



*Journal of Franciscan Culture*  
*Issued by the Franciscan Friars (OFM Malta)*

101





Quarterly journal of  
Franciscan culture published  
since April 1986.

Layout:  
John Abela ofm  
Computer Setting:  
Raymond Camilleri ofm

Available at:  
<http://www.i-tau.com>

All original material is  
Copyright © TAU Franciscan  
Communications 2012

## Contents

- Editorial ..... 2
- The legenda Ad Usum  
Chori ..... 3
- The Crypt of S. Masseo .... 15
- Francis, the Brothers and the  
anguish of solitude ..... 19
- Quote ..... 23

# 101

## EDITORIAL

# FRANCISCANS AND "EUROPEAN" VALUES

During these last couple of years we have been constantly bombarded with news regarding the alarming state of the world economy, and hence also of the economy of the European Union. We are witnessing soaring unemployment in many European countries, particularly in Spain, as well as the deep economic recession that has hit Greece, forcing bailouts to counter the danger of economic collapse in the Eurozone. The situation seems to be deteriorating, even though politicians from different spectrums try to convince us that everything is fine, or else that we are on the eve of doomsday.

One of the persistent mistakes in the European Union has been that of forgetting the social and economic roots of Europe. It seems that we are also forgetting the values of the founding fathers of Europe. Forgetting one's roots is dangerous and leads to a crisis of identity and a lack of direction. In spite of all the rhetoric about common European values, we have to admit that Europe is as divided as ever over so many issues. It has become a continent without values, or rather, a patchwork of selfish interests in its political and economic system, which pretend to dictate laws that insult true democracy.

True democracy is based on mutual respect. For centuries before Illuminism Europe was governed by theocracies. That was the case for example in Malta during the rule of the Order of the Knights of Saint John. The French Revolution wiped away this servitude in which God seemingly interfered in all spheres of society through the powers of the priestly Catholic caste. In the name of liberty, equality and fraternity a new Europe was born. After going through the trauma of two great wars, and the spectre of Fascism and Communism, contemporary Europe boasts to be the perfect symbol of democracy and defence of human rights and dignity.

Unfortunately many of the newcomers in this new Europe have forgotten that these values, in spite of the old theocratic system, are enshrined in Christianity, which has formed Europe for two millennia. It was Christianity that moulded the social and economic framework of Europe during the Dark Ages with Benedictine monasticism, which revolutionised agriculture. The feudal system might have had its injustices, but it guaranteed an orderly society based upon values which were considered sacred.

The Franciscan spring during the 13<sup>th</sup> century revolutionised the feudal social framework in Italy. Francis of Assisi initiated a way of life in which the hierarchical structure was sidelined in favour of fraternity. His upbringing as the son of a middle-class merchant helped in this new ideal. The Franciscans who were his disciples, particularly during the 15<sup>th</sup> century, developed the first banking system in Europe, establishing the Monti di Pietà, in order to defend the poor against the scourge of usury.

In our post-modern European society a basic knowledge of these facts would be of immense help to reject the forceful arguments of those who think that their values of hedonism and secularism matter and dictate laws. They only show that they are ignorant of history and its impact on human life. And the history of Europe would be meaningless without the role of Christianity, monasticism and the ideals of Francis of Assisi that preceded the French Revolution by at least five centuries.

Fr. Noel Muscat ofm

# THE LEGENDA AD USUM CHORI

## BY THOMAS OF CELANO

Filippo Sedda

[Filippo SEDDA, *La “Legenda ad usum chori” e il codice assisano 338*, in *Franciscana. Bollettino della Società Internazionale di Studi Francescani*, XII (2010) 43-83. A selection from the paper and footnotes is presented here.]

If we take into consideration to two recent collections of Franciscan Sources, the *Sources Franciscaines* and the *Franziskus-Quellen*,<sup>1</sup> it seems that the contribution of Timothy Johnson<sup>2</sup> has marked the attention of scholars. The American scholar had in fact noticed that the *Legenda ad usum chori* has pride of place among the other liturgical *legendae*, if we consider them as privileged instruments for the creation and spreading of the image of Saint Francis. It was precisely in them being liturgical sources that these documents have been used, prayed and meditated, and therefore were well known by all the sons and followers of the Saint.

Both in the French and German editions the *Legenda ad usum chori* has been inserted with translations in these languages. The same thing did not occur in the case of the Italian edition of the Sources, where there still does not exist a translation of the *legenda*.<sup>3</sup> The same thing can be said regarding the editions of the Sources born towards the end of the 1960's, where the *legenda* has often been omitted. It is not found in the three Italian editions of the Sources,<sup>4</sup> neither in the French or Spanish editions.<sup>5</sup> Among the more recent international publications those who welcomed it were the *Summa Franciscana*,<sup>6</sup> the *Fontes Franciscani*,<sup>7</sup> and the English language edition of the Sources.<sup>8</sup> In Maltese the *legenda* has also been published in the most recent edition of the Franciscan Sources.<sup>9</sup>

The first ten years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century have brought fame to the *legenda*, but the merit is not just that of Johnson, but also thanks to the encouragement given by Francesco Dolciemi,<sup>10</sup> Jacques Dalarun<sup>11</sup> and

Felice Accrocca,<sup>12</sup> who contributed to create this new sense of interest in the liturgical sources.

The *Legenda ad usum chori* was partially published for the first time by Niccolò Papini in 1822.<sup>13</sup> It was entirely published by Leonard Lemmens in 1901<sup>14</sup> and by Eduard d'Alençon in 1906.<sup>15</sup> The critical edition is found in volume X of the *Analecta Franciscana*.<sup>16</sup>

During the same years in which the Franciscan scholars of Quaracchi were finalizing the volume on the *Legendae sancti Francisci*, John Moorman was publishing a volume on *The Sources for the Life of St. Francis of Assisi*. Regarding our *legenda* he only makes a fleeting quotation in a note.<sup>17</sup>

After him it was only Stephen van Dijk who spoke about the *Legenda ad usum chori*, but only within the context of his liturgical studies.<sup>18</sup>

This historiographical absence of the *Legenda ad usum chori* has prompted me to propose a detailed analysis of the document through a study of the circumstances in which it was composed and of its literary genre, basing my analysis on the editions and witness of manuscripts, particularly the Codex 338 of the Fondo antico of the Biblioteca Comunale of the Sacro Convento of Assisi. I will also give some hints regarding the date of composition and the author of the *legenda*.

---

### *Circumstances of composition and literary genre*

On 16<sup>th</sup> July 1228 the holiness of Francis was sanctioned by the apostolic letter *Mira circa nos* of Gregory IX,<sup>19</sup> who was a friend of the saint and the cardinal protector of the Order of Minors. From this moment it was necessary to compose an official life of the new saint. For this aim the Order entrusted the task to brother Thomas of Celano. The *Vita beati Francisci* (also known as the *Vita prima*) was ready and approved

on 25<sup>th</sup> February 1229.<sup>20</sup> The enrollment of Francis in the catalogue of saints had as a consequence the solemn annual celebration of his *dies natalis*, and for this reason it was necessary to compose for the new saint a Mass<sup>21</sup> and a proper Office.

The *Legenda ad usum chori* is inserted within the context of the official holiness of Francis. Since it is a liturgical *legenda* it is composed in such a way that it would be read during the Office of Matins (*ad matutinum*), which according to the Roman tradition was composed of nine *lectiones*, recited in three *nocturni*: this choral prayer was recited at the end of the night and before the first lights of dawn.

In order to understand the *Sitz im Leben* of the *Legenda ad usum chori*, it is necessary to analyze the Rhythmic Office composed by Julian of Speyer.<sup>22</sup> The creation of a proper Office is documented in a text by Thomas of Eccleston, who in *De Adventu* presents the testimony of brother Augustine, who then became bishop of Laodicea:

“Brother Augustine, the blood brother of Brother William of Nottingham of blessed memory, at first belonged to the household of the lord pope Innocent IV; later he went to Syria with a nephew of the pope, the lord patriarch of Antioch, and later still was made bishop of Laodicea. He related publicly in the convent at London that he had been in Assisi for the feast of St. Francis and that Pope Gregory was there; when the pope went up to preach, the brothers chanted: ‘This one the saint chose as his father, when he ruled over a lesser church,’ and the pope smiled.”<sup>23</sup>

Since Gregory IX was present in Assisi for the feast of Saint Francis in 1235, one can consider that the *terminus ante quem* of the composition of the Office dedicated to Saint Francis was 4<sup>th</sup> October 1235. Bruning<sup>24</sup> holds that the Office was composed in 1230 and bases his thesis on three arguments which are convincing to a great degree:

1. On 25<sup>th</sup> May 1230 the translation of the relics of Saint Francis from the church of Saint George to the new Basilica dedicated to him was held. Now we know that for such occasions new Offices were often composed.

2. On the feast of Pentecost 1230 the general chapter was convened in Assisi. The chapter also discussed liturgical questions regarding the breviary and the singing. Such a circumstance could also be the occasion to compose an Office common to the entire Order.<sup>25</sup>

3. During the Middle Ages the translation of the relics of a Saint was celebrated with solemnity, and it was normal that the celebration would be accompanied by singing.

Bruning therefore concludes in accordance with two dates: one *post quem*, 25<sup>th</sup> February 1229

(approval of the *Vita Prima*) and one *ante quem*, 25<sup>th</sup> May 1230, the date of the general chapter celebrated on Pentecost, which on that year fell on 26<sup>th</sup> May.

Claudio Leonardi, in the introduction to the *Officium Rhythmicum* of Julian of Speyer, does not propose a precise date, but indicates 1235 as the official date on which it began to be used in the liturgy and 1228 as the year in which the parts which do not come from Julian’s pen were composed.<sup>26</sup>

Jean-Baptiste Lebigue transfers the *terminus post quem* to 1228, the year of the proclamation of the canonization of Francis, since he holds that Gregory IX would never have decreed a solemn celebration of the *dies natalis* without the necessary instruments, namely a double office, “consisting of first and second vespers, having three nocturnes and nine proper responsories.”<sup>27</sup>

Bruning also raised the problem of the attribution of the *Officium*: “Until about twenty years ago, the question regarding the author of the Office of Saint Francis [...] was rather confused. Some attributed the Office to Celano. Others, following Wadding, attributed it to Saint Bonaventure, to Julian, to both (Saint Bonaventure being author of the poems and Julian of the music).”<sup>28</sup>

Weiss and Felder,<sup>29</sup> although working independently one from the other, have clarified this problem, arriving at the same conclusion, namely that both text and music were the work of Julian. The problem, however, in reality was much deeper. Although the paternity of Julian regarding the Office could be confirmed,<sup>30</sup> not all the parts of the same Office could be considered as coming from his pen. Other poets certainly collaborated in the realization of this work. They can be identified with Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241), and with the cardinals Tommaso da Capua di Santa Sabina<sup>31</sup> and Raniero di Santa Maria in Cosmedin.<sup>32</sup> Thomas of Celano agrees with this hypothesis, since in his *Vita beati Francisci* he writes that a “new song” was sung for the feast of the canonization of the Saint (16<sup>th</sup> July 1228).<sup>33</sup> Other witnesses also indicate with certainty the nature of these songs and their authors.<sup>34</sup>

If we accept the fact that a liturgical office had to be composed, if not for the feast of the canonization, at least for that of the *translatio* of the mortal remains of Saint Francis, which was the *legenda* that would be read during the Office of Matins?

Before the approval of the *Legenda minor* of Bonaventure we do not possess any certainty regarding a liturgical *legenda* that the Church of Chapter officially approved, contrary to what happened in the case of the *Vitae* and Office of the Saint. The *Legendae chorales* did not have the prerogative of uniformity, because they were not officially approved and because of the fact that the memory of Francis was celebrated in a different way



among the various Orders. The same solemnity was also endowed with an Octave Office whereas before it was a double Office without an Octave.<sup>35</sup> The *Legenda ad usum chori* seems to be the occasional fruit of a compendium of the *Vita beati Francisci*, and its aim was to serve as the basis for the nine *lectiones* of the nocturnal Office. The one who requested this work was a friar, who is traditionally – even though not always in agreement regarding his attribution – identified with brother Benedetto di Arezzo.<sup>36</sup> The prologue to the same *Legenda* gives us this information:

“You asked me, Brother Benedict, to make excerpts from the Legend of our most blessed father Francis and put them into the order required for the series of nine readings, so that they could be put into breviaries where all could have them at hand because of their brevity. I have done what I could and *since you are a man of desires* (Dn 9:23) I have dutifully, although unworthily, tried to please you. I ask, as the price for this short bit of work, the lasting fruit of your holy prayer.”<sup>37</sup>

The *Legenda ad usum chori*, however, is not the only liturgical *legenda* that we know of. In volume X of the *Analecta Franciscana*, the fathers of Quaracchi tell us of the existence of other *legendae chorales* or liturgical, which are older than the *Legenda minor* of Bonaventure, when the general chapter of Paris in 1266 declared it as the only text that could be read in the Order, and ordered the destruction of the other *legendae* composed previously.<sup>38</sup>

In order to better contextualise these liturgical *legendae* compiled before the *Legenda minor*, we can follow the distinction made by Jacques Dalarun, who before the initial research on the liturgical codexes conserved in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, distinguished three types of Franciscan *legendae*:

1. The intentionally liturgical *legendae*
2. The *legendae* that were only occasionally used
3. The *legendae* that do not seem to have ever been used in a liturgical setting.

