

Drew University Graduate School - Madison, New Jersey

A MEDIEVAL TREATISE ON GALATIANS 2: 11-14 :

PETER OF AILLY (1350-1420)·

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in the Graduate School of Drew University

by

Karlfried Fröhlich

1961

A Medieval Treatise On Galatians 2: 11-14

Pierre d'Ailly (1350-1420)

Preface

Portrait

Part I: Introduction

A. The Author

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Pierre d'Ailly's place in history | 6 |
| 2. The academic career | 11 |
| 3. Ailly and the Schism | 20 |

B. The Setting

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. The exegetical situation | 27 |
| 2. The interpretation of Galatians 2:11-14 | |
| a. Earliest commentation | 34 |
| b. Jerome and Augustine | 39 |
| c. Medieval echoes | 43 |
| d. Conciliarist literature | 47 |
| e. Galatians 2:11-14 in the work of Ailly | 51 |

Part II: The Treatise

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. The Manuscript | 61 |
| 2. Short Analysis of the Treatise | 62 |
| 3. The Question of the Date of Writing | 64 |
| 4. The Latin Text from MS Paris nat.lat. 3122 | 67 |
| 5. An English Translation | 74 |

Bibliography

- | | |
|---------------|----|
| Books | 81 |
| Articles | 90 |
| Abbreviations | 94 |

**A MEDIEVAL TREATISE ON GALATIANS 2:11-14:
PIERRE D'AILLY (1350-1420)**

Karlfried Froehlich

1961

To say anything definite about a personality of fifteenth century Church history would be presumptuous at the present state of historical research. The field is not yet ripe for the harvest. Many formative aspects of religious and intellectual life of the period have just begun to draw the attention of scholars. This is not only true for the rich canonistic sources after the rise of Bologna, the *Decretum* and its commentators, which were only recently discovered as one of the most important formative powers for the religious movements of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries,¹ but even more so for the contributions in the biblical field which are still widely left out of consideration in the approach to the epoch.² Any work in the area, therefore, is handicapped by the difficulties created by the inadequate picture of so many single facts out of which the comprehensive view arises.

This also proves to be true in the case of our investigation. To be sure, we are not left completely on our own in approaching the figure of Pierre d'Ailly. Apart from the printed sources of former centuries, there are two modern biographies which help in preparing the way. The one by Paul Tschackert,³ though considerably older, shows a much deeper understanding of the

¹ See Brian Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory*, 1955, a study continuing the work of Henri-Xavier Arquillière, Victor Martin, Walter Ullmann and others. (abbr.: Tierney).

² Tierney, p. 7, only mentions "the political theorist" and the "church historian" as those interested in the conciliar doctrines as "an important field of study," leaving out the exegete who traces the history of biblical interpretation.

³ Paul Tschackert, *Peter von Ailli (Petrus de Alliaco). Zur Geschichte des grossen abendländischen Schismas und der Reformconcilien von Pisa und Constanz*, Gotha, 1877. (abbr.: Tschackert).

theological and historical aspects than the busy work by Louis Salembier⁴ which is rich in information but does not conceal its narrow apologetic aim—the "rehabilitation of a French compatriot who is wrongly claimed by the Protestants to be one of their own." Unfortunately, there is no reliable bibliography of Ailly's works as yet. Tschackert's attempt to give an inventory of all the works he could find was not more than a first step. Even Salembier's different lists,⁵ though increasing our knowledge about the writings of the Cardinal considerably, lack the incorporation of the results of recent research and therefore remain insufficient. Bernhard Meller who, in 1954, contributed a valuable thesis on Ailly's "Erkenntnislehre"⁶ corrected Salembier only occasionally, and his list does not even present the minimum of usefulness since it mentions only the titles of the works. Thus, the most elementary task, the result of which could serve as the basis for a critical edition—a dream as old as the Cardinal himself⁷—vantage point still is left undone. It is all the more important, then, that detailed studies in the teaching of Pierre d'Ailly and other outstanding figures of the time be undertaken in order to provide a platform upon which the more comprehensive task of interpreting the whole of their "life and times" can be approached. The contribution which each such study provides to a more comprehensive picture is obvious enough. New horizons open up with almost every step. It is hoped that the present study may suggest some of these wider outlooks from a very limited vantage point into a broad field of amazing newness to the Protestant historian who often still feels that the generation of his "fathers" starts in the sixteenth century.

⁴ Louis Salembier, *Le cardinal Pierre d'Ailly, chancelier de l'université de Paris, évêque du Puys et de Cambrai 1350-1420*, Lille, 1931. (abbr.: Salembier).

⁵ Salembier's first bibliographical attempts list 154 titles: "A propos de Pierre d'Ailly, évêque de Cambrai. Biographie et bibliographie" (*Société d'émulation de Cambrai. Memoriales*, vol. 64, 1909, pp. 99-126), and: *Bibliographie des oeuvres du Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly*, Besançon, 1909. They are supplemented in his articles on Ailly in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. 1, 1912, pp. 652f; and *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques*, vol. 1, 1912, pp. 1154ff. The final list in the above-quoted work (note 4) contains 174 titles.

⁶ Bernhard Meller, *Studien zur Erkenntnislehre des Peter Ailli. Mit einem Anhang: Aillis Traktat De materia concilii generalis*, Freiburg i.Br., 1954. A list of Ailly's works here on pp. XV-XIX. (abbr.: Meller).

⁷ Louis Salembier in: *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. 1, 1912, p. 649. See also the complaint about the lack of a modern critical edition by Ludger Meier (*Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 43, 1950), p. 57.



PART I : INTRODUCTION

A. The Author

1. Pierre d'Ailly's Place in History

Perhaps the most valuable feature of Jacques Lenfant's prolific *Histoire du Concile de Pise*, published in 1731,⁸ is the selection of portrait engravings supplementing the description of important personalities of the time. Among these illustrations, we find a fascinating portrait of Pierre d'Ailly. It is an 18th century etching, but the artist may well have used a contemporary painting as its source.⁹

It presents the great cardinal more vividly than any wordy description could. We see a dignified grandseigneur, well adjusted and familiar with the refined and decadent culture in which he moved. The cardinal's cap fits extremely well, and the broad ermine, costly and exquisite, seems to belong. The courts of ecclesiastical and secular princes were his world. We see a bold face with a sharply cut cheek line, high brows and an overlong, overthin nose. This is the "Eagle of France", the "indefatigable hammer of all heresies", with unconditioned zeal devoted to his task, no smoothness mitigating the edges, no warmth transforming the loneliness of the wide-open eyes.

It is also the intelligent face of the scholar, marked with the wisdom and learning of his time. The high furrowed brow, the curving of the wings of the nose indicate a keen and quick mind. And yet, this "wisdom" seems to have a deeper dimension. The sceptical mouth, both corners pulled down as if in contempt of all the world, matches the penetrating eyes, full of sorrow and concern. There is no humorous sidelight as we often find it in the portraits of the humanists. An ascetical mood dominates the expression. It is the burden of a frightening time that makes the observer freeze in the presence of so little hope on a human face. The fire of these eyes does not burn for an exciting future, for progress, for a message. (Pierre d'Ailly has been accused of not

⁸ Jacques Lenfant, *Histoire du Concile de Pise*, Utrecht, 1731. I was able to use a copy extant at Rose Memorial Library, Drew University. (abbr.: Lenfant).

⁹ Material for an iconography of Ailly in Salembier, pp. 137. 138f, and Tschackert, pp. 76. 168. 301 n.4.

having much of an eschatology). Here is no fiery prophet, nor even the inspiration of a deeper faith. This man "knows" the course of this world, and knowing is trapped in it. He is resigned and disappointed, and yet he is working at his task, the task of a thankless in-between. The atmosphere of his portrait is perfectly caught in the lines that are written on his tombstone:

Mors rapuit Petrum; petram subiit putre corpus,
 Sed petram Christum spiritus ipse petit.
 Quisquis ades precibus fer opes semperque memento
 Quod praeter mores omnia morte cadunt.
 Nam quid amor regum, quid opes, quid gloria darent
 Aspicias; haec aderant tunc mihi; nunc abeunt.
 (cf. Lenfant II, 57).

Should we say: a perfect picture of late medieval ecclesial spirituality in all its dignity and vanity? Pierre d'Ailly may stand as a symbol of much of the antinomies of late medieval people which for us appear utterly irreconcilable: culture and vulgarity, faith and superstition, genius and stupidity, avantgardism and reactionism. But he certainly is more. As a theologian and cardinal, as church politician, and even as a natural scientist, he himself has made history, and his personality in all its limitations has deeply influenced his generation and those following him.

The wide range of this influence is astonishing. It seems strange, but actually he even had a share in the discovery of America. When, on August 13, 1410, he finished his comprehensive but not very original geographical work *Imago Mundi*,¹⁰ he could not anticipate that a few decades later, this book would form part of the small hand library which Christopher Columbus had with him on his various westward voyages including that memorable trip in 1492 when he discovered a new continent.¹¹ He himself witnessed to the important influence which Ailly had on his plan to find the seaway west to India: Columbus' personal copy with marginal notes in his own hand is still extant at the *Bibliotheca Colombiana* in Sevilla.¹² The eighth chapter treats the spheric form of the earth. Under the influence of the fabulous travel reports from the East, from India, and from Mongolia, Ailly as well as his contemporaries believed that the Asian continent extended much farther east than it actually does, and thus came to the conclusion that only a small strip of ocean

¹⁰ See Tschackert, pp. 333ff.

