

5. The facsimile in Millares shows an indecipherable entry on March 31, which he reads as *Sci (Ser)vi(tani)*. No other kalendar places a saint on this day ; but B and C have '*Requievit Dominus*'.

6. I.e. Fructuosus of Braga, ob. c. 665.

7. The fact that this saint appears in the Carmona fragment seems, on Dom Serrano's theory, quite inexplicable.

8. I.e. Eugenius II of Toledo, ob. 636.

9. Note 7 applies equally here.

10. The boy-martyr of Cordova, put to death by Abderrahman III in 925. Within a decade of his death several churches were dedicated to him and a Mass composed in his honour, and about 966 his relics were brought to León. In 1062 the relics of Isidore of Seville were also translated to León, and the fact that no commemoration of this has been inserted in the Kalendar (as in AEF, on Dec. 22) may indicate that the additions were made between the two dates ; anyhow it supports the hypothesis of a date earlier than 1069 for the Antiphoner.

11. The Antiphoner retains the proper for S. Cucufas, but prefaces it with the note : '*Officium sancti Cucufati (sic) erit dimittendum propter officium sancti Iacobi quod de sanctis dicitur*' (fol. 223) ; and on a blank page at the beginning (fol. 5) a later hand has inserted the *Sacrificium in diem Sci. Iacobi apostoli, VIII Kal. Agusti*. G is the only other Spanish kalendar which commemorates S. James on this day.

12. The fact that S. Lawrence has his proper in the Antiphoner makes it difficult to regard the entry here as an interpolation. The same applies to S. Genesis (Aug. 25) and to SS. Vincent, Sabina, and Christeta (Oct. 28).

13. The absence of the proper for the Assumption suggests that this entry is an interpolation, although Dom Serrano does not so regard it.

14. The dedication of the basilica of S. Leocadia in Toledo took place in 618. The interesting point is that the Antiphoner, at the end of the Mass of S. Leocadia, adds an antiphon '*Ad sepulcrum*', which can only mean that its prototype belonged to that church.

15. This must be meant for S. Marcellus.

W. S. PORTER.

THE *EXORDIUM MAGNUM CISTERCIENSE*

It might conceivably be argued that the *Exordium Magnum* does not rank among the primary authorities for the early history of the Cistercian Order ; for a very small portion of it can have been written before the year 1186. It records (*Dist. ii 33*) the death of Peter Monoculus, eighth Abbot of Clairvaux, which, as we learn from the *Chronicon Clarevallense*, occurred in that year.

Nor, we may allow, can it rightly be said that the work is, in any very distinctive sense, a chronicle of events. Events *are* chronicled, but rather as the basis of a theme, an apologetic theme comprehensive of issues some of which are broader far than that raised by the foundation of Cîteaux; although every issue is viewed in the light of principles enunciated at Cîteaux and emphasized arrestingly by the life lived at Clairvaux. No plea is urged which is not evidently that of a son of Clairvaux, of a Bernardine *jusqu'au cou*.

The writer begins with a justification of *monastica religio*. He finds it upon the Gospel-precept: *Poenitentiam agite*, with its *verbum consolatorium*: *Appropinquabit enim regnum coelorum*. How much less severe is this than the *lex talionis* of Moses! Our Lord himself has given us the *formula perfectae poenitentiae*: *Si vis perfectus esse, vade, vende omnia quae habes, et da pauperibus, et veni, sequere post me*; and then—the interpretation of the *verbum consolatorium*—*habebis thesauros in coelo* (*Dist. i 1*). He finds this principle exemplified, a little crudely perhaps, in the *omnia communia* of the primitive Church (*Dist. i 2*). Mother Church, doubtless, has in view of the *imperfectorum multitudo* relaxed this application of the principle; yet from that day to this *nunquam defuerunt viri virtutum*, such as Anthony, Pachomius, Basil, Macarius, and Paphnutius, *quorum prior Antonius* (*Dist. i 3*). The enthusiasm for St Anthony and for the monks of Egypt recalls words used by St Bernard on several occasions (*Apol. ix 19 and 23*; *Ep. i 11*).