For our analysis we shall concentrate on the first two types of *legendae*.

Widening his prospective glance at the *legendae* marked by the fathers of Quaracchi in chapter IX of volume X of *Analecta Franciscana*, Dalarun includes in the first group the *Legenda ad usum chori*, a *Legenda ad usum chori* inspired by the *Vita sancti Francisci* of Julian of Speyer,<sup>39</sup> the *Legenda liturgica breviarii minoritici Vaticani*<sup>40</sup> and the *Legenda minor* of Bonaventure.

To the second group of *legendae*, occasionally used in the liturgy, belong the *Vita beati Francisci* by Thomas of Celano, the *Vita sancti Francisci* by Julian of Speyer, the *Legenda Choralis Umbra*,<sup>41</sup> the *Memoriale*,

the *Legenda maior*. The liturgical *legendae* taken from these text can truly be defined as compilations of *excerpta*, but this would generate other questions, which merit a specific study, for example on how we can distinguish between the *legendae* composed with a liturgical intent in mind from those which are the fruit of a juxtaposition of texts; and again, what could be the criteria to establish that a *legenda* is the fruit of a redaction *ad hoc* according to the proper will of its author, or else *excerpta et compendiata* from other *legendae* under the form of a textual *collage*. The textual fluidity typical of the low Middle Ages renders such a systematic study very difficult indeed.

It is certain that such a typology of *legendae* up till now has had only an ancillary function with respect to that of the *legendae* from which they have drawn their material, especially after the edition of the fathers of Quaracchi – among whom Michael Bihl merits a special mention – who showed a special predilection towards the official *legendae*, and less to the so-called “minor” or “shorter” *legendae*. These were studied solely taking into consideration the critical reconstruction of the texts from which they were derived. It would instead be necessary to study these texts, to draw a complete picture of them and to be able to give a more objective evaluation, in order to be able to enjoy the “extraordinary fecundity of the sterile,” a metaphor used by Felice Accrocca.

This is, for example, what Dalarun has accomplished when he edited the abbreviated extract of the *Vita secunda* or *Memoriale*, found in the Vatican ms. BAV, Vat. lat. 12973, of which he has presented a transcription.<sup>42</sup>

Another liturgical work that merits attention is a *legenda* that has nearly been forgotten, and which is not known by the majority of specialists, except for the fact that it appears at the introduction to the X volume of *Analecta Franciscana* as a fragmentary witness of the *Vita beati Francisci*.<sup>43</sup> I am referring to a *legenda choralis* included in ff. 277va-278va of the so-called “Breviary of Saint Clare,” a codex conserved in Assisi in the friary of San Damiano.<sup>44</sup> As the fathers of Quaracchi affirm, the manuscript is probably older than codex 338, since it is dated roughly 1230. The text was edited in 1908 by Teolfo Domenichelli,<sup>45</sup> who gave it the title *Prima legenda chori*. After him nobody else studied this manuscript. This is a liturgical *legenda* for the feast of Saint Francis, inserted in the last section (ff. 275-278) of the manuscript of San Damiano, structured according to nine *lectiones* of Matins taken word by word from the *Vita beati Francisci*.

These two examples show the necessity of continuing the research and the cataloguing of the choral *legendae* in the ancient breviaries of the Friars Minor. As Dalarun has stated, only such a research will

help us to understand better the textual context and the scriptural circumstances of the liturgical *legendae*, and thus favour a more detailed knowledge of the manuscript witnesses of the same *Legenda ad usum chori*.

## The manuscript tradition and the critical edition of the *Legenda ad usum chori*

The first critical edition of the *Legenda ad usum chori* was published by Michael Bihl in volume X of *Analecta Franciscana* in 1926. The scholar made use of 10 manuscripts. Some years later the same scholar also discovered another manuscript in the codex of Siena, Biblioteca degli Intronati, F.VIII.13, which is the only codex containing the entire text of the *Legenda* (paragraphs 2-17), except for the prologue, which we know only thanks to the manuscript 338 of the Biblioteca comunale of Assisi (Sacro Convento). This manuscript helped the fathers of Quaracchi to update their critical edition. The update was published in the *Addenda et corrigenda* of the last section of the volume dedicated to the *Legendae sancti Francisci* in *Analecta Franciscana* (1941).<sup>46</sup> The list and description of the manuscripts utilised by Bihl is found in the *Praefatio*,<sup>47</sup> and in a more detailed manner in a study regarding the edition, published in 1933 in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*.<sup>48</sup>

The Siena codex is the only one that is structured in its list of lessons for the feast of Saint Francis, at a time when the octave had already been introduced. The text of the *legenda* is divided into three groups of 9 *lectiones* each. Paragraphs 2-6 are read on the feast day, paragraphs 7-13 are read during the octave, and paragraphs 14-17 contain the miracles.

After the discovery of the Siena codex, the research for other manuscripts of the *Legenda ad usum chori* has not stopped. Dalarun found 7 other manuscripts,<sup>49</sup> besides the 11 manuscripts used in the critical edition of Quaracchi.

At this stage the problem regarding the critical edition of the fathers of Quaracchi presents itself. Without wanting to diminish or reject the precious contribution of Bihl, it now seems necessary to study once again the edition of the *legenda*, with the help of the newly-found manuscripts, with the aim of producing a *stemma codicum*, and to try to individuate an archetype. Luigi Pellegrini<sup>50</sup> proposed the hypothesis that the Assisi codex 338 contains the *exemplar* conserved in the *scriptorium* of the Sacro Convento, from which the various manuscripts were then copied and sent to

the provinces of the Order. We shall now examine the codex.

## Assisi Codex 338, *Sacro Convento*. An *exemplar*?

The Assisi manuscript 338, Biblioteca comunale (Sacro Convento), represents one of the key witnesses for the edition of Bihl, both because it is the most ancient codex, and also because it is the only one that conserves the prologue with the mention of the one who requested it, namely *frater Benedicte*. The *Legenda ad usum chori* is found in ff. 52r – 53v. In the same section is also included a collection of miracles and the *Regula bullata*. Pellegrini has described the manuscript as a miscellaneous and composite codex,<sup>51</sup> and retains that this is the only section which remains of a probable collection of miracles pre-dating the official biography by Celano. Dalarun<sup>52</sup> strenuously defends this position. On the basis of a textual synopsis between the miracles of the *Vita beati Francisci*, the *Legenda ad usum chori* and the *Tractatus de miraculis*, and those present in the manuscript traditions of the *Legenda Umbra* (all texts attributed to Thomas of Celano), he concludes that the collection of miracles contained in ms. 338 is none other than the final section of the *Legenda choralis Umbra*, whose preceding section is lost. In fact it is probable that the presence of the *Regula bullata* helped the conservation of this section of the manuscript.

The text of the *Legenda ad usum chori* is incomplete. It comprises the prologue, the first 8 paragraphs out of a total number of 17, which are divided into 4 *lectiones*. According to Pellegrini we are faced with “the text in its original edition, namely in that form in which it appeared before the *Legenda* was divulged for liturgical use for which it had been destined; in other words, before its effective inclusion within the context of the liturgical office for the feast and octave of Saint Francis. All this induces us to think that the lessons, the beginning of each of which is evidenced by our codex with the rubrics in the initials, correspond effectively to the original division of the text, which we find totally modified in the various manuscripts.”<sup>53</sup>

This fifth section therefore had to make part of a codex *exemplar* conserved at the Sacro Convento, whose *scriptorium* produced the first drafts that were then sent to the various provinces of the Order. Thus we can conclude from Jordan of Giano, who informs us of the production of breviaries and antiphonals *secundum Ordinem*; these are the so-called “Rule breviaries” or breviaries of Honorius III, or more simply, the breviaries before the liturgical reform of Haymo of Faversham.

Besides the observations regarding the codex and the palaeographical details of the same, three questions still remain to be answered. When was the liturgical *Legenda* actually written in the codex? In what circumstances? How trustworthy is the prologue, which is found only in ms. 338 and which seems to be an addition?

1. Regarding the precise period of the material writing of the *Legenda* – which should not be confused with the date of its edition – what occasion could have been better than its approval during the reform of Haymo of Faversham? During the chapter of Genoa in 1244 a new *Ordo* was approved for the breviary that Haymo, who had died some months back, had prepared. In the *Ordo* it was established that the *Rhymed Office* of Julian of Speyer should be celebrated on the *dies natalis* of Saint Francis, but there is no indication as to the *legenda* that the friars should use for the readings of Matins, thus leaving a blank space in the manuscript where the name of the liturgical *legenda* should have been indicated.<sup>54</sup> Why was no liturgical *legenda* indicated? We could think of a sincere omission by the copyist, who forgot to fill up the blank space, or else we could presume that the Chapter did not take any decision regarding this matter. We cannot forget that, as a result of that chapter, the minister general Crescentius of Iesi asked the brothers to gather new documentary testimonies on the life of Saint Francis, since the *Vita beati Francisci* was not appealing any longer to an Order that was profoundly changed two decades after the death of its founder. A proof of this need is the fact that, around 1240, before the death of Pope Gregory IX, brother Giovanni of Perugia composed *De inceptione Ordini* (*Anonymous of Perugia*).<sup>55</sup> In it he not only tried to underline the holiness of the founder, but of the entire Order, and “he did not think twice to correct the official biographer every time he deemed it necessary to do so.”<sup>56</sup>

We have already seen that there were various liturgical *legendae*, among which the *Legenda ad usum chori*, which followed the pattern of the first official biography by Thomas of Celano, which at that moment was not appealing to the friars. However, it was precisely during that time – around 1240 – that the *legenda* was copied in the manuscript in order to provide an *exemplar*, as if it seemed that that *legenda* represented the best image of Francis to be read on his *dies natalis*.

Apart from the hypotheses on the historical context and the motivations that are difficult to reconstruct without a precise date for this section of the manuscript, the affirmation of Pellegrini remains valid, namely that the *legenda* in the manuscript is found “in its original state”. In other words, one could speak of an archetype, as is evident from the good number of

manuscripts that survived the destruction of the chapter of Paris of 1266. To me the affirmation that this was “the form in which the *Legenda* appeared in before it was divulged for liturgical use” is a question for discussion, especially if it would mean that the *legenda* was never used for such a scope before 1240.

2. The second question regards the aim of the insertion of the *legenda* in the manuscript. If the will to collect in one codex the *Miracula* and the text of the *Regula* can be justified also by the need to have a codex for the public reading in the refectory, this could not regard the liturgical *legenda* in an absolute manner, since it would certainly not have been read in the refectory. I believe that the only reasonable explanation to justify this collection of three texts is that of taking us back once again to the specific use for which this section of the codex was written, namely that of being an *exemplar*, in which one would find the *vita*, the *Regula*, and the liturgical *legenda* of Saint Francis. In this way one can also explain the punctuation signs necessary for the public reading of the document, that were formed within the context of a scriptorium.

3. Lastly, the fact that the prologue could be a kind of re-thinking on the part of the copyist, or a posterior addition, if it is read within the context of the period 1240, with the non acceptance of the *Legenda ad usum chori* during the chapter of Genoa, it seems that the same prologue is a kind of defense of justification of the same *legenda* and a confirmation of a climate of hostility towards it, or better still, towards its dependence upon the *Vita beati Francisci*. Indeed, if one reads attentively the prologue one sees that it affirms the double aim of the draft document: to provide the nine readings to insert in the breviary, but at the same time the possibility to provide everybody with a short and handy document. This detail and, in particular, the emphasis placed on the possibility that the document could be handy *ab omnibus* makes me reflect. It seems that not all the friars could make use of a short *legenda* which they could insert in their own breviary. This explains why the readings for the night office were often taken directly from the official *legenda*. Or else, one can come out with the hypothesis of another panorama: the multiplication of the *Vitae* of Francis (besides the *Vita beati Francisci*, we know of the existence of the *Legenda “Quasi stella mattutina”*;<sup>57</sup> as well as the *Vita sancti Francisci* by Julian of Speyer, the *Legenda choralis Umbra*, and *De inceptione*) created a certain fragmentation regarding the points of reference presented by the only official *legenda*, in such a way that this second motivation could appear as auguring that the *Legenda ad usum chori* could have a divulgation among the grass-roots level of the friars, not only materially because of the facility of copying a brief text, but also as a gravitational centre in which the



image of Francis that it represented could be anchored.