¹¹ William Eleroy Curtis, *The Authentic Letters of Columbus*, Chicago, 1895, p. 115.

¹² Salembier, in: *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. 1, 1912, p. 644. Here, reference is made to Henry Harisse, *Excerpta Colombiana*, Paris, 1887, where the copy is described.

separated the West coast of Europe from "India's" East coast. "This ocean actually can be crossed by ship in very few days provided the wind is favorable."¹³ We must add, however, that even these speculations were not the fruit of Ailly's own imagination. *More saeculi*, the entire *Imago* was more or less a compilation in which he drew not only on ancient sources such as Aristotle, Pliny and Seneca, but most heavily upon Roger Bacon's *Opus majus* to which credit for most of Ailly's "ideas" must be given, including the short sea way West. Ailly's performance in the field of natural sciences no doubt was poor and not very original. His actual geographical knowledge was superficial. His astronomy was ridiculed by Pico della Mirandola,¹⁴ and even his most important contribution, the pressure for calendar reform on scientific grounds, did not prove informed enough to promote action by the Council of Constance.¹⁵ Nevertheless, all through his life he entertained a vivid interest in the field of scientific exploration, and at least a certain amateur achievement cannot be denied. As in the case of Albert the Great, it was the influence of Aristotle, whose works on natural science were read as part of the curriculum *in artes* in Paris, that kept awake the interest in a study of natural phenomena.

Much better known is Pierre d'Ailly's role in the church history of his lifetime. Here his contribution has the stamp of an original and powerful personality. Brought up in the nominalistic world of the Paris schools, we naturally find him on the side of Paris' "Conciliarism" from the outbreak of the "Great Schism" on. To be sure, the roots of this movement go back far beyond the 1378 generation of Henry of Langenstein, Conrad of Gelnhausen and others, as recent research has shown.¹⁶ But its historical hour came with those dark years which Ailly himself describes as "worse than the Roman Empire at the time of Sallustius,"¹⁷ when the hypothetical propositions of former generations and the practical deliberations of the hour had to be brought to bear on a unnerving factual situation. Pierre d'Ailly was one of the key figures in this process all through the almost forty years of the schism. And as a matter of fact, his genius found its originality not so much in the field of theoretical investigation into the background as in the practical appropriation of ideas

¹³ *Imago Mundi*, ed. Louvain s.a. (Hain I, col. 837), fol. 79a; Tschackert, p. 335.

¹⁴ Lenfant, II, 1, p. 67.

¹⁵ For a discussion of the issue and an account of Ailly's contributions in the field, see Tschackert, pp. 331ff.

¹⁶ A good summary of the main lines in more recent discussion is found in Tierney, pp. 7-14.

¹⁷ Sermon, January 23, 1389, in: Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Joannis Gersonii Opera omnia, novo ordine digesta, et in 5 tomos distributa; ad manuscriptos codices quamplurimos collata. Quibus accessere Henrici de Hassia, Petri de Alliaco, Joannis Brevicoxa. Necnon monumenta omnia ad causam Joannis Parvi pertinentia*, Antwerp, 1706, vol. III, p. 1021 (abbr. *Du Pin*). A better text is found in the 1490 Strasbourg edition of Ailly's *Tractatus et Sermones* (see below, note 190).

and lines of thought worked out in his younger years. As the outstanding spokesman for the interests and doctrines of the great Paris University (to which he remained attached through all of his life as an ardent advocate for a purer and dignified papacy, as the brilliant defender of conciliar rights at many an important Church assembly) the *magister*, cardinal and diplomat has left his traces extensively in the history of the epoch. It was his activity as an advocate of conciliar reform that has made him famous. All the experiments of Gallicanism in subsequent centuries claimed him more or less as one of their "fathers," and even the Lutheran Reformation acknowledged in him an advocate of reform. Matthias Flacius, the founder of Protestant historiography, listed his name in his *Catalogus testium veritatis*;¹⁸ Luther himself not only knew and admired Ailly's Commentary on the Sentences which he used when he started to lecture on the Lombard,¹⁹ but could quote him as an associate in the fight against the papacy:

"... quamvis Cardinalis Cameracensis in suo vesperario papam satis confutat et Parisiis publice disputavit contra auctoritatem papae et potestatem."²⁰

In the eyes of the Reformers, Pierre d'Ailly appeared as a sign of the dawning day in the middle of the rotten world of the fifteenth century papacy.

In the light of this appreciation it is almost embarrassing to recall another line of Ailly's activity which does not appear in the eulogies but forms as much a part of his personality as the other features do. In Constance, it was Pierre d'Ailly who presided over the special commission appointed to examine and to judge Magister John Hus of Prague. He pronounced the solemn anathema over the heretic and handed him over to the secular authorities to be burned at the stake.²¹ And the "indefatigable hammer of all heresies" had already had experience in this kind of investigation. The abominable Wyclifite pest which had entered his Cambrai diocese under the disguise of a group that called itself the *illuminati*, had been suppressed by him with rigorous

¹⁸ Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, Frankfurt a.M., 1660. Tschackert, p. 76 n.5.

¹⁹ Melancthon, speaking about Luther's relation to the Sentences of Peter Lombard, testifies that Luther knew Ailly's commentary on the Sentences almost "by heart": *Corpus Reformatorum*, vol. VI, *Melancthon, Philippus, Opera quae supersunt omnia*, edidit Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider, p. 159.

²⁰ Martin Luther, *WA Tischreden*, vol. 5, p. 673.

²¹ The story of Hus' trial and of the events leading up to his death is fully told in Eustace J. Kitts, *Pope John the Twenty-Third and Master John Hus of Bohemia*, London, 1910. - For Ailly's role at the trial and the Council of Constance as such see especially John Patrick MacGowan, *Pierre d'Ailly and the Council of Constance*, PhD Dissertation. Catholic University, Washington, D.C., 1936.

hands.²² The same man who in the eyes of a generation of Reformers some decades later appeared as a hero of progress, was at the same time the most militant conservatist and reactionary.

Reformation for him was restoration, not the opening up of new horizons. This conservative trend also dominated his piety. It is true, he had a vivid interest in the Brethren of the Common Life,²³ but he also could most sincerely investigate alleged cases of miracles in his diocese and confirm their authenticity,²⁴ and an elaborate astrology was one of the means he used in expounding the depths of natural and supernatural "knowledge."²⁵

All these contradictions and seeming inconsistencies in the character of one man would place Pierre d'Ailly right in the center of that strange age of transition which we call the late Middle Ages, caught between the fronts of a dying old world and a dawning new age. In this sense, Pierre d'Ailly was a truly "medieval" figure. He certainly did not rise above his time, a prophet of great things to come, but, forced by the necessities of the day, he acted for a future he himself did not know (and would not have approved). Fifteenth century conciliarism did not have the power to bring about the new age of the Church which was so much hoped for by the contemporaries; it did not act in strict consequence of its own premises because it still only could conceive of the old roads. Different from the radical "republicans" of the thirteenth century, the theologians of the Councils regarded their work as the solution of temporary problems, as a step forward toward the real return. Ailly is deeply involved in this reactionary failure of the conciliar movement, but his work as well as that of his friends helped to clear the stage for what was to come a century later.

²² See the transactions of the case against Conrad of Hilgermissen and the *homines intelligentiae* in 1411 (Charles Duplessis d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, qui ab initio duodecimi seculi post incarnationem verbi, usque ad annum 1632[-1735] in ecclesia proscripti sunt & notati*, vol. I, 2, pp. 201-209; cf. Tschackert, pp. 167f) which reveal the Wyclifite influence on the "sect." The remarks against certain rigorists in Ailly's Third Synodical Sermon (*Tractatus et Sermones* in the 1490 Strasbourg edition) are possibly also to be seen in this context.

²³ As bishop of Cambrai he proved himself on several occasions as an engaged defender and promotor of the communities of the Brethren. This might account for the fact that the earliest editions of Ailly's works have been printed by the Brussels Brethren. See also Salembier, pp. 127f., and Tschackert, pp. 115. 297f (controversy with the Dominican Frater Matthaeus Grabon at Constance).

²⁴ For the two cases, both concerning eucharistic miracles (blood emanating from a host in Brussels and a blood-stained altar napkin at Bois-Seigneur-Isaac), see Salembier, pp. 139f.

²⁵ On Ailly's use of astrology and his astronomical writings, see Tschackert, pp. 329ff.

2. The Academic Career

Ailly's education, as was his entire life, was closely connected with Paris²⁶ whose fame as a center of learning was well established. With the first royal privileges granted to the *scholares Parisienses* by Philip Auguste in 1200, the first statutes of the corporation of masters at about 1210/11, and the final imposition of a Code of Statutes by the papal legate Cardinal Robert Curzon in 1215, the university had come into existence as a public institution with discernible corporative rights and functions. The roots go back into the time between 1150-70, when the *magistri* of the then existing cathedral and monastic schools (especially Notre-Dame, Saint Victor, Sainte Geneviève) began to act as one body in certain cases of common interest. Thus, from its very beginnings, the Paris *universitas* was a university of masters rather than of *scholares*, the guild-like corporation of teachers (*magistri*) constituting the formative element of the development. This factor gave Paris its distinctive character over against the earlier form of the Bologna "students' university" where the *universitas scholarium* gave rise to the form of the institution so characteristic for many early Italian universities.²⁷ The decline of the Paris university around the middle of the thirteenth century was mainly due to the incessant struggle between the mendicants and the university which was still dominated by secular masters.²⁸ Many excellent teachers were removed from their university positions simply because of their status as members of mendicant orders and helped establish the fame of their orders' *studia generalia*, much to the detriment of the university proper.