But the grace of God, which gave these fathers to the East, gave to the West one of whom it may be said that *quidquid Oriens in diversis patribus divisit chrismatibus habere se gaudet, hoc totum in uno sanctissimo patre suo Benedicto, justorum omnium spiritu pleno, se possidere Occidens non immerito gloriatur* (*Dist. i 4*). After referring to the mission of St Maurus to Gaul by St Benedict on the invitation of the Bishop of Le-Mans (*Dist. i 5*)—now known to be historically doubtful—the author writes of Cluny, beginning with St Odo, the second abbot (927–942). He emphasizes the fact that this great monastic reformer *ad tantum sanctitatis apicem excrevit, ut ordinem monasticum temporibus suis omnino in praeeptis ruentem, secundum gratiam sibi a Domino collatam, per omnia in antiquum sacrae religionis vigorem restauraverit*. He refers to his activities in Italy as well as in Gaul, probably having in mind the work which he undertook (c. 930) in the vicinity of the Holy City at the instigation of Alberic Prince of the Romans, as well as the reformation which he effected at Monte Cassino at about the same date (Hugon. *Destructio Monast. Farfens. 7 ap. M. G. H. xi 535 sq.* Cf. Joann. *Vita Odon. ii 23*). He tells the story of the appearance of St Benedict to the porter of Fleury (St Benoît-sur-Loire), and of his sending to the monks of that house—as he bade the porter tell them

that he would do—*virum secundum cor meum de Aquitania, quatenus peruersos ipsos corripiat, et Ordinis disciplinam in hoc monasterio restauret*—meaning St Odo. He extols not only Cluny, but also the *monasterium de quo pater Odo cum fratribus suis Cluniacum secessit*—which would be Baume-les-Messieurs, where at the age of thirty he was professed and made master of the *schola* in 909, one year before the foundation of Cluny (*Dist.* i 6. Cf. Mabill. *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* vii *Saec.* v 126 sq.).

Of St Berno, the founder of Gigny, of Massy, of Bourg-Duix, and of Cluny, the reformer of St Martin-d'Autun, of Vézelay, of Souvigny, and of Baume-les-Messieurs, he makes no mention. What, one wonders, is the meaning of this omission? He tells, recording however no names, of two miracles wrought at Cluny, and refers appreciatively to St Majolus and St Odilo, acknowledging gratefully the institution of the *Dies Fidelium Animarum* among the Cluniacs, which we know to have been due to St Odilo (*Dist.* i 7 and 8). St Hugh, who ruled the *Caput Ordinis* as sixth abbot from 1049 to 1109, he evidently regards as the exponent of the Cluniac tradition at its best; but, alas, with him the glory departed. *Quid agimus quod negligentia quae, proh dolor! in ipsa quoque religiosorum conversatione deprehenditur, ad vitia tam proclivis est?* Monks have not been careful to avoid the *complexus* of this *meretrix negligentia*, and naturally have been begotten *voluptas* and *vanitas*, two daughters worse than their mother. Let who will read the *Apologia* of St Bernard, and he may learn of the lapse of Cluniac *religio*. Once *perfectissima* it has become *miserrima, quam hodie oculis nostris cernimus, dissolutionem replicando et inculcando*. Let our effort be, he exclaims—we who *per gratiam Dei in renovato et ad tramitem veritatis per Cistercienses patres correcto monastico Ordine Domino militamus*—warned by the ruin of others, to wash our hands in the blood of sinners, and to remember St Benedict's precept in the Rule to flee *negligentia* and *oblivio*. The word *negligentia* occurs four times in the Rule, and always *ad hoc*; the word *oblivio* nowhere; presumably the writer has in mind the general tenor of its teaching.

What has so far been offered is an apology for the *Cisterciense Institutum* as at the time representing the true norm of *monastica religio*, itself a thing founded upon the essential Gospel-precept: *Poenitentiam agite* and practised by *virii virtutum* from the very first. At this point the writer begins his story of the foundation of Cîteaux. Broadly speaking it is worth while for the benefit of future generations *diligentiam describere qualiter Cisterciensis Ordo sumpserit exordium*; evidently he regards existing records as inadequate. He gets his information *partim per litterarum monumenta* handed down by the *virii sancti, qui ab initio sacrae hujus religionis auctores exstitere*—this in the main would be the