## Date of composition

Michael Bihl suggested the date of composition of the *Legenda ad usum chori* between 16<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> May 1230. In paragraph 17 there is a veiled reference to the *translatio* of the mortal remains of Saint Francis (25<sup>th</sup> May). In the same paragraph there is a reference to the indulgences and gifts awarded to the Basilica of Saint Francis with the letter *Mirificans misericordias suas* of 16<sup>th</sup> May 1230. This date gives value to the hypothesis of those scholars who hold that the friar mentioned in the prologue as the one who commissioned the *legenda*, can be identified with brother Benedict of Arezzo, who at the time was minister provincial of Greece, and who was present for the general chapter of 1230.<sup>58</sup>

Stephen Van Dijk<sup>59</sup> is of the opinion that the date of composition should be placed in a later stage, since the *Legenda ad usum chori* did not become the official legend for use in the breviary. It could have been composed after 1243, when it would have been too late for it to achieve success, since it would soon have been replaced by the *Legenda minor* of Bonaventure, composed some time after 1260.

Chiara Frugoni<sup>60</sup> insists that the *Legenda* should be dated after the *Tractatus de miraculis* by Thomas of Celano (concluded in 1253), since paragraphs 14-16 contain many miracles *post mortem*, which do not appear in the *Vita beati Francisci*, while they are present in the *Tractatus* in a more extended form: in this way the *Legenda* must have been written after the *Tractatus*. These arguments now appear fragile after the recent study by Dalarun on the *Legenda umbra*,<sup>61</sup> where he shows that these miracles have had a more ancient existence than that which is normally thought, and thus confirms the thesis of Bihl who speaks of a *Catalogus miraculorum sancti Francisci*, in which the miracles that occurred at the tomb of Saint Francis were collected.<sup>62</sup> We should also keep in mind that, before 1246, many memories of the friars arrived in Assisi, and they were collected after the request of the minister general Crescentius of Iesi during the chapter of 1244. These collections served as a basis for Thomas of Celano to compose his *Memoriale in desiderio animae*. How can we explain that the *Legenda ad usum chori* does not take note of this material? The most evident proof is the negative picture of the parents of Francis in the first paragraphs of the *legenda*: after 1244 such a description would have been unthinkable.

Jacques Dalarun proposes a date between the bulla *Mirificans misericordias suas* of 16<sup>th</sup> May 1230,<sup>63</sup> where there is a reference to the miracle of the raising of a person from death in Germany narrated also in the *Legenda ad usum chori*, par. 7, and the bulla

*Speravimus hactenus* of 16<sup>th</sup> June 1230,<sup>64</sup> where the laying of the foundation stone of the Basilica by Pope Gregory IX is mentioned. The French scholar explains the fact of the omission of the *translatio* as being the result of internal strife caused by Elias, thus prompting the author to keep silent on this important issue.

From what is evident at this point, especially regarding the paleographic examination of Codex 338, I think that the *Legenda ad usum chori* was composed in 1230, between 16<sup>th</sup> May and 25<sup>th</sup> May. The occasion of the chapter and the *translatio*, as Bruning has noted, favoured the gathering of many friars in Assisi. From the witness of Jordan of Giano we know that the chapter discussed liturgical issues (and in the same circumstances we have to place the composition of the *Officium rhythmicum* by Julian of Speyer).

The fact that it was exactly during those years in Assisi that the breviary of Saint Clare conserved at San Damiano chose a nocturnal office with an *historia* that was not taken from the *Legenda ad usum chori*, induces us to think that such an epitome of the *Vita beati Francisci* was initially destined for a circumscribed local usage, and it was maybe linked with the same person who commissioned the work, namely brother Benedict of Arezzo who was minister provincial in Greece, if one accepts as valid this identification.

The *Legenda* acquired a new importance during the years in which Haymo was preparing his liturgical reform. It was included in a codex/*exemplar* that sanctioned its consecration, if not institutionally at least philologically, as the archetype of new copies. I would like to imagine – since I do not have any elements that prove this hypothesis – that some friar behind the scenes had taken from the dust of some cupboard the epitome composed some ten years previously, and then inserted it in a codex, just as it happened in the case of the *opuscula* of Saint Francis. If I have to imagine who was the friar who accomplished this action I would say that it was brother Leo.

Beyond the attribution of responsibility, which remains simply the fruit of imagination, the data coming from the codex and palaeography, as well as the great number of manuscripts that are still extant, all point to the thesis that the *Legenda ad usum chori*, born in a local context, spread far and wide and not only within the Order of Minors, from 1240 onwards. Such a thesis has to be reinforced with further research, but in order to do so it would be necessary to continue sifting through the various manuscripts and to give a detailed description of the liturgical *legendae* that pre-date the one coming from the pen of Saint Bonaventure, in order to understand the true impact of the *Legenda ad usum chori*. In fact, at this stage of study, there is no agreement: it seems that the same Bonaventure in 1259 had sent to Cîteaux the text of the *Vita beati Francisci*



by Thomas of Celano in order that the monks could take the twelve readings of the monastic office for the feast of Saint Francis.<sup>65</sup> Maybe the nine *lectiones* that made up the *Legenda ad usum chori* were not sufficient for the monks. The brief nature of the *Legenda* became a problem with the introduction of the octave for the feast of the *dies natalis* of Saint Francis. According to Dalarun this was the reason why, after 1244, the *Legenda ad usum chori* could not answer fully to its liturgical function, and therefore the friars began once again to use abridged forms of the bio-hagiographical official *legendae*. That the *legenda* fell in disuse after 1244 is shown by the discovery of the codex Vatican, BAV, Reg. lat. 1738, which contains a longer version of the *Legenda liturgica breviarum minoritici Vaticani*.<sup>66</sup> According to the French scholar this *legenda* was composed after 1244, and it was inspired above all by the *Vita prima* by Thomas of Celano, but also made use of the *Legenda ad usum chori* and of the *Vita sancti Francisci* by Julian of Speyer, with a clear liturgical aim, since it had to respond to the need to have sufficient readings for the entire octave of the feast of the Saint, a function that the short *Legenda ad usum chori* could not satisfy. Dalarun arrives at this conclusion from a note he found in the manuscript, that states “during the octave IX lessons from his *legenda* are to be read.” The longer version was certainly motivated by new needs that arose with the introduction of the octave, but one should also note that the final result was certainly less than the 63 *lectiones* of the *Legenda minor* of Bonaventure.

The example of the Siena codex shows us that the way in which the *historia* of Saint Francis was adapted to the novelty introduced by the octave before the publication of the *legendae* of Bonaventure betrays many aims, and not only that of creating a compendium of the official *legenda* with new *excerpta*, but also with the scope of adapting the already existing liturgical *legendae*.

I also think that it is relevant to evaluate the incidence and diffusion of the *Legenda ad usum chori* to examine the fact that it results as the source of the same *Legenda liturgica Vaticana*. After all it is a witness of the spreading of such *legendae* outside the environment of the Order of Minors, since the Dominican Jacopo da Varazze certainly made use of the *Legenda ad usum chori* in order to compose the *historia* of Saint Francis in his *Legenda Aurea*.<sup>67</sup> Among other things, the fact that it was composed during the first years after 1260 raises the question as to why the *Legenda minor* of Bonaventure was not used, if it had already been composed.

---

## The author

If one analyses both the contents as well as the language used in the *Legenda ad usum chori* in the

light of the *Vita beati Francisci*, one can easily deduce the great affinity between them, and therefore arrive at attributing the composition to Thomas of Celano.<sup>68</sup>

With these words Fernando Uribe synthesises the conclusions of Michael Bihl regarding the author of the *Legenda ad usum chori*.<sup>69</sup> Niccolò Papini,<sup>70</sup> who published the first edition of the *Legenda* in 1822, also attributed it to Thomas of Celano, as did Lemmens<sup>71</sup> in 1901 and Eduard d’Alençon<sup>72</sup> in 1906: the style is very similar to that in the official *Vita* by Celano and convinced all the various editors regarding the identity of its author, or better still, its *exceptor*, namely brother Thomas from Abruzzo.

“The author of this *legenda* was therefore the same author of the *Vita*,” states Bihl, when he established the link between the two *legendae*. At the same time Bihl admits that, “the style of the *Legenda chori* is very distant from that of the *Vita I*, where there is an abundance and frequency of complex phrases composed in a very polished style.” In fact, he presents the evidence that the style of the author was influenced by the necessity to write in an abbreviated form, so that the parataxis (clause joined to another without using conjunctions) prevail over the hypotaxis (subordinate clause), that is, the coordinated clauses over the subordinated ones; the sentences are short; the use of the historical present is frequent; the grammatical subject is nearly always Francis; the need for brevity brought the author to use stronger and fuller expressions, or also to use hyperbole. He also provides a list of those *loci* where one finds particular ways of constructing phrases, such as the use of the absolute ablative, the conjunction of participles, the use of conjunctions which introduce the coordinate propositions to the subordinate ones, the adverbs, the superlatives; finally he makes a list of the rhetorical figures (metaphors, antitheses) and underlines that, because of the brevity the author could not accumulate tropes, neither direct quotations from Scripture. In spite of this stylistic divergence Bihl recognised in the *Legenda ad usum chori* the expert pen of an author like Thomas of Celano.

The Quaracchi scholar also analysed certain analogies between the *Legenda ad usum chori* and the *Vita sancti Francisci* by Julian of Speyer. However he explicitly excluded the possibility that Julian could be its author. An emblematic example is paragraph 56 of the *Vita sancti Francisci*:

“In addition to the other almost innumerable miracles which he worked in the alleviation of various diseases, necessities or dangers, he also miraculously brought many dead persons back to life. The exact number cannot presently be determined, but we are certain that there were very many such occurrences. We have learned from trustworthy persons that there were at least eleven.”<sup>73</sup>

Julian is witness that he found 11 miracles of resurrection from death, which corresponds to the same number found in paragraph 15 of the *Legenda ad usum chori*, whereas in the *Vita beati Francisci* of Celano there is no mention of a miracle of resurrection.<sup>74</sup> Bihl underlines the fact that the reference by Julian to the “trustworthy persons” should be attributed to Thomas for what he writes in the *Legenda ad usum chori* 15, but that in this way he accomplishes a grammatical flaw on a text in which he uses the plural.

Another significant fact that proves Bihl’s conclusions regarding the author of the choral *legenda* is the account of the translation of the saint’s relics. Julian of Speyer was the first biographer to give us the account of the episode in his *Vita sancti Francisci*. According to Bruning, Julian was called in Assisi on the occasion of the chapter of 1230, as a musical expert to help in the edition of the breviaries and antiphonals to send to all the provinces of the Order,<sup>75</sup> and therefore he would have been an eyewitness of the event. Bihl, however, states that, during that period, Julian was residing in France and that he would have received the information from Thomas, although Bihl could not state with precision from which document. He then adds, however, that even if Julian was in Assisi on the occasion of the *translatio*, one cannot deny that Thomas of Celano was also present, and thus it would have been easier to make recourse to an *auctor peritus et scriptor* like Celano, rather than to a *minoris figurae retractator* like Julian of Speyer. Besides, if during that time Julian was living in Assisi, he certainly would have made use of the *Legenda ad usum chori* when composing his *Officium rhythmicum*.

The assertive way with which Bihl defended the paternity of Thomas of Celano regarding the *Legenda ad usum chori* has not left space for other hypothesis after him. For this reason, together with Eleonora Rava, I have conducted a systematic lexicographic analysis of the liturgical *Legenda* in order to verify whether Thomas can truly be considered as the one who compiled it. The result which I here anticipate, in view of the publication of a study in 2011,<sup>76</sup> has been much of a surprise. After having made a synoptic confrontation between the pericopes which not only present the same episode, but also betray a textual coincidence, one notes that in many cases the compiler varied some of the words which he took from his source. When one studies the recurrence of such elements in all the works attributed to Thomas of Celano, one arrives at the conclusion that they do not belong to the lexicon of the first biographer. Therefore one concludes that the compiler could not have been the same author of the *Vita beati Francisci*. The study of the *miracula*, of the *hapax*, of the *cursus* and rhythm and the use of patristic quotations, has brought us to the same conclusions.

We are also proposing the hypothesis of attributing the authorship of the *Legenda* to Julian of Speyer, who – as Bihl had already noted – presents notable and common points of contact with the *Legenda ad usum chori*. In spite of the fact that this attribution is based on internal (lexicographic) and external (historical) arguments which are rather strong, it nevertheless remains a conjecture, since the lexical coincidence of some sequential elements does not invariably decree the same paternity of a work, particularly in period in which the textual fluidity was more elastic with respect to the fixed rules that were established later on with the invention of printing.