By the middle of the fourteenth century, the university had somewhat recovered and stood at the eve of an era of immense influence in the life of the French "nation" and European church politics. The important study reform of 1366,²⁹ introduced by new statutes at the initiative of the papal legates Gilles de Montaigu and Jean de Blandry, occurred during the period of Ailly's earliest achievements as a Parisian scholar. In following his academic career, we will actually follow one

²⁶ In our presentation, we are particularly indebted to the treatment of the University of Paris and her history in vol. 1 of the third edition of Rashdall's *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Frederic M. Powicke and Albert B. Emden, 1936. (abbr.: Rashdall). See further the long section on Paris in Andrew G. Little and Franz Pelster, *Oxford Theology and Theologians*, 1934. For the original documents, one does no longer solely depend on César Egasse Du Boulay's old *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, Paris, 1665ff. (abbr. Du Boulay), as the documents now are conveniently collected in Heinrich Denifle - Emile Châtelain, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, Paris 1889-97. (abbr.: Denifle-Châtelain)

²⁷ See Charles H. Haskins, *The Rise of Universities*, London and New York, 1923.

²⁸ Bibliographical note in Rashdall, p. 344.

²⁹ Denifle-Châtelain, *Chartularium*, III, no. 1319; Rashdall, pp. 443. 473 n. 1.

of the great times of the Paris university as such; his name and work have done much to make it a time of greatness.

We know that Pierre d'Ailly entered academic life at Paris in 1363 when, a boy of fourteen, he took up residence as a *boursier* at the *Collegium Navarrae* in order to begin the regular course of study under a master at the faculty of arts.³⁰ He might have studied in Paris prior to this since the *grammatici*, boys from the age of eight or nine years, often were housed and schooled in the residential city, if the purse of the parents allowed it. The Navarra College itself, like many other colleges, was endowed not only with thirty "purses" for artists and twenty for theologians, but also with twenty for grammar boys. But even so, entrance into the liberal arts program was the actual step into higher education. "Colleges" had been founded in Paris since the early 13th century.³¹ They were mainly intended as charitable institutions providing adequate housing for poor students, and soon these outnumbered the original form of students lodging with their masters under the same roof. It seems that admission to the colleges was no longer restricted to needy boarders only. The college itself gained more and more importance in the social and academic life of the *universitas*; the Sorbonne College (founded by Robert de Sorbon in 1257) and the equally famous Collège de Navarre soon seemed to serve the same purpose (i.e., a *vita communis* of the *scholares* studying as secular clergy) as did the recently established colleges of the mendicants. In Ailly's time, it certainly was very honorable to belong to the Navarre community. We are fortunate enough in the case of the Collège de Navarre to possess a fully documented "history" of the institution written by one of its 16th century *alumni*, Guillaume Launois.³² Its foundation dates back to Jeanne de Navarre, the wife of Philip the Fair, in 1304. The three "classes" of students (*grammatici*, artists, theologians) were governed by three masters, the master of the theologians at the same time functioning as *rector* of the whole. Nominations of bursarships were arranged through the *aumonier* of the king; he also must have admitted the young son of a well-to-do Compiègne family.³³

³⁰ Tschackert, p. 9, has him incorrectly enter the Navarra College in 1372 as a theologian, "skipping over the courses of the grammaticists and the artists." The correct picture is found in Salembier, pp. 26ff.

³¹ See Rashdall, pp. 497-536, in a special chapter on Paris colleges.

³² Jean de Launois, *Regii Navarrae Gymnasii Historia*, Paris, 1677. (abbr.: Launois).

³³ Ailly's family probably did not belong to the lower classes. Salembier, p. 27, points out that about the same time, Ailly's parents left him some houses and meadows around Compiègne (against Tschackert, pp. 367ff).

For our discussion of Pierre d'Ailly's *quaestio* it is important to follow as closely as possible the course of study he had to pass as a Paris theologian during the last third of the fourteenth century. It is difficult to interpret the data of an individual curriculum if there is no clear idea as to the general study program of the period. Tschackert's biography, on the few pages he devotes to Peter's early years, is full of errors regarding his performance as a Paris student, and even Salembier is not always able to set the particular detail into an accurate picture of the general context.

The first landmark in Ailly's academic career was his "determination", "*determinavit in artibus* 1365" (Du Boulay),³⁴ two years after the start. It would seem that by the middle of the fourteenth century the *determinatio* of an arts student actually constituted the last act in obtaining the "degree" of a *baccalarius* which had been for several decades a basic requirement toward all M.A. work at Paris. During Christmas time he had passed preliminary *responsiones*, a kind of disputation with a master on grammar and logic. This exercise constituted the admission to the *examen determinantium* which, in the form of disputations with a regent master, extended over several sessions during Lent. The origins of this lower "degree" in the unofficial realm of student activity without official sanction by the university is discernable in the fact that the chancellor of the university had nothing to do with its conferment, while all other degrees were conferred by him. The arrangements for examination were made through the "nations" whose *procurator* presented the duly pre-examined candidates shortly after Christmas to the faculty board of the "nations" examiners. During preparation for the *determinatio* the young student worked closely with the one master "under whom he determined." Peter's master was Jean Caillaud de Quercu who most probably had his "school" with the other masters in the Rue du Fouarre on the left banks of the Seine.³⁵ We do not know how for Pierre d'Ailly the evening of his determination passed. Usually the day was closed by noisy student festivities for which the *determinatus* was host to his fellow students.

The post-bachelor studies of the arts student eventually led up to the *licentia* which Pierre d'Ailly obtained on October 31, 1367.³⁶ Conferring this first "academic" degree was the privilege of the chancellor who bestowed upon the candidate the solem licence to teach in he faculty of arts,

³⁴ Du Boulay, IV, p. 979.

³⁵ Salembier, p. 31, and *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques*, vol. 1, 1912, p. 1156.

³⁶ Salembier, p. 34.

together with the apostolic benediction. The reform of 1366 fixed the minimum residence requirement for an M.A. degree at four and a half years and prescribed the books to be studied in order to obtain the licence. Examinations seem to have been given in two parts: the candidate had to appear first for a (more formal) *temptamen in communibus* conducted by the chancellor and four *temptatores* approved by the faculty; this board recommended him for the *temptamen in propriis* conducted by four "independent" *temptatores* from his own nation. For the solemn act of licencing, the *auditio*, the group of eight or nine *licentiandi* processed from the convent of the Mathurines, the seat of the French nation and the *rector*, to the episcopal palace where one or more candidates might present some public *collationes* followed by discussion before the licence was conferred by the chancellor.

The definitive promotion to the function of a *magister artium*, the *inceptio* through the solemn act of *birretatio* (bestowing of the magisterial "*cappa*"), generally occurred half a year later. In Ailly's case, Du Boulay mentions this event: "inceptit autem in artibus 1368."³⁷ In the meantime, the candidate had to secure the agreement of his nation. On the eve of inception he participated in a solemn disputation called *vesperiae*, and then proceeded the following day to deliver his full inaugural lecture at the end of which he was solemnly received as a master by the presiding *magister regens*.

The oaths taken before inception obliged the young magister to stay in Paris for at least two years and to teach in the faculty of arts. Pierre d'Ailly most probably remained a fellow of the Navarra College, now in the new position of a student of theology. This combination of pursuing studies at one of the higher faculties while at the same time teaching at the undergraduate level was common practice. As a matter of fact, almost the entire student body of the higher faculties (the medical one last) consisted of M.A.s who probably all taught for some time in the arts faculty.

That Ailly's performance must have been outstanding is witnessed by the fact that in 1372 he was elected *procurator* of the French nation and kept this office for several terms (usually three months each).³⁸ The "nations" first had developed as a fourfold division in the arts faculty: French, Norman, Picardic, and English-German nation.³⁹ Their function had been to protect members of the *universitas* from violence and injustice by closer contact within natural divisions and common

³⁷ Du Boulay, loc.cit. (see above, note 34).

³⁸ About this office and its background see Rashdall, pp. 312ff; esp. 314 n. 1.

³⁹ Rashdall, pp. 298-320. Also Salembier, pp. 28f.

action. Out of their midst the *rector* was chosen as "head" of the arts faculty. It was particularly through the oath of obedience to the *rector* imposed on all masters of arts, who at the same time were members of the higher faculties, that by the middle of the fourteenth century this officer established himself as the official head of the whole university with more direct power and influence than the chancellor. The leading position within the respective nations remained the one held by the procuratores, the *procurator* of the French nation acting as their *chargé d'affaires*.