Exordium Parvum—*partim vero majorum relatione*; as we shall presently see, he is conscious of possessing special qualifications due to intercourse with these *majores* in his early days. But he is not merely motivated by *devotio et utilitas rerum*; he *does* desire that the *filii degeneres* of his times should blush to think *quam nobili regum mamilla lactati sint*—plainly in his view the Order was not altogether what it once had been—yet this is not all; *necessitas nonnulla compellit*. A definite charge was being brought against the first fathers of Cîteaux. The Black Monks, especially those of Germany, wherever and in whatever hearing they can, *sacro Ordini nostro derogare non cessant, asserentes sanctos patres nostros cum scandalo et inobedientia contra voluntatem abbatis sui de Molismensi coenobio egressos fuisse*. This *impudens mendacium* he will refute, for his text, *rem gestam enucleatius pandens*, will be a plain statement of what actually happened.

Here it may be remarked that the evidence of the *Exordium Parvum*, a document credited by its acceptance by Calixtus II at Saulieu in 1119 as the *exposé historique* of the origin of the Order (Guignard, *Mon. prim. de la règle Cisterc.* xxx), goes to shew that it was for his adherence to his abbot, St Robert, in seceding from Molesme that St Alberic *multa opprobria, carcerem et verbera perpessus fuerat* (*Exord. Parv.* ix). We may perhaps recognize in William of Malmesbury's depreciation of St Robert as compared with St Stephen and in his ascription of the foundation of the Order to the year 1119—that in which St Stephen appeared before Calixtus at Saulieu—some trace of this *impudens mendacium* (*De Gest. Reg. Angl. iv. De Cisterc.*); but probably within fifty years after the last words of the *Exordium Magnum* were written it had been generally dissipated, for the reference to the foundation of Cîteaux in the *Aurea Legenda* (vii) represents the Abbot of Molesme as himself seceding to Cîteaux with twenty-one of his monks.

In spite of his regretful admission of the existence in his day of *filii degeneres* we cannot think that the writer believed them to be numerous, for he insists upon the *sacrae religionis vigor* prevailing not only in the greater, but in the lesser houses of the Order *in diversis partibus*, upon the number of those who, *spontaneae tribulationis angustia decocti*, have passed to the land of the living *absque igne purgatorio, quod quidem*—a foolish boast, we may perhaps think—*in alio genere hominum rarissimum est*. He cannot tell the story of them all, but after he has *ad exhilarandum devotos et ad reprimendum detractores falsiloquos* described the *exordium* of the Order, he will say something briefly of certain Abbots of Cîteaux and of Clairvaux (*Dist.* i 10).

Accordingly we are given records of the first five Abbots of Cîteaux, ending with that of Raynald who died during the lifetime of St Bernard at the close of the year 1150 (*Manric. Annal. Cisterc.* ii 176). The

longest record is that of St Stephen. The records of the first eight Abbots of Clairvaux are given in *Distinctio* ii. In the last *Caput* (33) we read, as has been said, the record of Peter Monoculus who died in 1186; the first twenty *Capita* contain that of St Bernard, and in the printed editions of Mabillon and Migne form, together with certain *excerpta* from *Distinctiones* i, iv, and vi, what is presented as the Seventh Book of the *Vita Prima*. *Distinctio* iii is in the main concerned with St Bernard's brother Gerard, with Humbert, first Abbot of Igny, with Guericus, second Abbot of the same house, with Archbishop Eskil the Dane who became a monk of Clairvaux, with Gunnar the Sardinian Prince who did the like, and with other less familiar persons. *Distinctio* iv deals in a similar manner with various comparatively obscure monks and *conversi* of Clairvaux. The tone of the writer becomes increasingly edifying and pragmatic, until in *Distinctio* v we find ourselves in the full flood of monastic ethics, being warned of the sins of *proprietas*, ambition, disobedience, and the rest. There is a long disquisition on the duties of the confessor; and the *Distinctio* concludes with an exposure of the snares of nepotism. The sixth *Distinctio* is yet more definitely didactic, dealing as it does with such matters as the Sacrament of the Altar, penance, and prayer for the dead. In fine these last two *Distinctiones* constitute something of a treatise on moral theology in various of its monastic aspects. The illustrations in them are, we feel, in large measure taken from Clairvaux, although not always explicitly so; but other houses, both in France, Germany, and even in Italy, are mentioned, and one is taken from the Abbey of Schönau (v 10), a Cistercian house in the diocese of Mainz, illustrious as associated with St Hildegarde (Cf. Caesar. Heist. *Dial. Mirac.* i 40). Perhaps the most significant references in them are those to Eberbach (v 10 and 17), the ninth daughter of Clairvaux, founded in 1131. The writer selects Eberbach in order to illustrate that wide-spread extension of the Cistercians *ubique terrarum* for which St Bernard himself, *missis fratribus*, was personally responsible. He speaks in glowing terms of its excellence, as a house which *celsitudinem reverendae matris suae usque hodie aemulatur, as in cunctis Germaniarum provinciis velut speciale religionis et honestatis speculum*; its very site is a glory, *haud procul a ripa Rheni magni et inter omnes praecipui fluminis*. The touch of local enthusiasm is suggestive; but it is not forced; and there is nothing to lead the reader to suppose that a brief is held for Eberbach, or for any other particular house of the Order.