---

## Fragments to recompose

We have already stated that the *Legenda ad usum chori* was composed with a liturgical scope: its *Sitz im Leben* is therefore that of an *historia* that would be read during the night office. This confers to the work the power of divulging the image of the holiness of Francis that can emanate only from the typology of the *legendae*, in that it would leave an indelible mark upon the memory and imagination of the brothers and the faithful. This power is to be seen also in the great number of manuscript witnesses that have arrived to us. If we keep in mind that the chapter of Paris of 1266 decreed the destruction of the *legendae* – including the liturgical ones – that predated the ones by Bonaventure (*Legenda maior* and *minor*), the fact that Dalarun has counted 18 manuscripts, seven more than those discovered by the fathers of Quaracchi for their critical edition – and, as he himself stated, a number that is destined to increase if one makes a systematic overview of all the breviaries predating Bonaventure – we can safely state that we are truly faced with a best-seller of the 13<sup>th</sup> century.

At the same time, a more systematic study of the *legendae chorales* would help to cancel the mark of the *legendae minores* given to this literary style by the editors of Quaracchi, and to see in a more critical way the influence of the *Legenda ad usum chori* over other contemporary documents, like the *Legenda liturgica breviary minoritici Vaticani* or the *Legenda aurea* by Jacopo of Varazze.

I am also convinced that it is time to think of presenting a new critical edition of the *Legenda*, in which the Assisi codex 338, at least on the basis of a paleographic analysis of the same codex, should be considered a kind of *stemma codicum*, if not the archetype or at least the manuscript that is closest to all the others.

Regarding the date of composition of the *Legenda ad usum chori*, I substantially agree with the



editors of Quaracchi in placing it between 16<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> May 1230, because otherwise one cannot explain its great silence on the event of the *translatio*.

Another question regards the diffusion of this *Legenda*. From the witness of the *Prima legenda chori* that has been found in the breviary of Saint Clare it seems that the *Legenda ad usum chori* had a local circulation. If we believe the identification of *frater Benedicte* as referring to brother Benedict of Arezzo, provincial of Greece, we could think that the *Legenda ad usum chori* was initially destined for a circumscribed area of the Order. But because of the affirmation: “all could have them at hand because of their brevity” in the prologue, I retain it more probable to imagine that such a *legenda* should have been composed for all the brothers.

Some among the choral *legendae* that have arrived to us, as for example the *Legenda liturgica breviarii minoritici Vaticani*, prove that its author made use of the *Legenda ad usum chori*. Since Dalarun presented the date of the longer edition after the introduction of the octave of the feast of Saint Francis (1244), the shorter edition should have preceded this date. Therefore one could conclude that, already around 1240 the *Legenda ad usum chori* was functioning as the source of other *legendae*. On the other hand the lack of use of the *Legenda ad usum chori* in the breviary of Saint Clare could be attributed to other causes rather than to its lack of circulation. The choice made by the author to speak only about the episodes of the *conversio* of Francis (1C 1-4) and those regarding his *transitus* (1C 109-112), to the description of the stigmata (1C 113), seem to place an emphasis on this episode of the stigmatisation. This would make us think of a *legenda* linked with the period in which the same pontiff promulgated a *bull*a to defend the veracity of the same stigmata. I refer to the *bull*a ‘*Confessor Domini*’ of 5<sup>th</sup> April 1237.<sup>77</sup>

Returning to our choral *Legenda*, around 1240 it was consecrated, at least philologically if not institutionally, to become a text of the Order, exactly during the time in which the brothers accepted the liturgical reform of Haymo and also when the *Officium rhythmicum* was divulged in all the provinces. These are the conclusions to which I have arrived after having conducted the analysis of the palaeography of the manuscript of Assisi, Biblioteca del Sacro Convento, codex 338, in which the 5<sup>th</sup> bunch is part of the *exemplar* used in the *scriptorium* of the Sacro Convento.

The history of the influence and diffusion of the *Legenda* cannot be said to have waned even after the introduction of the Octave that decreed the nine *lectiones* as insufficient for the Office that had to be recited during a period of eight days. For this reason other solutions were tried, such as that of the manuscript

of Siena: the *Legenda ad usum chori* was divided into three groups of nine *lectiones* each, and in this manner it arrived the number of 27 lessons.

Even after the publication of the *Legenda minor* of Bonaventure, the *Legenda ad usum chori* did not finish to exert its influence upon a text such as the *Legenda aurea* by Jacopo di Varazze.

The last question that I have raised regards the author and compiler of the *Legenda ad usum chori*. It has always been attributed to Thomas of Celano because of the closeness of its style with that of the first official biographer. Thanks to a systematic lexicographic analysis we have concluded that the compiler could not have been Thomas. On the basis of arguments which are still not totally determined, we attributed the authorship to Julian of Speyer: in this way we recognize his double paternity of the office and *historia* of the Saint of Assisi, just as is evident in the case of the office and *historia* of Saint Anthony of Padua.

## Notes

1 Franziskus-Quellen. *Die Schriften des heiligen Franziskus, Lebensbeschreibungen, Chronicken und Zeugnisse über ihn und seinen Orden*, im Auftrag der Provinziale der deutschsprachigen Franziskaner, Kapuziner und Minoriten, herausgegeben von Dieter BERG und Leonhard LEHMANN; in Verbindung mit Johannes-Baptist FREYER, Bernhard HOLTER, et alii, Kevelaer, 2009, XXXI + pp. 1797.

2 Cfr. Timothy JOHNSON, *Lost in Sacred Space: Textual Hermeneutics, Liturgical Workshop, and Celano's "Legenda ad Usus Chori"*, in *Franciscan Studies* 59 (2001) 109-131.

3 The author of this paper has prepared a new Italian translation with a brief introduction, which will shortly be published by the Editrice Porziuncola.

4 Cfr. *Fonti francescane. Scritti e biografie di san Francesco d'Assisi. Cronache e altre testimonianze del primo secolo francescano. Scritti e biografie di santa Chiara d'Assisi*, Assisi 1977. *Fonti Francescane. Nuova Edizione. Scritti e biografie di san Francesco. Cronache e altre testimonianze del primo secolo Francescano. Scritti e biografie di santa Chiara d'Assisi. Testi normativi dell'Ordine Francescano Secolare*, a cura di Ernesto CAROLI, Padova 2004. The most recent contribution is the pocket-edition, *Fonti Francescane. Terza edizione rivista e aggiornata*. Edizione tascabile, Editrici Francescane, Padova 2011.

5 Cfr. FRANÇOIS D'ASSISE, *Documents. Écrits et premières biographies*, rassemblés et présentés par Th. DESBONNETS et D. VORREUX, Paris 1968. SAN FRANCISCO DE ASÍS, *Escritos, Biografías, Documentos de la época*, a cura di J.A. GUERRA, Madrid 1978 (Biblioteca de autores cristianos, 399).

6 Cfr. *Summa franciscana vel sancti Francisci et sanctae Clarae Assisiensium opuscula, biographiae et documenta*, compilavit L. GARCÍA, Murcia 1993, 167-171.

7 Cfr. *Fontes Franciscani*, a cura di E. MENESTÒ, S. BRUFANI et alii, Santa Maria degli Angeli, Assisi 1995 (Medioevo Francescano, Testi, 2), testo latino: 425-439; introduzione comune per tutte le opere di Tommaso da Celano a cura di Stanislaw DA CAMPAGNOLA, 264-266.

- 8 Cfr. *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents*. Vol. I, *The Saint* [FAED I], edited by Regis J. ARMSTRONG, J. Wayne HELLMANN, William J. SHORT, New York – London – Manila, 1999, 311-326.
- 9 TOMMASO DA CELANO, *Legenda ad usum chori*, in *Fonti għall-Hajja ta' San Frangisk t'Assisi*. Vol. I, *Il-Kitbiet ta' San Frangisk. Fonti Medjevali għall-Hajja ta' San Frangisk*, Traduzzjoni ta' Noel MUSCAT, Gużep Beneditt XUEREB, Marjanu VELLA, Introduzzjonijiet u apparat kritiku ta' N. MUSCAT, Provincia Frangiskana Maltija tal-Patrijiet Minuri u Edizzjoni TAU, Malta 2005, 199-203.
- 10 Cfr. F. DOLCIAMI, *Francesco d'Assisi: tra devozione, culto e liturgia*, in *Collectanea Franciscana* 71 (2001) 5-45.
- 11 Cfr. J. DALARUN, *Vers une resolution de la question franciscaine: La Légende ombrienne de Thomas de Celano*, Paris 2007. Italian translation, *Oltre la questione francescana: la leggenda nascosta di san Francesco (La Leggenda umbra di Tommaso da Celano)*, Padova 2009.
- 12 Cfr. F. ACCROCCA, *La straordinaria fecondità della sterile: la "Legenda minor" di Bonaventura*, in *Frate Francesco* 75 (2009) 179-211.
- 13 Cfr. N. PAPINI, *Notizie sicure della morte, sepoltura, canonizzazione e traslazione di san Francesco*, Firenze 1822, 222-226 (second edition: Foligno 1824, 239-243).
- 14 Cfr. L. LEMMENS, *Legenda brevis S. P. Francisci scripta a fr. Thoma de Celano*, in *Acta Ordinis Minorum*, t. 20, 1901, 15-18, 30-32.
- 15 Cfr. Ed. ALENCONIENSIS, *S. Francisci Vita et Miracula*, Roma 1906, 433-445.
- 16 THOMAE DE CELANO, *Legenda ad usum chori*, in *Legendae S. Francisci Assisiensis saeculis XIII et XIV conscriptae* [Analecta Franciscana, Vol. X = AF X], Quaracchi, 1926-1941, 117-126, 720-721.
- 17 Cfr. J.R.H. MOORMAN, *The Sources for the Life of Saint Francis of Assisi*, Manchester 1940 (Publications of the University of Manchester, 274. Historical Series, 79), 127, note 6. Referring to the *Legenda ad usum chori*, which he quotes within the context of the *Tractatus de Miraculis*, the author states: "This is an abbreviation of the *Vita Prima* by Celano himself for liturgical purposes."
- 18 Cfr. S.J.P. VAN DIJK – J. HAZELDEN WALKER, *The Originis of the Modern Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century*, Westminster-London 1960; S.J.P. VAN DIJK, *Sources of the modern Roman Liturgy: The Ordinals by Haymo of Faversham and Related Documents (1243-1307)*, Edited with an Introduction and a Description of the Manuscripts, 2 volumes, Leiden 1963 (Studia et documenta franciscana, 1-2).
- 19 Cfr. *Bullarium Franciscanum* [BF], ed. J.H. SBARALEA, Romae 1759, I, 42-44.
- 20 Cfr. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 3817, f. 282vb: "Apud Perusium felix dominus Gregorius nonus, IIº gloriosi pontificatus sui anno, quinto kalendas marcii, legendam hanc recepit, confirmavit et censuit fore tenendam. Gratias omnipotenti Deo et Salvatori nostro super omnia dona sua nunc et per omne saeculum. Amen."
- 21 Regarding the parts of the Eucharist that was celebrated on the feast day, Michael Bihl affirms that the *oratio*, *secreta* and *postcommunio*, "pro sollemnitate canonizationis confici solebant" (AF X, L); in fact, in the three variants that we know of regarding the Mass in honour of St. Francis, these three prayers are always found unvaried. For the edition of the Mass, cfr. AF X, 389-396.
- 22 JULIAN OF SPEYER, *Officium Rhythmicum Sancti Francisci* (FAED I, 327-345). For a recent synthesis of the Office, cfr. G. CREMASCOLI, *Introduzione a Iuliani de Spira. Officium sancti Francisci*, in *Fontes Franciscani*, 1099-1104; JULIEN DE SPIRE, et la *Vie de saint François*, introduction et traduction par Jean-Baptiste LEBIGUE, in *François d'Assise. Écrits, Vies et témoignages*, 705-738.
- 23 THOMAS OF ECCLESTON, *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, 15, in *XIIIth Century Chronicles*. Translated from Latin by Placid HERMANN, Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago 1961, 177. Latin edition: THOMAE DE ECCLESTON, *Tractatus de adventu fratrum minorum in Angliam*, ed. A.G. LITTLE – J. MOORMAN, Manchester 1951, 90: "Retulit publice in convento Londoniae se fuisse apud Assisium in festo S. Francisci, et fuit ibi papa Gregorius, et cum procederet ad praedicandum, cantabant fratres: 'Hunc sanctus praelegerat in patrem' [id est antiphonam III vesperarum], etc., et subrisit papa."
- 24 Cfr. F.E. BRUNING, *Giuliano da Spira e l'Officio ritmico di s. Francesco*, in *Note d'archivio* 4 (1927) 133 (129-202). Cfr. FRA GIULIANO DA SPIRA, *Vita e Ufficio Ritmico di San Francesco d'Assisi*, a cura di E. MARIANI, Vicenza 1980, 6 and 93.
- 25 Jordan of Giano affirms: "In eodem Capitulo generali (anni 1230) breviaria et antifonaria secundum Ordinem provinciarum sunt transmissa." IORDANUS A GIANO, *Chronica*, ed. H. BOEHMER (Collection d'études et documents, 4), Paris 1908, n. 57, p. 49.
- 26 C. LEONARDI, *Introduzione a Giuliano da Spira*, in *La letteratura francescana*. Volume II: *Le Vite antiche di san Francesco*, a cura di C. LEONARDI, Roma (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla) 2005, 267-277.
- 27 J.B. LEBIGUE, in *François d'Assise. Écrits, Vies et témoignages*, 727.
- 28 BRUNING, *Giuliano da Spira*, 131.
- 29 Cfr. J.E. WEISS, *Julian von Speier (†1285). Forschungen zur Franziskus und Antoniuskritik, zur Geschichte der Reimoffizien und des Chorals*, in *Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen Seminar München*, n. 3, München 1900; H. FELDER, *Die liturgischen Reimoffizien auf die heiligen Francisus und Antonius gedichtet und komponiert durch Fr. Julian von Speier*, Freiburg (Schwiz) 1901.
- 30 Cfr. O. TONETTI, *L'Ufficio ritmico di san Francesco d'Assisi di fra Giuliano da Spira*, in *Rivista Internazionale di Musica Sacra* 4 (1982) 370-389, particularly p. 374. Cfr. J.B. LEBIGUE, in *François d'Assise. Écrits, Vies et témoignages*, 706-725.
- 31 Born in Capua, he became archbishop of Naples (1215) and cardinal of Santa Sabina. He died in Anagni on 22<sup>nd</sup> August 1243. He became Chancellor of the Curia under Innocent III and later on became major penitentiary. Gregory IX entrusted him with many legations, even to Emperor Frederick II. He wrote some hymns, antiphons and sequences in honour of St. Francis and of the Virgin Mary (cfr. C. SCHMITT, *Tommaso di Capua*, in *Enciclopedia Cattolica*, XII, Città del Vaticano 1954, col. 243).
- 32 Commonly known as Raniero Capocci, he was a Cistercian monk, who became cardinal in 1216. He was a great friend of the Order of Minor and took part in the general chapter of 1221. Cfr. A. PARAVICINI BAGLIANI, *Cardinali di curia e "familiae" cardinalizie. Dal 1227 al 1254* (Italia sacra, 18-19), 2 voll., Padova 1972, I, 15.
- 33 1C 125 [FAED I, 295].
- 34 Cfr. TONETTI, *L'Ufficio ritmico*, 377; GIULIANO DA SPIRA, *Ufficio ritmico e Vita seconda*, a cura di V. Gamboso, in *Fonti agiografiche Antoniane*, Padova 1985, 17.
- 35 The double Office would begin with the first vespers of the feast and conclude with the second vespers. The octave was a solemnity that lasted for 8 continuous days, starting from the feastday. During the last day of the octave the same liturgy of the feast was repeated. The passage of the double Office without an