The theological studies proper of the young *magister artium* were long and thorny. The length of the complete course leading up to the *magisterium* and thus to the "doctorate" as proscribed by the 1366 reform amounted to sixteen years, dispenses, however, being frequently granted by the faculty. Peter of Ailly finished with his *licentia* and inception not earlier than 1381, his studies of theology extending over fully thirteen years.

The first progress, usually after six years of merely auditing Bible (four years) and the Sentences (two years), was the promotion to the ranks of the *baccalaurei*, the lowest of which was described as *baccalaureus (biblicus) cursor*. The time of merely attending classes was over; the student then was expected to teach beginning courses in his faculty. On application he presented himself to an examination board of four *doctores* who had to establish the fulfillment of all requirements and testify to the ability of the candidate. Being passed, he would receive the formal right to read his *primus cursus*. The B.D. then was not an academic "degree" in the strict sense; its meaning was narrower, more professional. It simply marked the new status of the candidate *within* the theological curriculum, the transition from *auditor* to lecturer.

Pierre d'Ailly started as *baccalaureus cursor* in 1374. The official inception consisted of a public *principium*, an inaugural lecture which in a programmatic way introduced a one year "cursory" lecture on a biblical book of the bachelor's own choice, to be followed in the second year by a similar course on another book. Besides this, "ordinary" lectures on the Bible were given by *baccalaurei biblici ordinares* whom the mendicant orders had to present each year. Except for the general rule that the *cursores* mostly belonged to the secular, the *ordinares* to the monastic clergy, the difference between them is not completely clear.⁴⁰ Ailly's *principium in cursum bibliae*

⁴⁰ Rashdall, pp. 474-76; Salembier, pp. 33f.

is still extant.⁴¹ It was meant to be a piece of rhetoric in order to impress the audience, but it is interesting to see that here already the theme of the law of Christ and its validity over against the antiquated "old" Law stands in the center of Ailly's presentation. If the allusion to the Gospel of Mark here has any bearing on the topic of his first year's lecture course, it would seem that the ambitious bachelor treated a very unusual topic; the Gospel of Mark stood completely in the shadow of Matthew and John throughout the Middle Ages. There is, however, no trace left of any commentary on Mark by him. Salembier, therefore, suggests the *Hexaemeron* for the first, *Canticum* for the second year, both of which have at some time been explained by Pierre d'Ailly as the preserved commentaries according to the fourfold sense prove.

Three years later, the biblical bachelor would pass his tentative and gain the second rank of bachelorship: *baccalaureus sententiarium*. It seems that this examination consisted of a disputation in the presence of some older bachelors presided over by a master who would pose the question to be disputed. Powicke-Emden quote an instructive text from the statutes of Valladolid which sheds light on this special performance and the nature of the academic *quaestio* as such:⁴²

We decree ... that the licentiandus shall enter a public and solemn disputation called *tentativa*, under the regentship of a master whose turn it is. Thus the magister regens ... occupying the cathedra shall read a small portion from a scriptural passage on which one of the assistants, designated in advance, raises some theological question according to the two extremes, having touched upon the middle ways, which he then leaves for the candidate to resolve. This one steps forward to the place in front of the cathedra in order to determine. He will briefly speak to the solution of the mentioned question, and then will propose three conclusions for its major solution, adding two corollaries respectively, the last of which be responsive. He then shall prove his conclusions and corollaries at the beckoning of the master president; after this has been done briefly, the president argues first, and finally all those who want to argue may do so, and this shall not end until nobody argues any more. If there is a good number of opponents, however, the president may terminate the session after three hours at his discretion.

Having passed this exercise which may have had a similar form at Paris, Pierre d'Ailly was officially admitted to the oaths of a *baccalaureus sententiarium* on the first of July 1377.⁴³ The *sententiarium* had to lecture on the whole of the Sentences during nine months. The solemn

⁴¹ See the second appendix to Ailly's Commentary on the Sentences in the 1490 Strasbourg edition (below, note 45). *Du Pin* I, pp. 610-17; Edward Brown; Ortwin Gratius, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum* II, London, 1690, pp. 513-18.

⁴² Rashdall, p. 476 n.2.

⁴³ Salembier, p. 35.

beginning consisted again in a *principium* setting forth in a general analysis some major problems of the Sentences in the presence of at least one doctor of the faculty. Ailly's own *principium super lecturam sententiarum* fortunately has survived.⁴⁴ It is not quite clear whether the following minor *principia* prefacing the explanation of each of the single books were equally official or not.

However, we still possess the elaborate form of the course of 1377/78 in Ailly's *Commentarius super primum, tertium et quartum Sententiarum*.⁴⁵ The curriculum reform of 1452 abolished the requirement that theological bachelors had to deliver their disputations and lectures extemporaneously, using only a written outline. This hard measure had been imposed in the 1366 reform, and we have reason to believe that Ailly had followed this procedure which demanded such concentration from the young teacher.

For the third and last rank among the bachelors, the *baccalaureus formatus*, there was no form of an official inception. After having finished the nine months course the bachelor automatically was regarded as *baccalaureus formatus* and maintained that status until the licence was conferred, normally after three years. Ailly's time as *formatus* extended from 1378 to 1380/81. In this quality he accompanied his Navarra rector, Simon of Freron, on the important mission to Avignon 1379 in order to assure Clement VII of the support of the Paris university and to obtain from him the confirmation of the *rotulus*, the list of proposed benefices for the university and their members.⁴⁶ In general, however, the *formati* appear to be graduate students who were supposed to stay in residence at Paris during the three years. They had to participate actively in special disputations, partly in connection with the promotions of their fellow students, including preaching a university sermon (*collatio*) on feast day afternoons when a master had preached in the morning.

The licence finally was conferred without literary examination after a conference with the chancellor and an investigation into the bachelor's conduct. The student who had complied with all requirements of the statutes and had passed all prior tests and disputations could expect to be on the list of *licentiandi* which was presented to the chancellor by the faculty. Theological licences

⁴⁴ It is extant in a Rheims manuscript: Rheims BM 409 (s. XIV), fols. 198-208. Cf. Friedrich Stegmüller, *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, Würzburg, 1947, no. 651, 1. (abbr.: Stegmüller)

⁴⁵ The printed editions have the title: *Quaestiones super primum, tertium et quartum sententiarum*. I have used a copy in the New York Public Library, a 1490 Strasbourg print, the third after Brussels (at the *Fratres vitae communis*) 1478, and Paris (at Barbion), s.a. Cf. Stegmüller, no. 650.

⁴⁶ Salembier, pp. 53f, who dates this mission before May 1379.

were conferred at the *jubilaeum* about the time of All Saints Day. For Pierre d'Ailly this moment came in the fall of 1380. In front of the whole university assembled in the bishop's hall the *licentiandi* heard the solemn formula of transmission spoken by the chancellor:⁴⁷

By the authority of Almighty God, and of the apostles Peter and Paul and of the Apostolic See I bestow upon you the licence of disputing, lecturing, preaching and performing in the theological faculty all acts pertaining to a master. In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

The inception of the newly licensed magister by which he actually took over his functions among his colleagues consisted of three steps. The solemn bestowal of the "magisterial cap" (*birettatio*) and the mounting of the *cathedra* took place at the *aulatio*, an elaborate ceremony in the bishop's hall where in the case of the theologians the chancellor, by virtue of his ancient connection with the leading position in the cathedral school, acted on behalf of the faculty. Out of his hands, the candidate received the *birettum doctorale*: "Incipiatis in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti." The account of a Heidelberg *aulatio* may give an impression of the procedure, since it certainly was shaped after the model of Paris.⁴⁸

After oath and *birettatio* the new master presents a *recommendatio sacrae scripturae*; when he has finished, another master in arts or another competent person stands up and proposes a *quaestio* with arguments for the new magister to be disputed. One of the older bachelors answers, then the new master argues with him, and after him the master who bestowed the *birettum* upon him.

The active participation of the new master in this solemn act by his own *aulica*, i.e., the praise of the scriptures as mentioned and the setting forth of thesis and arguments, was only part of the three exercises. The *aulatio* was preceded the evening before by a ceremonial disputation, the *vesperiae*, and was followed later at the beginning of the academic year when he officially incepted as *magister regens*, by a *resumptio*.

The material for his performance on these three occasions was four selected theses which were to be announced in advance to all *magistri* and *baccalaurei formati*. Two of these theses

⁴⁷ See Rashdall, p. 483 n.2, for the Latin text.

⁴⁸ Rashdall, p. 485 n. 1.

were to be debated in the *vesperiae*, three other two in the *aulica*. In the *resumptio*, two questions, namely the second (from the *vesperiae*) and the third (from the *aulica*) were taken up again and resolved.⁴⁹ As for the *vesperiae*, we may take again a pertinent Heidelberg statute as indicative for the Paris customs as well:⁵⁰

The *vesperiae* are held after dinner in the following fashion: the master who is giving the *vesperiae* disputes one question to which one of the bachelors responds. Now the president argues with the latter and right afterwards all bachelors may argue in their respective order. The arguments of the bachelors having been presented, an answer is given to the senior one only. After this, one of the senior masters proposes a question with a terminological analysis and arguments for both sides. When this has been determined by the *vesperiandus*, the master who has proposed the question now argues against some of the things that have been said, and so does the following master against something else which his predecessor has not touched. This being accomplished, the recommendation of the *vesperiandus* is expressed by the presiding master.