Nevertheless, taking the *Exordium* as a whole and presuming it to be the work of one mind, we are conscious that the writer is making some apology for himself as a reliable recorder of facts. Even supposing

a large proportion of the didactic material to have been supplied by another or by others—which is perhaps not impossible—the writer would seem to claim that he is telling the true story of the origins of the Order, justifying by the way its amazing strictness—which was evidently still a stumbling-block, in particular to the Black Monks—but always by an appeal to history from the days of our Lord to those of St Hugh of Cluny, thus finally driving the Cluniac detractors back, firmly though seductively, to the point at issue between the two Orders by an appeal to their own great saint of days but a century ago. The reproach, he feels, may be possible that he takes scanty account of the affairs of Cîteaux and devotes himself with some partiality to a record of what has been done at Clairvaux—the implication being perhaps that, as compared with Cîteaux, Clairvaux was not true to type, or again, that there were certain discreditable features connected with the foundation of Cîteaux which he would gloze over; of this latter point something will presently be said. To one who would voice this reproach his reply would be: *Noverit nos ut Ecclesiae Claraevallis alumnos nostrorum seniorum sacra studia familiarius et efficacius investigare potuisse* (*Dist.* i 10). This plea which the writer makes at the outset he reiterates at the conclusion, by referring to himself as *in Claraevallensi disciplina claustralibus et sacri Ordinis observantiis subditi* (*Dist.* vi 9). In the same context he again expresses his twofold purpose in writing: *primo quidem ut fratribus nostris . . . de initio Ordinis nostri certam notitiam traderemus . . . secundo vero ut monachis Nigri Ordinis calumniandi occasionem tolleremus*. He proceeds to specify this calumny; it is the same *impudens mendacium*, to the effect that the seceders left Molesme *absque licentia abbatis sui*, which he has already refuted in *Distinctio* i 10.

But there are grounds for the belief that the author was a far more honest historian even than the text of his work as reproduced by Migne (*P. L.* clxxxv 995 sqq.) from Tissier's edition (*Biblioth. PP. Cisterc.* i 13 sqq.) might lead us to suppose. Tissier gives, he tells us, the text of a MS from Foigny, a house founded in 1121 as the third daughter of Clairvaux, now in the Bibliothèque Municipale at Laon, where it is numbered 331. He ascribes the authorship of the work to a Clairvaux monk by name Conrad, who from 1213 to 1226 was fifth Abbot of Eberbach (*Gall. Christ.* v 656). The internal evidence is not inconsistent with such a supposition; the *Exordium* might well have been begun at Clairvaux and finished at Eberbach; moreover the tone of the earlier portion is that of one in subjection; of the later that of one in authority. But Tissier has external evidence also, upon which to found his opinion. The script of the Foigny MS might be conjectured to be *c.* 1225. Tissier quotes from it the following words:

Istum librum composuit quidam abbas Conradus nomine Everbaccensis cenobii qui fuit monachus Clarevallis. A reference to the MS reveals in the margin at the top of folio 4 *verso*, immediately above the words: *Incipit prologus*, in a hand later, we are disposed to think, by something like a century than the rest of the MS, the statement noted by Tissier—but so far only as the word *cenobii*, which is itself mutilated, having been cut obliquely across its last two letters since Tissier collated the MS for his edition of 1660. The words which follow have disappeared.