octave to that with an octave is to be placed at the latest in 1244 with the promulgation of the reform of the *ordo* of the breviary by Haymo of Faversham. This is what we read in the *Ordo breviarii fratrum Minorum secundum consuetudinem romanae curie* (Haymo of Faversham, 1243-1244): “The feasts that fall within the octave of Saint Francis are not to be celebrated, but they are to be transferred after the octave. During the octave nine lessons are to be read daily, and they are to be taken from his *legenda*, while eight responsories are sung. All the rest of the Office is the same one of the feastday, except that for the octave the antiphon *Sancte Francisce* is to be said at the *Benedictus* and the antiphon *Salve sancte pater* or *Plangue turba* is to be said at the *Magnificat*” (S. VAN DIJK, *Sources of the modern Roman liturgy*, II, 166). Cfr. S.J.P. VAN DIJK – J. HAZELDEN WALKER, *The Origins of the Modern Liturgy*; J. Dalarun, *Introduction à Thomas de Celano, Légende de Choeur*, in *François d'Assise. Écrits, Vies et témoignages*, 684, note 1.

36 Brother Benedetto of Arezzo in 1230 was minister provincial in Greece (1221-1237). Afterwards he lived in Constantinople until 1261. He was present in Assisi for the general chapter during which the *translatio corporis beati Francisci* took place (cfr. H. GOLUBOVICH, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente Franciscano*, vol. 1, Quaracchi 1906, 129-149). Van Dijk is of the opinion that the name does not refer to a particular friar who commissioned this summary of the *Vita beati Francisci*, but maybe “for several reasons which cannot be here explained, the identification of the *frater benedictus*, who had requested its compilation, with Benedict of Arezzo, provincial of Greece from 1221 to 1237, appears unsatisfactory to the present author. The omission of the cue rather suggest that no choir legend was available just before the mid-forties, but that Haymo was expecting one. And one wonders whether he himself was ‘the blessed brother’ who had asked Celano for it” (S.J.P. VAN DIJK, *Sources*, I, 84).

37 THOMAS OF CELANO, *The Legend for use in the Choir*, 1 [FAED I, 319].

38 Chapter IX of the *Praefatio* of AF X, pp. LVI-LVIII is entitled *De quibusdam brevis Legendis S. Francisci*. In the section of the texts on p. 529 there is the title: *Legenda quaedam minores. Francisci Assisiensis in Vitis fr. Thomae Celanensis fundatae*. The section includes 6 *legendae*: 1) *Legenda liturgica breviarii minoritici Vaticani*; 2) *Legenda liturgica antiqua Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*; 3) *Legenda liturgica Ordinis Praedicatorum brevior et priore excepta*; 4) *Legenda liturgica brevissima et brevior extracta*; 5) *Legenda choralis Carnotensis*; 6) *Epilogus in S. Franciscum* within the *Liber Epilogorum in gesta Sanctorum* by the Dominican Bartholomew of Trent, which has now been critically edited: BARTOLOMEO DA TRENTO, *Liber epilogorum in gesta sanctorum. Edizione critica*, a cura di E. PAOLI, Firenze 2001.

39 This is a choral *legenda* found by Théophil Desbonnets in ms. Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 595 ff. 390ss; cfr. TH. DESBONNETS, *La diffusion du culte de saint François en France d'après les bréviaires manuscrits non franciscains*, in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 75 (1982) 153-215.

40 This *legenda* was edited in three moments by LEONHARD LEMMENS, *De officio S.P.N. Francisci*, in *Acta Ordinis Fratrum Minorum* 19 (1900) 33ss; *Testimonia minora saeculi XIII de S.P. Francisco*, in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 1 (1908) 257-259; *Testimonia minora saeculi XIII de S. Francisco Assisiensi*, ed L. LEMMENS, Quaracchi 1926, 56-57 (Collectanea Philosophico-theologica, 3). This edition was included by the fathers of Quaracchi in AF X among the so-called “minor” *legendae*. These editions have all been based on the manuscript of the Vatican, BAV, Vat. lat. 8737. Dalarun found another manuscript in the Vatican, BAV, Reg.

lat. 1738.

41 Jacques Dalarun, in his study *Oltre la questione francescana*, together with a new critical edition of the *Legenda Choralis Umbra*, has proposed an analytical and detailed study of the literary genre and context, on the date of composition and the attribution of the *legenda* to Thomas of Celano. This contribution has decisively renewed the study accomplished by the fathers of Quaracchi (cfr. M. BIHL, *De legenda choralis Umbra*, in *Praefatio*, AF X, LVIII-LXI, and for the text, 543-554).

42 Cfr. DALARUN, *Oltre la questione francescana*, 303-305.

43 Cfr. AF X, p. XIII.

44 The codex has been studied and described by A. CHOLAT, *Le Bréviaire de Sainte Claire conservé au couvent de Saint Damien, à Assise, et son importance liturgique*, in *Opusculs de critique historique*, II, Paris 1914, 33-95. Cfr. S.A. VAN DIJK, *The breviary of St. Clare*, in *Franciscan Studies* 8 (1948) 25-46; id., *The breviary of St. Clare. A correction*, in *Franciscan Studies* 9/1 (1949) 10-12; A. MAIARELLI – P. MESSA, *Le fonti liturgiche degli scritti di Chiara d'Assisi e il 'Breviarium sanctae Clarae'*, in *Clara claris praeclara. L'esperienza cristiana e la memoria di Chiara di Assisi in occasione del 750° anniversario della morte*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Assisi, 20-22 novembre 2003), 97-145.

45 T. DOMENICHELLI, *Prima legenda chori de S.P. Francisco hucusque inedita*, in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 1 (1908) 62-67.

46 The text of the edition of 1926 is found in AF X, 118-126; that of the 1941 edition in AF X, 720ff.

47 Cfr. [M. BIHL], *Praefatio*, in AF X, XXI-XXIII.

48 M. BIHL, *De sancti Francisci "Legenda ad usum chori"*, 343-389.

49 These include: (1) Clermont-Ferrand, Bibl. Municipale et univ., 78 (73), XV cent.; (2) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 1057, XV cent.; (3) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 1033, XV cent.; (4) Poitiers, Bibl. Municipale, 25 (312), XIV cent.; (5) Chicago, Newberry Library, 24 23817, XIII cent.; (6) Napoli, Bibl. Nazionale, VII.A.15; (7) BAV, Vat. Lat. 12991, XIII cent.

50 L. PELLEGRINI, *La raccolta dei testi francescani nel codice assisano 338. Un manoscritto composito e miscellaneo*, in *Revirescent chartae codices documenta textus. Miscellanea in honorem fr. Caesarem Cenci OFM* (Medioevo, 3), 1, a cura di A. CACCIOTTI e P. SELLA, Roma 2002, 289-340.

51 For a description of the ms. cfr. L. PELLEGRINI, *La raccolta dei testi francescani del codice assisano 338. Un manoscritto composito e miscellaneo*; C. CENCI, *Bibliotheca Manuscripta ad Sacrum Conventum Assisiensem*, Assisi 1981 (Il miracolo di Assisi. Collana storico-artistica della basilica e del sacro convento di S. Francesco – Assisi 4/I) I, 236ff., n. 363.

52 DALARUN, *Oltre la questione francescana*, 80-110.

53 PELLEGRINI, *La raccolta dei testi francescani del codice assisano 338*, 325ff.

54 The liturgical reform of Haymo of Faversham did not establish an official liturgical text, but left a blank space where the name of the official *legenda* should have been indicated: “Lectiones leguntur de legenda ipsius scilicet...” Cfr. S.J.P. VAN DIJK, *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, I, 84; II, 165; VAN DIJK – HAZELDEN WALKER, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, 380ff.

55 Cfr. F. URIBE, *Introduzione alle fonti agiografiche di san Francesco e santa Chiara d'Assisi (saec. XIII-XIV)*, Santa Maria degli Angeli 2002 (Medioevo francescano, Saggi, 7), 173-193; F. ACCROCCA, “Viveva ad Assisi un uomo di nome Francesco”. *Un'introduzione alle fonti biografiche di san Francesco*, Padova 2005, 53-60.

