Strutio, come il Lusitano afferma, ma tra i Cumani, come dice il Castiglio con più di 90 altri Frati l'anno 1222.<sup>42</sup>

He retained the same notice in the restructured second edition, published in Bologna in 1620, cols. 60-61, but this time he also found room for the supposed inquisitor, who therefore had to be identified as 'un'altro F.Pavolo d'Ongheria'; on the explicit authority of Taegio he says of him that 'essendo Priore in un Convento della Dalmatia fu preso da gli Infedeli, legato con una catena al Palo, e finalmente, così vivo, abbruggiato' (ibid. 109).

On the authority of Piò this 'alter Fr. Paulus Hungarus' was included in Ferrarius's chapter on Dominican Hungarian martyrs;<sup>43</sup> and, as we have seen, Fontana, apparently ignorant of previous

<sup>40</sup> Hernando de Castillo, *Primera parte de la historia general de Sancto Domingo y de su orden de Predicadores*, book I, Madrid 1584, ff.158<sup>r</sup>-159<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> On Alberti as a source for Castillo see Tugwell, AFP 77 (2007) 30.

<sup>42</sup> G.M.Piò, *Delle vite de gli huomini illustri di S.Domenico, parte prima*, Bologna 1607, 330-331.

<sup>43</sup> S.Ferrarius, *De rebus Hungaricae provinciae ordinis Praedicatorum*, Vienna 1637, 64.

references to him as 'Paulus Hungarus', kept him even further away from the founder of the Hungarian province by calling him 'Paulus Dalmata'.

'Paulus Hungarus' and 'Paulus Dalmata' were finally brought together by Rovetta: under the year 1232 he lists 'Fr. Paulus Hungarus, seu ut alii volunt Dalmata', biasing the choice in favour of Dalmatia by putting 'Fr. Paulus Dalmata' in the margin.<sup>44</sup> His bibliography on Paul includes both Fontana and the 1516 edition of Alberto di Castello's chronicle.<sup>45</sup>

This is how Paul the Hungarian, founder of the Dominican province of Hungary, became Paul the Dalmatian, a metamorphosis as mythical as any that we read about in Ovid.

---

<sup>44</sup> A.Rovetta, *Bibliotheca chronologica illustrium virorum provinciae Lombardiae sacri ordinis Praedicatorum*, Bologna 1691, 6.

<sup>45</sup> He refers to f.146<sup>v</sup> of 'Chronicon Iacobi de Susato'; Alberto's chronicle was anonymous, but it begins with the statement that James of Soest is its primary source, so it was generally cited as if it were James's chronicle (cf. Creytens, AFP 30 [1960] 257-258).