But this is not the most serious mutilation which, taking Tissier's statement as to the derivation of his text to be true, has occurred since his day. One entire folio has been cut out at the end, and the last words of *Distinctio* vi in the MS are: *Quapropter ne forte post negligentie et torporis. . .* The place may be recognized in Migne (*P. L.* clxxxv col. 452 l. 31), where however *negligentiam* is read for the *negligentie* of the MS.

And there is yet more to be said on the matter of mutilation. If we consider carefully the last words of *Distinctio* i 14 and the first words of *Distinctio* i 15 we are perturbed by a certain lack of reasonable continuity, thus: *Quorum* (sc. *Molismensium monachorum*) *importunitate dominus Papa mandavit legato suo . . . ut, si fieri posset, idem abbas* (sc. *Robertus*) *reverteretur, et monachi eremum diligentes in pace consisterent*, is immediately followed by: *Post decessum sui pastoris Cisterciensis Ecclesia . . . convenit de electione abbatis sine personarum acceptione tractatura. Et . . . elegerunt virum bonum nomine Stephanum.* Evidently the deceased *pastor* was St Alberic. Migne (*Nota ap. loc. cit.*), as before him had Manriquez (*Annal. Cisterc. ii an. 1106*) and Tissier (*op. cit., loc. cit.*), recognized this; but none of them seems to have suspected that the *lacuna* represented more than the omission of the story of St Alberic.

Dom Tiburce Hümpfner, of the Cistercian Abbey of Zircz in Hungary, has carefully collated in the library of the University of Innsbrück a MS of the *Exordium Magnum* from the Abbey of Stams—a Cistercian house about half-way between Innsbrück and Landeck—numbered 25. It is of the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. Of all known MSS this alone supplies the missing matter; and it is found not only to record St Alberic's rule at Cîteaux, but with an engaging frankness to provide details of St Robert's return to Molesme, which might well be thought to reflect unfavourably upon the *exordium* of the Order at this early stage. This discovery of evidence unknown to Manriquez, Tissier, and Migne, considerably raises the author in the scale of historical credibility; incidentally it would seem to date the compilation of the record earlier than 1222. To quote a letter from Dom Tiburce Hümpfner—who deals with the whole question in his

Der bisher vermisste Teil des Exordium Magnum—addressed to the present writer : *Cistercienses aegre ferebant recessum S. Roberti ad Molis-menses, et quomodo locuti sint de hac re ex hoc textu videre licet. S. Robertus anno 1222 in catalogum Sanctorum relatus est, et post canonisationem S. Roberti Cistercienses hanc partem Exordii Magni quae satis sinistre loquebatur de eo, eliminarunt.* But, assuming the Innsbrück MS to be of the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, its *textus integer* represents the persistence in some quarters of 'the whole truth' for at least seventy-five years after the canonization of St Robert.

WATKIN WILLIAMS.

JULIUS AFRICANUS AND THE LIBRARY OF THE PANTHEON

I

THE reign of Alexander Severus, A.D. 222–235, was one of the happiest in Roman history and marked the end of the age of the Antonines. But it is imperfectly recorded. Dio Cassius deserts us in A.D. 229 after being represented by a few fragments in addition to the epitome. We are reduced to the pages of Herodian and the gossip-mongers of the *Historia Augusta*, so that the modern historian of the empire has often to state problems rather than to record facts.

Yet, when we turn to the vast area of events which lie beyond the scope of the court and of military organization, the outlook changes. The liberty and the toleration which characterized the legal administration of the empire culminated in the first peace of the church. Nor was the church unrepresented at court. From a casual source, *P. Oxy.* iii 412, we learn that Julius Africanus was the head of the library in the Pantheon. ἡρχιτεκτόνησα is to be taken in a wider application than the term 'architect' suggests. The Roman, like the Greek, architect was the director of works. Even the term engineer is scarcely wide enough. And such a position at court was associated with the office of imperial secretary. Vestinus, the director of the libraries at Rome, was also the secretary of Hadrian, *C.I.G.* iii 5900, and this precedent throws light upon Africanus.

But Africanus stands out, by his practical and scientific attainments, above his predecessors. After military service under Septimius Severus he became the prefect, *τοπάρχης*, of Emmaus (Nicopolis) one of the ten subdivisions of Palestine, and was sent on a mission to Elagabalus to plead the interests of his city. It seems probable that his visit to Rome was followed by the appointment to the librarianship of the Pantheon.