- 56 ACCROCCA, "Viveva ad Assisi un uomo di nome Francesco", 58.
- 57 Cfr. F. ACCROCCA, *Intorno al notaio Giovanni autore della vita di S. Francesco* "Quasi stella matutina", in id., *Francesco e la sue immagini. Momenti della evoluzione della coscienza storica dei frati Minori (sec. XIII-XIV)*, Postfazione di J. DALARUN, Padova 1997 (Centro Studi Antoniani, 27), 37-55.
- 58 Cfr. M. FALOCI PULIGNANI, *La leggenda del B. Benedetto di Arezzo*, in *Miscellanea Franciscana* 8 (1901) 5-8.
- 59 Cfr. S.J.P. VAN DIJK – J. HAZELDEN WALKER, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century*, passim; S.J.P. VAN DIJK, *Sources of the modern Roman liturgy*, passim.
- 60 Cfr. C. FRUGONI, *Francesco e l'invenzione delle stimmate. Una storia per parole e immagini fino a Bonaventura e Giotto*, Torino 1993 (Saggi 780), 10 e 198 ff, note 167.
- 61 DALARUN, *Oltre la questione francescana*, 131 ff.
- 62 Cfr. AF X, 124, note 4.
- 63 Cfr. BF I, 64 ff.
- 64 Cfr. BF I, 66 ff.
- 65 Cfr. *Praefatio*, in AF X, xvi; F. URIBE, *Introduzione alle fonti agiografiche di san Francesco e santa Chiara d'Assisi*, 80, note 83, and 239 ff, note 17.
- 66 Cfr. J. Dalarun, *Oltre la questione francescana*, 218-223 and notes 577 and 645. Dalarun affirms that, even if one attributes the *Legenda ad usum chori* to Thomas of Celano, basing oneself on the style, it would be more convenient to attribute to him this longer version of the *legenda*.
- 67 Cfr. IACOPO DA VARAZZE, *Legenda aurea con le miniature del codice Ambrosiano C 240 inf. Testo critico riveduto e commento*, a cura di G.P. MAGGIONI, traduzione italiana di C. Agosti, premessa di C. Leonardi, 2 vol. Firenze – Milano 2007.
- 68 URIBE, *Introduzione alle fonti agiografiche*, 86.
- 69 Cfr. BIHL, *De sancti Francisci 'Legenda ad usum chori'*, 373-384.
- 70 Cfr. N. PAPINI, *Notizie sicure della morte, sepoltura, canonizzazione e traslazione di san Francesco*.
- 71 Cfr. L. LEMMENS, *Legenda brevis S. P. Francisci scripta a fr. Thoma de Celano*, in *Acta Ordinis Fratrum Minorum* 20 (1901), 15-18, 30-32.
- 72 Cfr. ED. ALENCONIENSIS, *S. Francisci Vita et Miracula*, Roma 1906, 433-445.
- 73 Julian of Speyer, *The Life of Saint Francis*, 56 [FAED I, 407].
- 74 In the *Vita beati Francisci* the only miracles that draw close to those of resurrection from death are found in chapter IV of the third book (paragraphs 139-140), entitled *De infirmis a morte revocatis*, but in fact none of them contains a true and proper account of a resurrection. These miracles had a particular importance when it came to declare the holiness of a saint. It is probable that when Thomas wrote the *Vita prima* he did not have any documentation regarding miracles of resurrection. The fact that the bulla *Mirificans misericordiam suam* of 16<sup>th</sup> May 1230 makes a reference to the miracle of resurrection that occurred in Germany, and which was then included in the *Legenda ad usum chori*, is an attestation of the importance that such a miracle had, and also of its novelty.
- 75 Cfr. note 26, with reference to the *Chronicle* by Jordan of Giano.
- 76 Cfr. E. RAVA – F. SEDDA, *Sulle tracce dell'autore della 'Legenda ad usum chori'. Analisi lessicografica e ipotesi di attribuzione*, in *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 69 (2011) 107-175.
- 77 Cfr. BF I, Rome 1759, 214.

## NEW FRANCISCAN MARTYRS BEATIFIED

*On 13th October 2012 a group of 14 Franciscan friars will be proclaimed Blessed in Prague, Czech Republic. They died as martyrs on 15th February 1611. Their names are: Fr. Frederick Bachstein, Fr. Juan Martinez, Fr. Bartholomew Dalmasono, Fr. Simon (priests); Fr. Christopher Zelt, Fr. John Didak, Br. Emanuel, Br. John Bodeo (lay brothers); Br. James and Br. Clement (temporary professed brothers); Br. John and Br. Anthony (novices). Their nationalities were as follows: 4 were Bohemians, 4 Italians, 3 Germans, 1 Spaniard, 1 French and 1 Dutch. The beatification ceremony will be presided by Cardinal Angelo Amato, Prefect for the Congregation of the Causes of Saints.*

*In 1604 the Friars Minor settled in the friary of Our Lady of the Snows in Prague. They took care to rebuild the derelict friary and church. They immediately began to preach and to administer the sacraments to the faithful. They were an international fraternity, sent to preach the Catholic faith in Prague, which at the time was predominantly a Protestant city with a Catholic minority. After the Passau army's invasion of Prague in 1611 the town's inhabitants suspected the friars of collaboration and after having brutally tortured them killed them in their friary, where their remains were buried. Before beatification the remains were exhumed to establish the causes of the death of these martyrs of the Catholic faith in what is today the Czech Republic.*



# THE CRYPT OF SAN MASSEO "DE PLATHEA" AND THE "CRYPTA QUÆDAM IUXTA CIVITATEM"

Noel Muscat ofm

Thomas of Celano, in *The Life of Saint Francis* [1C], narrates an interesting episode in the life of the young Francis. "Now there was in the city of Assisi a man (Francis) loved more than all the rest. They were of the same age and the constant intimacy of their mutual love made him bold to share his secrets with him. He often brought him to remote places suitable for talking, asserting that he had found a great and valuable treasure. This man was overjoyed, and since he was so excited about what he heard, he gladly went with him whenever he was summoned. There was a *cave* near the city where they often went and talked together about the treasure."

The English translation of the mysterious place where Francis would go with his friend is not exact. The original Latin version states: *Crypta quædam erat iuxta civitatem* (There was a certain *crypt* near the city).<sup>2</sup> In Latin the word *crypta* indicates a crypt or under-croft

*The Church of San Masseo*



of a church, a structure that was particularly common in Romanesque and Gothic churches in Italy. If Celano wanted to indicate a cave he would have used one of the terms: *spelunca* or *antrum* or *caverna*. The translators of the English edition explain in the footnote on page 187: "Thomas uses the word *crypta* to describe that place of solitude. It is translated in this instance as 'cave'. Its location and nature remain problematic." The difficulty of finding the exact place where this episode occurred regards precisely the way one interprets the Latin term *crypta*. If one goes to look out for natural caves or grottoes in the immediate surroundings of Assisi which overlook the Umbrian plain, one is bound to remain disappointed. Instead, there were various monastic establishments and churches in this area, and all of them possessed a church with a crypt. One of these monastic foundations was the church of San Masseo, a short distance away from San Damiano which, incidentally, also had a crypt before its restoration by Saint Francis.

The *Legend of the Three Companions* [L3C] also narrates this episode. The English translation similarly uses the term *cave*: "Changed into good after his visit to the lepers, [Francis] would take a companion, whom he loved very much, to secluded places, telling him that he had found a great and precious treasure. The man was not a little overjoyed, and gladly went with him whenever he was summoned. Francis often

led him to a *cave* near Assisi, and, while he went alone inside, he left his companion outside, eager for the treasure. Inspired by a new and extraordinary spirit, he would pray to his Father in secret, wanting no one to know what was happening within except God alone, whom he consulted about acquiring heavenly treasure.”<sup>3</sup> The Latin text of the L3C also makes use of the term *crypta*.<sup>4</sup>

Is it possible to pinpoint the place where this experience of conversion of the young Francis took place? If we are to accept the Latin word *crypta* as referring to a crypt of a church in the whereabouts of Assisi, we have to go and look at those churches that lay outside the walls of Assisi. Two churches, in particular, could be candidates for our selection. One is well mentioned in the Franciscan Sources, namely the church of San Damiano, a short distance downhill from the city. It did have a crypt when Francis discovered it and used to visit it for moments of solitude and prayer. It could very well have been known to the young Francis even before the episode of the Byzantine icon of the Crucifix which spoke to him. Another church, which lies some distance away just above the Via Francesca, is that of San Masseo.<sup>5</sup> Today only the Romanesque crypt of this church remains. It will be this crypt that will be the object of our analysis regarding the place where Francis used to go with his friend, who accompanied him on a treasure hunt, unaware of the real motives that were pushing the young Francis to look for that particular place of solitude.

## San Damiano

The church of San Damiano as it looks today does not have a crypt. We know, however, that it did have a crypt when Francis set out to repair it.<sup>6</sup> This was after the experience of the Crucifix. The episode we are dealing with in this paper, therefore, occurred before this date. According to Celano the episode occurred after Francis came back from Spoleto, where he had resolved to go on a crusade in Apulia but decided to return to Assisi after a dream. It was probably the spring of 1205. Later on during the same year Francis had the encounter with the leper, and then the experience of San Damiano. Unfortunately we are not in a position to know for sure whether the crypt of San Damiano was the place where Francis would retire with his friend. What is important to know, however, is that the crypt was still existing at that time.

Few visitors to San Damiano know of a place which can also be described as a kind of crypt, or cellar, hewn in the ground below the friary and today used



### The Crypt of San Masseo

as a wine-cellar for the friars. This particular place did exist during the time of Francis, and it was probably the cellar of the house of the poor priest, called Pietro,<sup>7</sup> who resided at San Damiano. It was in this cellar that Francis hid from his father, according to the account given to us by Celano:

“The new athlete of Christ, when he heard the threats of his pursuers and learned in advance of their coming, lowered himself into a hiding place, which he had prepared for himself for his very purpose, wanting to leave room for their anger. That pit was in the house and was known to only one person. He hid in it for one month continually and scarcely dared to come out even for human needs. Whenever food was given he ate it in the secrecy of the pit, and every service was provided to him in secret. He prayed with flowing tears that the Lord would free him from the hands of those persecuting his soul and that he could favourably fulfil his fervent wishes.”<sup>8</sup>

The Latin text uses the expressions *in quamdam occultam caveam*, and *erat fovea illa in domo*.<sup>9</sup> The words *cavea* and *fovea* can correctly be translated as “pit”. In fact, this cellar lies deep underground, and one reaches it through a flight of steps going down from another cellar which lies above it, but always underground. The lower cellar truly resembles a pit dug in the rock. It provided a perfect hiding place for Francis. The mysterious person who would bring food to Francis might have been the same priest, Pietro, or else his friend who accompanied him to the crypt. In any case, I do not think that this pit was the same place where Francis would take his friend for a treasure hunt, for the simple reason that there is a difference in Latin between *crypta* (the crypt of a church) and *fovea* (a pit or underground cellar). Interesting though the hypothesis might be, we have to rule out the pit of San Damiano as the place where the young Francis would retire in solitude.



## San Masseo de Plathea

The crypt of San Masseo is found on the slope that goes down from Porta Moiano towards the Umbrian plain, in Via Petrosa. The best way to arrive is to go along Via Patrono d'Italia from Saint Mary of the Angels towards Assisi, and turn right into the Via Francesca, or Francigena, and then turn towards Assisi at the third road to your left, which leads you into Via Petrosa. From Assisi it is easier to go down straight from Porta Moiano. The church of San Masseo is nowadays in ruins, but its crypt is still intact. It used to be administered by the Franciscan community of San Damiano until 1999, but after the friars left it, the building was abandoned. Since 2010 the monastic Community of Bose is now residing in this place, which has been transformed into a centre of prayer and retreats.

According to the Assisi historian Arnaldo Fortini,<sup>10</sup> the area where the church of San Masseo now stands was called *Plathea*, according to the archives of the cathedral church of San Rufino (Arch. Catt., fasc. III, n. 12, a. 1104). During the 13<sup>th</sup> century it was called San Masseo, or San Matteo. It is mentioned in the cathedral archives as *in asio Sancti Mathei sub Assisio* (1267), or *in asio Silve Sancti Massei* (1269). The Latin term *silva* indicates that the area was wooded, just like the area around the Portiuncula.

In 1316 the procurator of the *monasterii Sancti Massei* sold to the Commune all the houses and cottages that the monastery possessed in the town of Assisi and its surroundings. The “Chronicle of Sassovivo” affirms that the church of San Masseo was built in 1091 by count Lupo di Monaldo, who in 1101 donated it to Dionysius, abbot of the Abbey of Santa Croce di Sassovivo.

The remains of the church, which was extensively damaged during the earthquake of 1832, confirm what we know regarding the period in which it was built. The only remains of the church is the semi-circular apse, built with irregular blocks of masonry. The crypt is divided into three bays separated by two rows of robust columns. It is very similar to the crypt of the Abbey of San Benedetto al Monte Subasio. The altar is made of a

single block of stone resting upon a truncated column.

In 1130 the church of San Masseo, with all its belongings, was handed over to the Abbey of Santa Croce di Sassovivo, and remained under its jurisdiction until 1503. Its farmlands were an important source of revenue for the abbey. During this period San Masseo had the title of a priory. The priory of San Masseo then passed over to the monastery and Abbey of San Pietro in Assisi, and its belongings were incorporated within this Benedictine establishment that had moved within the town walls after the destruction of the Abbey of San Benedetto al Subasio in 1399.

The church of San Masseo *de Plathea* possessed two polychrome 13<sup>th</sup> century sculptures of a Crucifix and a Virgin Mary, which are now found in the Abbey of San Pietro in Assisi.<sup>11</sup> During the time in which Francis maybe visited the place, around 1207, the prior was a certain monk from the Abbey of Monte Subasio called Angelo. Since the church was on the road leading to the leper hospital of San Lazzaro d'Arce, it sometimes served as a refuge for lepers, and Francis maybe could have visited also for this reason.