It seems that, as far as Pierre d'Ailly is concerned, we still possess the transactions of his own activity at all three occasions. The 1490 Strasbourg edition of his commentary on the Sentences contains in an appendix a number of smaller treatises the titles of which identify them as the promotion papers. The *Sermo in magisterio habitus: Recommendatio sacrae scripturae* (on Matth. 16,18)⁵¹ together with the two *quaestiones De legitimo dominio*⁵² and *Utrum indoctus*⁵³ constitute the *aulica* as a remark in the first *quaestio* shows: "*responsio in aula episcopi*"⁵⁴ Ailly's speech in the *vesperiae* is contained in the document entitled: *In vesperis: Utrum Petri ecclesia lege reguletur*,⁵⁵ part of which taken up in the record of the *resumptio* under the heading *Utrum Petri ecclesia rege gubernetur, lege reguletur, fide confirmetur, jure dominetur*.⁵⁶ According to Salembier, the *aulatio* took place on April 11, 1381, almost half a year after the licence, as was the custom. Thus Pierre d'Ailly might have started his work as regent master in the theological

⁴⁹ So the statutes of Bologna, ed. Franz Ehrle, pp. 40-46; Rashdall, p. 484 n. 3.

⁵⁰ Rashdall, p. 486 n. 1.

⁵¹ First appendix to Ailly's Commentary on the Sentences, in the 1490 Strasbourg edition; *Du Pin* I, pp. 603-10; Brown, *Fasciculus*, II, pp. 508-13.

⁵² *Du Pin*, I, pp. 641-46.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 646-62.

⁵⁴ Marginal note (hand of the late XVth cent.) in Codex Paris nat. lat. 3122, fol. 74, where the transactions of Ailly's doctorate follow our treatise on Gal. 2:11ff.

⁵⁵ Third appendix to the Commentary on the Sentences in the 1490 Strasbourg edition; *Du Pin*, I, pp. 662ff; Brown, *Fasciculus*, II, pp. 518-25.

⁵⁶ Fourth appendix to the Commentary on the Sentences in the 1490 Strasbourg edition; *Du Pin*, I, pp. 672-93; Brown, *Fasciculus*, II, pp. 525-40.

faculty at the beginning of the next "great ordinary", about St. Remigius' Day (October 1st), 1381, after the long summer vacation.

3. Ailly and the Schism

The beginnings of Ailly's career almost coincided with the outbreak of the "Great Schism"⁵⁷ While he was preparing for his theological licence and had just finished his nine months as *sententiarius*, thirteen renitent cardinals elected an antipope at Fondi. This was on September 20, 1378. In May 1379 the young Genevan pontiff took up residence at Avignon, and hence two popes claimed the rights and functions of the *vicarius Christi*, the one, Urban VI, from Rome, the other, Clement VII, from Avignon, the seat of the fourteenth century papacy down to Gregory XI who had died the year before. It was not the first schism the Church endured, and the contemporaries were aware of this fact. About the time of the Council at Constance, catalogues appeared that listed from twenty-two up to twenty-five different schisms in the Roman Church.⁵⁸ But in many respects it was worse this time.

Modern Roman catholic interpretation likes to stress the point that there was a "schisme sans schismatiques" (Congar),⁵⁹ a schism of strangely "unschismatic" character.⁶⁰ No dissension in major theological issues seemed to exist, the doctrinal unity remained as untouched as the principle of papal government and authority within the Church and the common basis of the old order was not questioned at all. The only dividing issue, we are told, was a question of outward church order: Who is the true Pope? This perspective certainly has its own merit. But if the

⁵⁷ For comprehensive information on France and the Schism, see Noël Valois' four weighty volumes: *La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident*, Paris, 1896-1902. A good account of the outbreak of the schism now in Walter Ullmann, *Origins of the Great Schism*, London, 1948. See also the short chapter by Matthew Spinka, "Conciliarism as Ecclesiastical Reform" in: *The Library of Christian Classics*, vol. IV, Philadelphia, 1953, pp. 91-184). Also Victor Martin, *Les origines du Gallicanisme*, 2 vols., Paris, 1939; Martin Seidlmayer, *Die Anfänge des grossen abendländischen Schismas* (Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft, II, 5, Münster i.W., 1940).

⁵⁸ See the discussion of the most popular one among these catalogues by Andrew of Escobar and its different recensions in Heinrich Finke, *Forschungen und Quellen zur Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils*, Paderborn, 1886, p. 160. Ailly, in *Utrum indoctus* (1380/81; see above note 53), counts twenty-two schisms. *Du Pin*, I, p. 661.

⁵⁹ Yves Congar, in: *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. 14, 1939, p. 1295.

⁶⁰ Jean Leclercq, "Points de vue sur le Grand Schisme," in: *L'Eglise et les Eglises*, ed. Gustave Thils, Paris, 1967), pp. 234ff. Also Salembier, p. 49: "Il y a simplement un peu partout ignorance ou erreur sur la personne à qui on doit l'obéissance. C'est un malentendu dans lequel la foi, la discipline, le culte et même l'unité formelle de l'Eglise ne sont pas en cause."

interpreters go on pretending that for the contemporaries it was not a "great, but a rather "small" schism, that the Church was not regarded as divided, and that people by and large came to realize the existence of a "true" Church on both sides, then things are no longer seen in the right perspective. It may be that the analytical mind of the later Catholic observer could state that with regard to Roman catholic doctrines there was no definite heresy involved on either side. As a theoretical presupposition undergirding all deliberations of the conciliarist party we may even find the argument expounded in the writings of the epoch: the schism itself was proof that there was no right pope at all in the situation; it was the time of a popeless interregnum, inspite of the fact that three "popes" reigned.⁶¹ But for the conciliarists this position beyond the actual fronts was a practical necessity in order to justify central action apart from the legitimation by the pope.

For the masses of average believers, however, the situation looked desperate as the immediate consequences of the schism deeply affected the sacramental functioning of the Church. If no point of *doctrine* was at stake, then the *practical efficiency* of the sacramental apparatus by which medieval society was living was all the more endangered. The medieval church acted as the divine institution distributing sacramental grace. But the efficiency of this distribution was rooted in the authority of the heavenly giver which on earth resided in the one to whom Christ had committed his Church. Being separated from the one head, the *Petrus vivus* as the visible sign of the sacramental unity of Christ's one body meant being cut off from the very source of religious life and salvation. The strength of medieval religion consisted in the fact that in the symbol of an authoritative head the distinction between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, salvation and rejection, life and death, always seemed to be clear and simple. Here the real danger of the schism appears. For the medieval mind, even the convicted heretic to whom justice was done by delivering him to fire and sword had an advantage over the tortured conscience of the believer in so completely ambiguous a situation. Where now could one find the actual sign of sacramental unity if two contenders claimed this right with the same exclusiveness? Where was the guarantee for the sacramental performances of one's priest being sanctioned by God? The whole structure of religious security was bound to collapse if there was no way to determine on which side God would stand.

⁶¹ Cf. already Ailly's letter to Benedict XIII (see below, note 78), ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove: "*Nonne scis-tu, bone pater, quod membra a capite divisa mortua sunt, nec duo capita in uno corpore naturaliter bene conveniunt?*" (p. 140).

Leclercq admits that it was an age of "*doute fondamentale*"; yet he fails to point out these deeper dimensions. The fact of several popes claiming spiritual authority as source of all sacramental activity in the church was not a mere question of outward church discipline. It threatened the whole structure of the church as "Heilsanstalt" which was its essence and purpose. The believer in this age of anxiety found himself at the rim of the ultimate abyss. What, if he had missed the chance to choose the right side? What if his priest acted without divine authority? What if the sacraments themselves did not have the power to heal and reconcile? What if the pope was not pope at all? The assurance of personal salvation was at stake, an issue important enough to stir up the hopes and fears of a whole generation.

That is the reason why so little thought was given to the question of the origin of the schism.⁶² All concern was feverishly engaged in finding a means to end this hell of insecurity. That also is the reason preachers around the end of the fourteenth century so often interpreted the signs of the time in terms of horrendous apocalyptic catastrophes. Brother stands against brother, children against their parents delivering them to death (Matth 10:21).⁶³ It was not difficult to believe: The end is close! Ailly himself, in a letter to John XXIII, warned that the Apostle's prophecy of 2 Thess. 3:2 is now fulfilled, the great *discessio* is here, and the end is waiting around the corner.⁶⁴ The Roman Church appeared as the great harlot of Rev. 17.⁶⁵ And the moving lamentation of the reviled *sponsa Christi*, the holy Church, certainly expressed the feelings of many a sincere Christian: "Woe ! Surrounded am I by innumerable dangers and adversities, and I fear the way out will lead to even worse things."⁶⁶

And Ailly was not wrong. Things rapidly seemed to develop toward complete ecclesiastical disorder. The Council of Pisa (1409), the hope of many, did not heal the deep cleft; on the contrary—instead of a "*dualitas infamis*" now a "*trinitas non benedicta sed maledicta*" exercised its apocalyptic regime.⁶⁷ Almost no hope was left.

⁶² Leclercq (see above, note 60), pp. 229f. In a letter to pope John XXIII, *Apostolicam decet*, Ailly names three reasons: The menace of the Roman mob, the long 'dissimulation' of the cardinals, and the false ambition especially of the French and Italian prelates (*Du Pin*, II, pp. 882f).