The crypt stands on the country road going down from the Moiano gate towards the Umbrian plain, leading to the Via Francesca and to other important memories of Francis' youth, like the leper hospital of San Lazzaro d'Arce with its tiny chapel of Saint Mary Magdalen, marking the spot where Francis met the leper, and the church of San Pietro della Spina in a plot of land belonging to Pietro di Bernardone, which Francis repaired during his period of conversion. It was probably along this country road that Clare of Assisi ran down to the Portiuncula on the night of Palm Sunday, 18<sup>th</sup> March 1211. The road left Assisi through

### *The apse of the Church of San Masseo*



the Moiano gate and the Galletta spring, went down by San Masseo in what is nowadays Via Petrosa and thence to the Via Francesca, from where country lanes led to the Benedictine possessions at the Portiuncula. Indeed, according to the historian Fortini, the powerful abbey of Saint Benedict on Mount Subasio possessed large tracts of land between Mount Subasio and the Umbrian plain, in the direction of Spello. The famous Via Francesca, used by the Italian merchants to travel beyond the Alps into France, passed just below Assisi in this area, close to San Masseo.

According to an ancient legend, which is common in the case of other monasteries around Assisi, including Saint Benedict of Mount Subasio, it was Saint Benedict himself who founded the church of San Masseo. We know that it was founded between 1059 and 1091. The opinion of some scholars that the crypt of San Masseo was the place where the young Francis would go to pray the Father in secret is still debated, but is a possibility. Unfortunately, as we have already said, it cannot be verified with certainty, although its closeness to Porta Moiano, just outside the walls surrounding the bishop's quarter and the old cathedral church of Santa Maria Maggiore made it ideal as a place of prayer and contemplation.

The name San Masseo is a local corruption in the Umbrian dialect of San Matteo. The church and crypt were dedicated to the Apostle and Evangelist Saint Matthew. The recent restorations undertaken by the Community of Bose have brought to their former splendour the remains of the church, especially the presbytery and apse, as well as the unique and exquisite crypt, which remains a silent reminder of the years of soul searching of Francis, who would retreat in this place asking to know God's will for him.

## NOTES

1. THOMAS OF CELANO, *Life of Saint Francis*, 6, in *Francis of Assisi. Early Documents*, Vol. I: *The Saint*, Edited by Regis J. Armstrong, J.A. Wayne Hellmann, William J. Short, New City Press, New York, London, Manila 1999, 187 [1C 6: FAED I, 187].
2. Latin text in, *Fontes Franciscani*, a cura di E. MENESTÒ, S. BRUFANI, G. CREMASCOLI, E. PAOLI, L. PELLEGRINI, S. DA CAMPAGNOLA. Apparato critico di G.M. BOCCALI, Edizioni Porziuncola, S. Maria degli Angeli 1995 (Medioevo Franciscano, testi, 2), 282.
3. *Legend of the Three Companions*, 12, in *Francis of Assisi. Early Documents*, Vol. II: *The Founder*, Edited by Regis J. Armstrong, J.A. Wayne Hellmann, William J. Short, New City Press, New York, London, Manila 2000, 74 [L3C 12: FAED II, 74].
4. *Legenda trium sociorum*, 12, in *Fontes Franciscani*, 1384: "Quem Franciscus ad quamdam cryptam iuxta Assisium saepe ducebat." The critical text of the L3C is that by Th. DESBONNETS, 'Legenda Trium Sociorum'. *Edition critique*, in *Archivum*

*Franciscanum Historicum* 67 (1974), 38-88 (introduction), 89-144 (critical text).

5. Cfr. FRANCESCO SANTUCCI, *Il priorato benedettino di San Masseo "de Plathea" nei secoli XI-XV*, in *Aspetti di vita benedettina nella storia di Assisi*. Atti del Convegno (12-13 settembre 1980), Accademia Proterziana del Subasio, Assisi 6 Ser. 5.1981, 149-169; BERNARDINO SPERANDIO, *Chiese romaniche in Umbria*, Quattroemme, Perugia 2001, 45; MARIO TOSTI, *Santuari Cristiani d'Italia*, École Française de Rome, 2003, 298; FRANCESCO GUARINO – ALBERTO MELELLI, *Abbazie Benedettine in Umbria*, Quattroemme, Perugia 2008, 261.

6. A. CRISTOFANI, *Storia della chiesa e del chiostro di S. Damiano*, ed. Ia in *Il Paese*, Perugia, 1875, ed. Ila, Assisi, 1882; L. BRACALONI, *Storia di S. Damiano in Assisi*, ed. Ia Assisi, 1919, ed. Ila Todi, 1926; M. BIGARONI, *San Damiano – Assisi: The First Church of St. Francis*, in *Franciscan Studies* 47 (1987) 45-97, with other bibliographical indications.

7. The name of the priest, Pietro, is mentioned only in *Anonymous of Perugia*, 7: FAED II, 36.

8. 1C 10: FAED I, 190-191.

9. *Fontes Franciscani*, 286.

10. ARNALDO FORTINI, *Nova Vita di San Francesco*, Vol. III, *Assisi al tempo del Santo – Gli Archivi Assisani – I Documenti*, Santa Maria degli Angeli, Assisi 1959, 83-84. English translation *Francis of Assisi*, by HELEN MOAK, The Crossroad Publishing Company, New York 1992, 17.

11. ELVIO LUNGH, *Il Crocefisso di Giunta Pisano e l'icona del Maestro di San Francesco alla Porziuncola*, Edizioni Porziuncola, Assisi 1995, 34.





“LORD, I GIVE BACK TO YOU  
THE FAMILY YOU GAVE ME” (CA 112):

# FRANCIS, THE BROTHERS, AND THE ANGUISH OF SOLITUDE

*Noel Muscat ofm*

On Saturday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 1226 at dusk Francis of Assisi died at the Portiuncula chapel in the Umbrian plain below Assisi. This solemn moment has been immortalised during the centuries by the annual celebration of the *transitus*, or passage, of Francis from his earthly life to heaven. The moving celebration recalls the final moments of the life of Francis and depicts them as an occasion of peaceful intimacy between him and the brothers, ushering the moment of the joy of eternal glory and heralding the canonisation ceremony that Pope Gregory IX was to celebrate in Assisi on 16<sup>th</sup> July 1228.

This is, at least, the idea we get when we read the accounts of the main biographers of the life of the saint during the 13<sup>th</sup> century, in particular Thomas of Celano and Saint Bonaventure. But when we compare these accounts with other narratives coming from the pen of the companions of Francis we are led to have a different idea of what was actually taking place in the sensibility of Francis during the final years of his life. Indeed, the same Thomas of Celano, who in the *Memoriale in desiderio animae*, or *Second Life of Saint Francis* (2C) written in 1246-47 depends heavily upon the documentary testimony of the saint's companions, presents a very different picture of these years from the one he had written in the *Vita sancti Francisci*, or *Life of Saint Francis* (1C) way back in 1228-29. If we consider the other sources coming directly from the companions, particularly the *Compilatio Assisiensis*, or *Assisi Compilation* and the *Speculum Perfectionis*, or *Mirror of Perfection*, we notice a very different tone in the description of the final years and months of the life of Francis and in the consideration of his relationship with the brothers. Indeed we are faced with many questions.

Is it true that Francis died a peaceful and serene death, surrounded by his intimate companions,

who wept for the loss of their founder and father? What is the true significance of the symbolic actions and words of Francis before he died, particularly the recitation of Psalm 141? Why did Francis choose this particular psalm? Going back further in time, to 1220, some months after Francis came back to Italy from the East, what made him decide to resign and hand over the government of the Order first to Peter Cattanio and then to Elias? Why is Francis so forceful in some expressions of his *Testament* when he deals with the question of poverty in the Order? What tensions arose between Francis and the ministers when he was drafting the *Later Rule* at Fonte Colombo in 1223? Why did Francis retreat to solitary places like La Verna with a handful of his most intimate companions in the last years of his life? Did Francis give in to the pressure of Cardinal Hugolino and the learned brothers regarding the issue of the literal observance of the Gospel? Above all, why did Francis become so irascible in certain moments during his final illness, and why did he recommend the Order to the Lord in his prayers?

These are just some of the many questions that come to mind when one deals with the final years of the life of Saint Francis. It is true that much has already been written on the subject. On the part of the early biographers we are familiar with the interpretation of events by the *Zelanti* and later Spiritual brothers in the Order. This fact makes us wary regarding the way we interpret certain facts as narrated by the sources coming from the pen of Francis' companions, or rather as they were later interpreted by the second and third generation of friars towards the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. It is a well-known fact that the Spirituals had every intention of portraying the inner anguish of Saint Francis in seeing his Order literally escape from his grasp towards the end of his life. Indeed these sources go even deeper and explain these facts as high treason of the evangelical ideals of

Francis and the first brothers. Any consideration of these sources, particularly the *Assisi Compilation* and the *Mirror of Perfection* is rendered rather difficult since one has to keep a healthy balance between the image of a serene and holy Francis who dies a happy death and that of a Francis who dies in anguish at seeing his dreams literally shattered by the newcomers in the Order. Our aim is that of looking at these sources and trying to understand what they want to convey to us, possibly by separating their interpretation of the history of the first century of the Order against the backdrop of Francis' life and intention from the actual facts as they occurred. We admit that it is not an easy task, and no interpretation will ever be unbiased.

The modern biographies of Saint Francis also add weight to the varying interpretations of the sources. The most widely known interpretation is obviously that of Paul Sabatier's *Vie de saint Francois d'Assise*, and his adamant conviction that the true ideals and intentions of the saint are to be looked for in the sources coming from the pen of brother Leo. Sabatier was the first one to introduce the distinction between the "official" and "non-official" sources for the life of Saint Francis, and he was definitely in favour of giving credit to the sources coming from the pen of the companions as being more faithful in their interpretation of facts. In this approach Sabatier was very close to the position of the Spirituals. Yet his biography remains one of the most inspirational contributions to the life of Francis in modern times. It was to his merit that the Franciscan question was presented in scholarly circles and continued to fuel discussions and publications for a whole century. Although we can nowadays consider the Franciscan question a thing of the past we are still faced with the dilemma of Francis' true intention. The thorough study of the sources has produced not only varying interpretations of what Francis really wanted out of his brothers, but has also contributed to look at the saint more from the human than from the spiritual aspect, considering also his family and social background, the ecclesiastical framework in which he founded the Order, and the *novitas* of his Gospel proposal. Indeed, the human aspect of Francis cannot be overlooked if we are to understand what he truly stood for and why he suffered so much towards the end of his life.

Our aim in this work will be that of discovering the true nature of Francis' inner anguish, the solitude he was bound to suffer at seeing the brothers taking a different course from the one he cherished. At the same time, however, we shall try to understand what the brothers also were feeling regarding Francis, and why they also were convinced that the way forward was bound to be slightly or radically different from the original proposal of the founder. Our aim is that of taking into consideration what the sources have to say regarding the last years and moments of Francis'

life, and present them within the context of events unfolding in the Order, which were already pointers at future choices and directions that the Order would take in the decades immediately following upon the death of the founder.

One of our first efforts will be that of looking closely at Psalm 141, *Voce mea ad Dominum clamavi*. Francis prayed this psalm before he died. A close look at the contents of this prayer might shed light on what Francis was going through during the final months and days of his life. The saint makes abundant use of this psalm, particularly in his *Office of the Passion*, and often applies it to the suffering Christ on the cross. The psalm, however, conveys more than just the image of a suffering man who is close to death. The words of the psalm speak also about abandonment, about the anguish of feeling alone even though Francis was surrounded by the brothers. I think it is very important to consider the contents of this prayer in the light of events that had unfolded during the last years of Francis' life. Although we cannot overlook the fact that Francis also welcomed death as a *sister* and asked the brothers to sing to him the *Canticle of Brother Sun*, it is also a fact that there were moments when he was feeling alone and abandoned by God just as Christ did on the cross when he prayed Psalm 21.

The next step would be that of looking at the narratives of the *transitus* of Francis as they are presented by the "official" biographers, particularly Celano and Bonaventure. These narratives are important as a documentary basis to what one can affirm about the inner feelings of Francis during the final days and hours of his life. The biographers are keen to portray a dying Francis who is surrounded by the brothers, who blesses them like the patriarch Jacob, and who celebrates with them the commandment of brotherly love in the re-enactment of the last supper and the washing of the disciples' feet. The reference to the testament of Jesus in John 13-17 is also an important element of this narrative, since it shows the intimate link between Francis and the Gospel and his full immersion in the paschal mystery of Christ. Yet these seemingly peaceful accounts have also to be seen against the other narratives coming from the pen of the companions of the saint. It is true that in the "non-official" biographies we do not find a systematic description of the events of the death of Francis. We do, however, find many instances in which the saint is presented at the concluding moments of his life accomplishing gestures which seem to be quite different from the ones described in the "official" accounts of his *transitus*. An illuminating example is the blessing that Francis reserves for his vicar, Elias. For reasons which are known, Elias disappears from Francis' side in the accounts coming from the pen of the companions.