⁶³ Cf. the word of Carl Malatesta in Heinrich Finke, *Acta Concilii Constantiensis*, I, pp. 25f.

⁶⁴ Epistula ad Joannem XXIII, *Dudum beatissime pater*, 1411 (Tschackert): *Du Pin*, II, p. 877.

⁶⁵ Second Synodical Sermon, *Tractatus et Sermones* in the 1490 Strasbourg edition, s.p.

⁶⁶ Epistula ad Joannem XXIII (above, note 64): *Du Pin*, II, p. 881.

⁶⁷ Hermann Blumenthal, *Die Vorgeschichte des Konstanzer Konzils*, Halle, 1897, p. 5. A standing joke of the time was a pun modifying the two popes' names: "Maledictus" for "Benedictus," "Erronius" for "Gregorius." Cf. Finke, *Forschungen*, p. 154.

The young scholar, it is true, had not yet paid much attention to the fact of the schism and its practical consequences. His earliest sermons after 1378 at least do not reveal more than a general concern about the devastating effects of a prolonged schism.⁶⁸ But when the university began taking active interest and, since 1381, a definitive lead in the attempt to end the schism and re-establish unity, Pierre d'Ailly made the university's concern his own. Hence his life was devoted to a task which demanded all his strength. But the world from which everything started for him was the world of Paris university. It was here that he developed, in close relationship to the Paris thinkers before him, the ideas which later on could be tested in the realm of practical church politics by the chancellor, the bishop and the cardinal.

His active time as *magister regens* after promotion was not very long. Greater tasks were already waiting. For him as an academic teacher, perhaps the most fruitful time were the years between 1384-89 when he held the office of the *rector* in the Collège de Navarre.⁶⁹ Here the famous circle of his pupils was formed, the names of whom soon gained the respect and the admiration of their time: Jean Gerson, Nicolas de Clémanges, Peter of Luxemburg, Jean de Montreuil, Philippe de Maizières. During all those years the university needed the eloquent *doctor* who showed such a remarkable diplomatic talent, and Ailly was frequently en route on important missions for the university which often involved as many hardships as honors.

The struggle of the University against the chancellor Jean Blanchard in 1385 over the matter of fees for the licence⁷⁰ brought him into first official contact with the papal court at Avignon where he had been once before. The young *magister* defended the university's cause so well that he could be sure of further attention from the highest ecclesiastical dignitaries of the church.

Two years later, the delicate matter of the university's condemnation of Jean de Montson opened the way to the king's court. Again, Ailly had pleaded the university's cause against the Dominicans' mariological "heresy" at Avignon, and thus had saved in the eyes of his countrymen one of the most cherished beliefs of the people of France: the *Immaculata Conceptio*.⁷¹ Montson was condemned, and Ailly refuted his sponsor and partisan, Guillaume d'Evreux, in a special

⁶⁸ Tschackert, p. 14, with reference to the Sermo de S. Dominico of 1379, *Tractatus et Sermones* in the 1490 Strasbourg edition.

⁶⁹ Launois, pp. 81. 91. 468. Ailly's predecessor was Laurent Chavange, his successor Gilles Deschamps. Cf. Salembier, pp. 66f.

⁷⁰ For an account, see Salembier, pp. 68-72; Tschackert, pp. 66-68.

⁷¹ Salembier, pp. 72-77; Tschackert, pp. 71-76.

disputation before the king. As a result, a little later he replaced Guillaume as *aumônier* and confessor of the king (1389). Obviously the king had realized that here was a man important enough to have his help enlisted for the difficult task of mediating between national interests and church politics. As the confidant of the young but unfortunate king Ailly soon played an important role at the court. Now it was the king who used his good services in many a diplomatic mission; in 1394 he made Ailly treasurer of the Sainte-Chapelle.

Avignon also showed growing interest in the able *doctor*. The final step in Ailly's university career was a fruit of the pope's eagerness to have the support of the influential diplomate. In October 1389, Ailly was named chancellor of the university by Benedict XIII, the new Avignon pope.⁷²

But his ecclesiastical career had only started. In 1391, he became archdeacon of Cambrai. In 1395, he was bishop of Puy-en-Velay. He finally resigned from all his university offices in 1387 to take over the office of the bishop of Cambrai.⁷³ In the chancellorship of the university he was followed by his great disciple Jean Gerson. But the climax was not yet reached. In 1411, he received the purple as one of the fourteen new cardinals (*tituli Sancti Chrysogoni*) created by the second pope of Pisa, John XXIII.⁷⁴

Even prior to his work as bishop of Cambrai, the involvement in the power struggle at Paris and Avignon did not really keep him away from the main task to which all of his public life was devoted—the re-establishment of peace and unity in the Church. Personal and political considerations, of course, often influenced his moves, but his consistent devotion to the final goal stood quite a number of hard tests. He was neither spared by the king's disgrace nor by the threats of the different supreme pontiffs.

His attitude and ideas on the procedures of terminating the schism were, more than is often recognized, influenced by the Paris university line. In his *vesperiae* of 1380 he personally still favored the *via compromissi* over against the *via cessionis* or the *via concilii generalis*.⁷⁵ It was the one which in earlier schisms always had proved the most convenient one; obviously the full extent of the danger was not yet clear to him. The change came soon. Already in 1381, Ailly tried in the

⁷² Salembier, pp. 91ff.

⁷³ Tschackert, pp. 97ff; Salembier, pp. 116ff.

⁷⁴ Tschackert, pp. 169f.

⁷⁵ *Utrum indoctus* (1380/81; see above, note 53): *Du Pin*, I, pp. 600f.

name of the university to convince the royal court of the necessity of the *via concilii*.⁷⁶ But the time was not yet ripe for this step. The university was experiencing a very difficult time. It was the year when many Paris teachers and students left the city for good, threatened by the brutal anti-conciliarist and pro-Clementine politics of Louis of Anjou. The university henceforth advocated the *via cessionis*, and Ailly backed this middle way with the full weight of his influence.⁷⁷ As for Avignon, things seemed almost ready for a solution when Benedict, after the distraction of obedience in France 1398-1403, promised to cede. But the delay of action on his side, and Benedict's hostile measures after the 1406 Paris Synod made Ailly finally break with the pope,⁷⁸ to whom he had felt closer than to any of the others, and join the advocates of the *via concilii generalis* including the demand of *cessio* for both popes. After Pisa where he played only a limited role, he was bound to the Council's new pope although he had warned beforehand that a hurried decision would make things worse and create an extra schism in addition to the present one.⁷⁹ For one year, the new pope was Alexander V, with whom arrangements had been made to settle the question of unity definitely at a new council to be assembled under his authority within three years. This new council finally took place under John XXIII in Rome 1412/13 but the disorderly circumstances contributed to and brought about even greater confusion than had existed before.

It was mainly the final intervention of Emperor Sigismund which gave the hopeful signal for the last act to be staged at Constance in 1414-18.⁸⁰ For Pierre d'Ailly, it was the climax of his career. Every student of the history of the great assembly knows about the decisive role of the cardinal who, together with his Paris friends, shaped the Council of Constance into one of the most significant manifestations of conciliarism in action. The schism at last was ended. Ailly

⁷⁶ Salembier, pp. 57f.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 95ff.

⁷⁸ "Epistola magistri Petri de Alliaco episcopi Cameracensis contra Petrum de Luna quondam dictum papam Benedictum XIII (1409-10)," ed. J.M.B.E. Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Chroniques relatives a l'histoire de la Belgique sous la domination des ducs de Bourgogne*, Textes latins, I, Brussels, 1870, pp. 139ff. The letter is found here in the chronicle of Jean Brandon, a monk of Duns in Flanders.

⁷⁹ "Conclusiones in Civitate Tarraconensi propositae" (Jan. 10, 1409, Tschackert), in: Martène-Durand, *Veterum scriptorum etc. collectio*, VII, p. 917. Tschackert, p. 152.

⁸⁰ Emil Göller, *Kaiser Sigismunds Kirchenpolitik 1404-13*, Freiburg i.Br., 1902. A good and comprehensive account is found in Karl Joseph von Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. VII, pp. lff. The older editions of the original documents by G. D. Mansi, *Conciliarum collectio regia maxima* (vols. 27-28), Jean Hardouin, *Conciliarum collectio regia maxima* (vol. VIII), and Hermann Von der Hardt, *Magnum Concilium Constantiense*, 6 vols., Frankfurt, 1697-1700, are partly superseded by Heinrich Finke, *Acta concilii Constantiensis*. For the role of Ailly at the council see especially the dissertation of MacGowan (above, note 21).

actually had been one of the potential candidates for the tiara. We hear that he was among the three final candidates on November 10, 1417.⁸¹ But political reasons would have prevented his general reception. Thus he resigned as the other candidate had done in favor of Otto of Colonna—henceforth Martin V. The goal of his public effort was reached. A few years later, Pierre d’Ailly died in 1420.⁸²

⁸¹ Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, VII, pp. 328f. Tschackert, p. 295.

⁸² For the discussion about the year and day of Ailly's death, see Tschackert, pp. 377ff. ("Beilage VIII: Über Ailly's Todesjahr").