In many of the biographies great importance is attached to Francis who renounces to the government of



the Order during the general chapter of 29<sup>th</sup> September 1220, in favour of brother Peter Cattanio, who died on 10<sup>th</sup> March 1221, and then in favour of brother Elias. Even here the sources differ in their interpretation of the event. They all agree that Francis' decision was dictated by a profound sense of humility and practicality in seeing himself not capable of handling such a large spiritual family. Indeed this could well have been the true reason, and we have every right to believe that Francis' holiness made him aware of his own human limitations and his humility prompted him to have trust in other brothers who were more capable than he was in governing the Order. Yet the sources coming from the pen of Francis' companions betray a sense of sadness on their part, since according to their way of seeing things Francis' decision to quit from the post of leader of the Order meant that the intellectual party got the upper hand. Many a time, in the "non-official" sources we have instances of brothers asking Francis to explain to them the true reason as to why he resigned from the post of leader of the Order at such a crucial moment of its early history. The answers that Francis gives can provide us with a clue to interpret the true intentions of the saint in making such a bold yet painful decision. Nor can we say that Francis never went back on what he had decided. Indeed, in the accounts of the companions, we often sense the inner anguish of the saint at seeing his Order taking a different course from the one he had envisaged.

Francis was aware that the art of governing the Order demanded specific abilities on the part of the brothers called to such a high office. He often speaks about the *officium praelationis*, which implies the office of governing (not necessarily linked with the clerical state in the early years of the Order). The sources seem to place Francis in front of the dilemma in reconciling the office of government with the vocation of the friar minor. Indeed, in various instances, the saint seems to become irritated by the fact that the brothers were considering the art of government as an office demanding a high level of intellectual formation.

Nowhere is this dilemma more evident than in the episode of the writing of the *Later Rule*. The sources that illustrate the episode of the brother ministers who come with Elias to Francis in order to protest against the writing of a rigid form of life become the symbols of the privileged position of the intelligentsia of the Order as opposed to the pure and simple lifestyle of the Gospel incarnated in the same Rule. We are aware of the underlying currents of thought and praxis that form the basis of these episodes as narrated especially by the *Compilatio Assisiensis* and the *Speculum*. At the same time, however, it is not difficult to imagine that something might have already occurred during the life of Saint Francis which made him regard this kind of friars with suspicion, if not with mistrust. Francis felt a sense of loneliness and abandonment in face of

the overwhelming opposition to his life project on the part of those who were now becoming a leading force within the Order. That is why Francis prefers to retreat in solitary places, but at the same time conserving his staunch and steadfast faithfulness to an ideal which was by now being shared by only a handful of the brothers.

Francis was profoundly aware that, in the face of so many learned brothers in the Order, he was a *simplex et idiota* (simple and unlettered). Indeed this self-description can lead one to assume that Francis possessed a very low self-esteem that ultimately made him decide to quit the post of leader of the Order. The real motive, however, seems to have been one of a profound knowledge of his own limitations, and hence more of a genuine sense of humility than of a feeling of possessing a low self-esteem. In fact, when Francis is faced with the dilemma of insistence on the part of the cultured brothers to change his ideas regarding the form of life he wanted to follow, and when he is hard pressed by Cardinal Hugolino to choose another more stable way of religious life enshrined in the venerable monastic circles, his reaction is downright decisive and smacks of contempt towards those who wanted to play down his more radical evangelical project. The end result was that, according to the sources, the same cardinal protector decided not to continue insisting on the matter. Francis becomes so forceful in certain moments that the sources do not hesitate to portray him standing up in bed when he was sick and vehemently protesting against the brothers who were upsetting the evangelical commitment of the Order, wishing to have the physical strength to denounce them and their actions in the general chapter.

In the face of these difficulties Francis must surely have felt very alone and abandoned by the majority of the brothers. Yet it was in these difficult moments that he resorted to prayer and was assured in his spirit that the Order would flourish and that Christ would never abandon the friars who remained faithful to Francis' Gospel ideals. The moments in which Francis felt more alone and isolated were the most intense moments of his faith and prayer. Indeed if we examine the prayers that, according to the sources, Francis would utter during those difficult moments, we glimpse a ray of hope that was never extinguished in the heart of Francis. Even though he might have felt dejected and isolated, Francis was aware that Christ would never abandon him and the brothers who promised to remain faithful to their radical calling. Francis let go of the leadership of the Order so that he could entrust it to Christ. Indeed his choice of the vicars was a practical way of dealing with the shortcoming of his lack of intellectual preparation, but in no way was it to replace his unwavering faith in Christ's assurance that the Order would never falter from its high calling, even though it could be reduced to a handful of faithful brothers. The prayers of Francis during this difficult

moment of his life reflect the prayers of Jesus in Gethsemane and on the cross. Jesus prayed: *Father, into your hands I commend my spirit*. Francis prayed: *Lord, into your hand I commend the family that you have given me*. According to the biographers Francis received an answer to his prayers directly from Jesus Christ. It is difficult to imagine that things were so easy for him, and maybe the idea behind the episode is to portray the power of the faith of the little poor man of Assisi. What is important is to try to understand how Francis placed absolute trust in Christ in the moments when he felt most abandoned and isolated by the same family that he had formed with so many sacrifices.

If, on one part, we shall try to demonstrate how Francis felt a profound sense of isolation and anguish towards the end of his life, at seeing his evangelical ideal not fully understood by the majority of the brothers, on the other we also have to portray his strong faith in the power of Christ and the trust he placed upon those brothers who would continue in the future to live his ideals to the full. If the sources tend to indicate these brothers in the persons of the most intimate companions of the saint in a time when the documentary evidence of Francis' life was being interpreted against the backdrop of the Order's tumultuous history in the conflict between the Community and the Spirituals and during the poverty controversy, it is also true that a grain of truth can be found in these narratives for the simple reason that they were coming from a strong tradition of faithfulness incarnated in the writings and lives of the companions of the saint.

The analysis of the documentary sources narrating the events we have just briefly outlined will have the aim of portraying events as they occurred historically and also of seeing how they had a lasting influence upon the decisions and intentions of Francis of Assisi when faced with the dilemma of illness, rejection by the brothers and crisis within the Order. This analysis can be made by a comparative study of the sources and by an effort to try to understand what underlies the expressions used by the official biographers or by the compilers who were disciples of Francis' first companions.

At the same time it is our intention to try to understand the state of mind and feelings of Francis during this difficult period of his life, with the aim of projecting these same sentiments and feelings to the future history of the Order and to our current experience of Franciscan life today. In an age when the service of authority and the *ministerium fratrum* are being revolutionised in a way that has radically changed the style of government that was the rule for centuries, and in an age when individualism and the crisis of identity have certainly left a heavy toll on the Order's framework and membership, I think it is important to discover the suffering Francis and take courage from his strong faith and commitment to the Gospel ideal.

The study of the sources leads us to consider Francis' inner feelings as quite a normal and ordinary human experience of a person who experiences an apparent failure of his efforts. It is no secret that Francis must have felt very alone during the final years of his life. He not only felt isolated, but he also decided to retreat in isolation. This heartbreaking experience is quite evident in the events we shall now consider. Our hope is that of portraying also the saint's unwavering hope in coping with a new situation in which his faith in the Lord was put to test, but never waned.

In the experience of fraternity Francis becomes emblematic. The story of a charismatic man whose dreams and achievements were not shared by the majority is a story that has been repeated along the history of the Order. It was in the suffering of isolation and abandonment that the best qualities of Francis came forth, inspiring countless generations of brothers, particularly during moments of crisis in the Order. From the experience of suffering and isolation was born a new thrust at reform and rebirth of the Gospel inspiration of Francis, handed down by his companions to the handful of brothers who meticulously set down to put the memories of the companions in writing. These sources were the inspiration of the subsequent reforms in the Order.

Indeed one can describe Francis as a genius who was misunderstood by the majority of those who wanted to share his ideals. His desire to become a *novellus pazzus* for Christ accompanied him during his entire life, singling him out as unique in so many ways. His vision inspired many, but not in the way he had imagined at the very beginning. Yet the original inspiration of Francis, misunderstood in his solitude and suffering, remains as strong as ever, and continues to enlighten the hearts and minds of those brothers who, like Francis, have experienced the anguish of solitude and the courage to go forward in their endeavour to work in favour of those same brothers who misunderstand them.





## Faithful to the Spirit, through Francis and Clare

“

*Without breaking our covenant with a living past, because moving ourselves around without any roots creates a journey with neither wisdom nor horizon, it is still necessary to call a halt in our journey, to give ourselves a time of silence, reflection and personal and fraternal discernment, in order to detect the hard soil (cf. 1R 22, 10-26) of our heart, even in the monasteries: activism, individualism, appropriation, fixation, nostalgia, agitation, distraction, the search for security, ...; and in order to appreciate adequately our brothers and sisters, companions on the journey: their evangelical freedom, joy, a sense of belonging, openness, living sine proprio ... During my visits to the monasteries of the OSC and the entities of the OFM, I am frequently asked about new instruments and methods to make our life more contemporary and attractive. I ask myself, and I ask you: Is it a question only of methods and new strategies, or is it a question of revisiting the essential elements of our life, and making radical choices? If we note today a certain indifference toward consecrated life and toward our Franciscan/Clarian life, it may be because we are losing the ability to be prophetic signs. The anniversary of the foundation of your Order, like the anniversary of the founding of our Order which we just celebrated three years ago, demands that we live today our Form of Life and respond to the signs of the times today, remaining faithful to that which the Spirit, through Francis and Clare, has given as a gift to the Brothers and Sisters and, through them, to the Church and the world. This does not mean a conformist adaptation of our Form of Life to what is fashionable - marry fashion and you will soon be widowed, an Eastern proverb says but to respond to the appeals that come to us from the world incarnating the Gospel, from the centre of the experience of God, in the form of expropriation/radical freedom - living sine proprio as we have professed - and in universal fraternity.*

José Rodríguez Carballo ofm  
Minister General

Letter "Look always to your beginning" for the feast of  
St. Clare of Assisi

11<sup>th</sup> August 2012

”

## Abbreviations

### Writings of St. Francis

Adm	Admonitiones.
CantAudPov	Cantico Audite Poverelle.
CantSol	Canticum fratris Solis.
LaudDei	Laudes Dei Altissimi.
BenLeo	Benedictio fratri Leoni data.
EpAnt	Epistola ad sanctum Antonium.
EpCler I	Epistola ad Clericos (Redactio prior).
EpCler II	Epistola ad Clericos (Red. posterior).
EpCust I	Epistola ad Custodes I.
EpCust II	Epistola ad Custodes II.
EpFid I	Epistola ad Fideles I.
EpFid II	Epistola ad Fideles II.
EpLeo	Epistola ad fratrem Leonem.
EpMin	Epistola ad Ministrum.
EpOrd	Epistola toti Ordini missa.
EpRect	Epistola ad populorum rectores.
ExhLD	Exhortatio ad Laudem Dei.
ExpPat	Expositio in Pater noster.
FormViv	Forma vivendi sanctae Clarae data.
Fragm	Fragmenta alterius RegulaeNB.
LaudHor	Laudes ad omnes horas dicendae.
OffPass	Officium Passionis Domini.
OrCruc	Oratio ante crucifixum.
RegB	Regula bullata.
RegNB	Regula non bullata.
RegEr	Regula pro eremitoriis data.
SalBMV	Salutatio beatae Mariae Virginis.
SalVirt	Salutatio virtutum.
Test	Testamentum.
UltVol	Ultima voluntas S. Clarae scripta.

### Sources for the Life of St. Francis

1C	Tommaso da Celano, Vita Sancti Francisci.
LCh	Celano, Legenda ad usum chori.
2C	Celano, Memoriale in Desiderio Animae.
3C	Celano, Tractatus de Miraculis S. Francisci.
LJS	Julian of Speyer, Vita Sancti Francisci.
OR	Officium Rhythmicum S. Francisci.
AP	Anonimo Perugino.
L3C	Leggenda dei Tre Compagni.
CA	Compilatio Assisiensis.
LMj	S. Bonaventura, Legenda Maior S. Francisci.
LMn	S. Bonaventura, Legenda minor S. Francisci.
SP	Speculum Perfectionis.
SC	Sacrum commercium S. Francisci.
ABF	Actus Beati Francisci et Sociorum Eius.
Fior	Fioretti di San Francesco.

### Sources for the Life of St. Clare

BICl	Blessing of St. Clare.
1-4LAg	Letters to St. Agnes of Prague..
LCI	Legend of St. Clare.
PC	Acts of the Process of Canonization.
PrPov	Privilege of Poverty.
RegCl	Rule of St. Clare.
TestCl	Testament of St. Clare.

**Editor: Noel Muscat OFM**

All correspondence should be  
addressed to  
[muscatnoel@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:muscatnoel@yahoo.co.uk)



**Cover picture:**

Portal of the Cathedral of San Rufino, Assisi