B. The Setting

1. The Exegetical Situation

The issue discussed in Pierre d'Ailly's treatise represents an old crux of the interpreters. Modern exegesis still is not ready to present a clear solution to the historical problems involved. Why and when did Peter come to Antioch? When did the "incident" occur? What were the real circumstances? And particularly: What importance did the incident have for the relationship between the two great apostles and for Paul's own history?

In spite of this lack of factual clarity, the passage, since the days of the Tübingen school, has served as the crown witness in numerous reconstructions of early Christian history. Ferdinand Christian Baur described the two forms of Christianity at the basis of the dialectical movement toward the early Catholic Church in terms of the two "antagonists" Peter and Paul. It would be wrong to put the blame for this simplification entirely upon Hegelian presuppositions. Actually, Baur had arrived at his conclusion on the Pauline-Petrine antagonism years before he discovered Hegel. His early study on the Christ party in the Corinthian Church (1831)⁸³ contained *in nuce* the entire argument which he later developed into a systematic picture under the influence of Hegel's dialectic: The history of early Christianity outside of Jerusalem was characterized by the antithesis of Petrine and Pauline principles the constant wrestling of which eventually led to a new form of Christianity as the synthesis. In his 1831 sketch Baur for the first time discovered the value of Galatians 2:11-14 for his argument. In his eyes, the Antioch incident showed the first open outbreak of the antagonism which was latent ever since Stephen's rise in Jerusalem and the event of the Damascus road and spreading soon all over the mission field: Galatia, Corinth, Rome.⁸⁴

This general picture has left its traces in the different reconstructions of early Christian history up to this day and, as it had been in Baur, Galatians 2:11-14 has continued to hold a hermeneutical key position for the presentation of the Peter-Paul relationship. In a kind of revival

⁸³ Ferdinand Christian Baur, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde; Der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche; Der Apostel Petrus in Rom" (*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 4, 1831), pp. 61ff. Cf. Werner Georg Kümmel, *Das Neue Testament. Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme* (Orbis Academicus III,3; Freiburg i.Br.-Munich, 1958), pp. 158ff.

⁸⁴ The full argument in Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*, (1845), 2nd ed., ed. by Eduard Zeller, Leipzig, 1866, I, pp. 146-48.

of Baur's view during the twenties of our century, Eduard Meyer again made Antioch the starting point for what he termed the "irreparable break" between the two leading figures of the early Christian scene.⁸⁵ From Antioch on, Peter and Paul are definitely rivals. Meyer found traces of this rivalry everywhere, from Paul's refusal to take John Mark with him ("he obviously was suspect as a follower of Peter") to the collect which Paul launched in order to mitigate the impression of his sharp conflict with Peter. That this basic approach had far-reaching consequences for the overall picture of the epoch is well seen in the work of Meyer's most prominent supporter, Hans Lietzmann. On the basis of the "irreparable break," Lietzmann discovered a peculiar rhythm permeating the history of early Christian missions: Paul's founding of gentile Churches is regularly followed by the anti-mission of judaistic agents steered from Jerusalem but carried out by Peter.⁸⁶ For Lietzmann there was no doubt that Peter's personal agitation was behind all the open difficulties in the Pauline mission fields. And the key for this construction? "We are entitled to draw these conclusions from the Antioch event."⁸⁷

Our question is: Can the passage carry the burden of this construction? Already the earlier critics of Baur such as Ernst Reuss, Albrecht Ritschl, Franz Overbeck pointed out that the picture is much more complicated than the simple antagonism Peter-Paul, the chiffre for the fight between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, would suggest.⁸⁸ Moreover, in reaction to Meyer and Lietzmann, there has been a growing awareness among exegetes that their conclusions rest on too small a basis and too narrow an interpretation of the sources, especially Galatians 1-2. We have only one single report on the key event of Antioch. This very fact alone should warn against definitive conclusions, all the more as the character of the report is anything but objective and lacking in ambiguity. As to the "irreparable break" between Peter and Paul, recent exegesis more and more agrees that there is no factual evidence at all for the assumption of a personal enmity between them; on the contrary, a certain consensus among scholars tends to emphasize that both apostles in

⁸⁵ Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, III, Stuttgart-Berlin, 1923, pp. 424ff.

⁸⁶ Hans Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche, I: Die Anfänge*, Berlin-Leipzig, 2nd. ed., 1937, pp. 106f. 108 etc.; especially: "Zwei Notizen zu Paulus," in: *Kleine Schriften*, II, ed. Kurt Aland, Berlin, 1958, pp. 287-91.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* ("Zwei Notizen" etc.), p. 288.

⁸⁸ See texts and comments illustrating the approach of the opposition against Baur in its various stages in Kümmel (above, note 83), pp. 177ff.

their theological position had more in common than, e.g., Peter had with the strictly judaistic wing in Jerusalem.⁸⁹

The general shortcomings of the Baur-Lietzmann position are certainly being corrected by these recent trends. But this still does not mean that the positive solution for the problems of Gal. 2:11ff has been found. Even the most vigorous critic of Baur and the Tübingen heritage, Johannes Munck, did not find a satisfactory alternative insofar as the passage is concerned.⁹⁰ His suggestion to place the incident before the meeting of the Apostles in 2:11ff (an idea as old as Augustine)⁹¹ does not have support from the context, and his quick elimination of problems like that of the *hoi apo Iakobou* or the transition into 2:15ff renders his interpretation somewhat dubious.

In order to ask successfully any historical question in the context of our passage, we have to start with its literary setting and to determine how Paul wanted it to be read. There can be no doubt that he used the Antioch incident in a polemical context; it was this insight that started the line of argument in the Tübingen interpretation. It is not clear, however, what the real or alleged charges were against which Paul felt the need to defend himself. Did they come from the judaistic standpoint of Jerusalem agitators who stirred up the churches during Paul's absence?⁹² Did they originate in Gnostic circles which had gained the attention of the Galatian Christians?⁹³ Were re-judaizing tendencies at work stimulated by certain gentile Christians who, out of a misunderstood reverence for the Jerusalem "mother church," re-introduced the forms and practices of Jewish life?⁹⁴ Whoever the enemy might have been, we can distinguish two main parts of the letter before the hortatory application in 5:13ff. Galatians 1:10-2:21 constitutes one block of material set forth in answer to certain personal charges, with vv. 14b-21 already constituting the transition to an

⁸⁹ This tendency is well exemplified by Oscar Cullmann, *Petrus - Jünger, Apostel, Märtyrer*, 2nd ed., Zürich, 1960, pp.51. 57ff. 72ff., who is also referring to Emmanuel Hirsch, "Petrus und Paulus" (*ZNW* 29, 1930), pp. 63ff.).

⁹⁰ Johannes Munck, *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte* (Acta Jutlandica, XXVI, Teol. Serie 6; Copenhagen, 1954), pp.92-95.

⁹¹ Augustine, Epist. 82,10 (see below, note 133) who is quoted in favor of the same position already by Th.Zahn, "Petrus in Antiochien" (*NKZ* 5, 1894), p. 435 n.2.

⁹² This is the usual interpretation as held by most scholars. See the commentaries, e.g., of Ernest DeWitt Burton, Hans Lietzmann, Heinrich Schlier and, most recently, Albrecht Oepke (p. 150).

⁹³ Walter Schmithals, "Die Häretiker in Galatien" (*ZNW* 47, 1956), pp. 25-67. His position is characterized by Hans-Joachim Schoeps, *Paulus. Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte*, Tübingen, 1959, p. 73 n.2, as "pangnostic phantasies."

⁹⁴ So Johannes Munck (above, note 90). Before him: Emmanuel Hirsch, "Zwei Fragen zu Gal. 6" (*ZNW* 29, 1930), pp. 192-97), supported by Wilhelm Michaelis, "Judaistische Heidenchristen" (*ibid.*, 30, 1931) pp. 83-89, but opposed by L. Holtzmann. (*ibid.*), pp. 76-83.

aggressive second part of doctrinal nature (3:1-5:12). As to the first part, the facts listed here in chronological order⁹⁵ concern exclusively Paul's personal history. This allows the conclusion that the argument from the data of Paul's life was of special importance for the Galatian agitation. We can only guess in what way. Some clue might be given by Paul's allusions to statements of the antagonists in 1:6-12. Combining what seems to be a quote in v. 6 (a gospel "*ho ouk estin allo*")⁹⁶ with the charges referred to in v. 11f, it would appear that Paul's biography was used in order to show the dependence of his gospel upon the same "men" whose support the agitators also claimed in presenting their "gospel" as "not different" from Paul's. Their success in the Galatian churches might have stemmed from the fact that they succeeded in presenting their "gospel" as being in line with Paul and the "men" behind him alike: since the source of their message was the same as Paul's, the contents, they pretended, were also identical. In Paul's eyes this pretense of harmony was nothing but dangerous smokescreening. He had to destroy this alleged identity of "his" gospel and "theirs". Two lines of argument serve this purpose: First, Paul attacks the thesis of the identical source of the two messages presented as "gospel" (1:11-2:21). All statements to the effect that the source of "this" gospel has anything to do with "men" are wrong. "His" gospel is not "from men" but has its source directly in the Lord, and, therefore, proves to be independent, not only from "transmission" but also from all personal consideration. It has its own life and power, almost independent from Paul's person. It is the only norm to which everybody, the "apostles before him" as well as he himself, are responsible. Secondly, he attacks the thesis of the identical content by showing that something presented as "law" cannot be identical with the "gospel" (3:1-5:12); law means *douleia*, gospel *eleutheria*. As Christians, the Galatians are in the "historical" situation after the Law: the change of the old aeon of *douleia* to the new aeon of *eleutheria* for which "Christ has freed us" has taken place so that acceptance of the Law as gospel would mean to fall back into the stage of slavery.

Concentrating on the first line, we ask: What is that "common" source of the agitators from which they derive their "gospel" and claim the same dependency in Paul's case? One name appears

⁹⁵ Without sufficient support from the texts, J. Munck has claimed that the chronological argument ends with 2:10. The incident of 2:11ff., according to him, does not belong in a temporal sequence as it is being developed in chapter 2. For criticism of this contention see W.D. Davies in *NTS* 2, 1955-56, p. 63.

⁹⁶ The present writer hopes to develop this interpretation of the phrase and its consequences for the understanding of Gal. 1-2 in another place. For the usual interpretation ("another gospel which as such cannot be gospel at all") see Ernest DeWitt Burton, *Galatians* (ICC), 1921, pp. 22-24 where several possibilities are discussed along this line.

throughout the exposition of this part: the name of Peter. The role of Peter for the two sections 1:18-2:10 and 2:11-21 is obvious. But it seems that even behind the first section of the "biographical" argument, 1:13-17, the figure of Peter can be discerned. It has often been pointed out that the report of Paul's conversion here has been styled after the vocation of Old Testament prophets, especially Jeremiah.⁹⁷ Munck suggested that Paul's own self-understanding is a prophetic and eschatological one: he sees himself being called to the eschatological task of preaching to the Gentiles so that the end can come.⁹⁸

It would seem, however, that another text imposes itself as an even closer parallel—Mt 16:16f. Only few scholars such as Joachim Jeremias have recognized the relationship of the two passages.⁹⁹ One actually could read Galatians 1:15f as a paraphrase of Mt 16, 16f, which takes up the vocabulary and the conception and fits them into Paul's special situation and purpose. The "father" as the subject of the revelation can be inferred from the parallel phrase "his son" (v.16). His function in view of the revelatory act is described in the language of the prophetic call (Jer. 1:5): the only preparation for the call is God's eternal election. The inspirational act itself, just as in Matth. 16:17, is marked by the verb *apokalyptein*, and the dative object (*soi* in Matth. 16:17) appears here in the koine form as *en emoi*.¹⁰⁰ Object of the *apokalypsis* is the "son" which matches the full form of Peter's confession in Matthew: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God". It seems not impossible, then, to interpret, in the short description of the conversion as *apokalypsis Iesou Christou* (v.12), the genitive as *genetivus objectivus* instead of *genetivus subjectivus (auctoris)*: "Through revelation of (with regard to!) Christ." Even a reminiscence of the clause *sarx kai haima* in the same negative use as in Matth 16:17 is present in Galatians 1:16b. If Paul did not know of Matth 16:17-19 in the integral form of our Greek Matthew, he at least was familiar with the separate tradition contained in Matth 16:17. In Galatians 1:15f he deliberately equates his own conversion, interpreted as the opening of his eyes for the person of Jesus Christ and thus as the "source" of his gospel, with the inspiration which tradition claimed as source for Peter's supernatural knowledge about Jesus' true identity.

⁹⁷ E.g., Pierre Bonnard, *L'Épître de S. Paul aux Galates* (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, 9; Neuchâtel-Paris, 1953), ad loc.; A. Oepke, *Galater*, 2nd ed., 1957, p. 32.

⁹⁸ Johannes Munck (above, note 90), pp. 48ff.

⁹⁹ Joachim Jeremias, *Golgotha* (Angelos. Archiv für neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, Beiheft 1, 1926).

¹⁰⁰ See Albrecht Oepke, *Galater*, p. 33; Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Chicago U.P., 1961, p. 220,1.

The reason for this equation in the context of the passage is clear. If the whole of the first part of the letter contains explicit and implicit references to Peter, it would seem that the Galatian agitators backed their own "gospel" with the name of Peter as representative of the genuine apostles, pretending that Paul and his gospel had the same source: Paul himself was a "pupil" of Peter and the Jerusalem church, just as they boasted. Paul counters by referring to direct *apokalypsis* as source of his gospel and at the same time refutes the assumption that Peter could be "source" of any gospel. Rather, Peter's gospel goes back to revelation from above just as Paul's does. Thus, Paul's picture of Peter is not that of an antagonist at all. Peter's prerogative is acknowledged: Peter was apostle before him (1:17). But in refuting the thesis of the Galatian agitation Paul wants to make clear that between him and Peter there is no dependency; they both depend with their gospel on the same source of divine revelation. Their gospel received in this way is basically one and the same, but it is not at their disposal. It stands beyond all human consideration, and demands equal obedience from all who are in its service under whatever circumstances.

This interpretation throws new light on Gal. 2:11-14. It is obviously intended as the closing demonstration of the "independence" of Paul's "gospel" which in reality is not his nor Peter's but stands objectively before both of them, demanding obedience without regard to human interests. We shall be careful, therefore, not to consider the Antioch event immediately as the "dramatic peak" of a tension built up between Paul and the claims of Petrine superiority. The passage may be merely an appendix suggested by the name of Peter and by the topic under consideration, serving the main function of providing the transition to the systematic exposition in 3:1ff. The passage (up to v.14) is in itself composed of two elements: the thematic point, "independence" of Paul's gospel from Peter, appears in v.11 and is taken up again in v.14. The verses in between (12-13) are not directly speaking to the point. They portray in parenthesis, as it were, the outward details of the scene as they are necessary in order to understand and to evaluate the preliminary judgment in v.11b. Paul thus does not introduce the incident *itself* as the dramatic high point of his demonstration. The parenthetic character of the narrative speaks against this explanation. From v.11 on, he is clearly headed for the "theoretical" part in vv.14ff. This casual treatment of the Antioch event in the framework of his argumentation is also indicative from another angle. The Galatians seem to know already about the rest of the biographical details. He can presuppose factual knowledge as to his conversion, his relationship to Jerusalem, the events at the Council,

and he proceeds immediately to their interpretation in the light of his argument, recalling only those points of the event that contribute to his point over against the use of the data by the agitators. In 2:12f., Paul records details, although they are not, strictly speaking, to the point. It is probable then that the Galatians had not heard about this event yet—because Paul probably did not regard it as being important. The parenthetic character of his narrative excludes the possibility that he wanted to correct a different version of the incident current in Galatia. Even if it actually was an important moment in the life of Paul, he does not want to have it read this way. The "incident" itself in its presentation is without any major stress. Is it not safe then to say that there was no "incident" at all? A "fight," even a "dispute", is not mentioned. From Paul's perspective, the scene appears as a one-sided blame, because Peter "was judged"-- not by Paul, but before the objective norm of that "gospel" which used Paul as its instrument.¹⁰¹ The passage does not convey the mood of triumph over a personal enemy; it is told as a proof for the ultimate and objective independence of the "gospel" which, instead of having Peter as its "source," stands above him as well as above Paul: "When I saw that they were not walking upright *according to the gospel* ... "

In the context of Galatians 1-2, Paul does not want to have the passage read as a document of dissension between him and Peter. It serves as an illustration for the relationship of the independent *gospel* to both of them, regardless of respective "merits", refuting the pretention that Peter could ever be source of the gospel. It seems as if in the light of this use of the "incident" in the framework of Paul's argument the "historical" question does not find much ground. It may well be that the historical Antioch "incident" was too unimportant as to pass for an "event" at all.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ All through the Middle Ages the Vulgate rendering "reprehensibilis" instead of "reprehensus" completely obscured this objective aspect in favor of a moral one.

¹⁰² It is not our intention to minimize the issue in an undue manner. However, it must be kept in mind that the historical evidence concerning the incident, in fact, is more than scanty. Paul's silence about the outcome of the encounter even could be interpreted as evidence for his defeat rather than Peter's! Cf. Paul Gaechter, "Petrus in Antiochien" (in his *Petrus und seine Zeit*, Innsbruck, 1958, pp. 213-57).

2. The Interpretation of Gal. 2:11-14

a. Earliest Commentation

It was unavoidable that Paul's intention in recording the Antioch "incident" was misunderstood wherever theological or apologetic concern in the historical phenomenon "Peter and Paul" as such was present. The very question of their relationship addressed to our text apart from the context of the Epistle almost necessarily evoked the understanding of the episode as a "fight", or at least a serious "dissension" of the apostles. Throughout the history of the church this understanding appears at the basis of the interpretation.

That, in fact, all subsequent confrontation of the apostles could by the very nature of their different personalities cause serious difficulty, appears from the well known passage in 2 Peter 3:15f.¹⁰³ The anonymous writer hardly conceals his impatient animosity toward the "dear brother Paul" whose letters are often "hard to be understood" and therefore dangerous for the average Christian reader. Significantly enough, this criticism is found in a letter protected by *Peter's* name.

No question, this "anti-Paulinism" in the name of Peter continued, and along its line Galatians 2:11-14 must appear as the striking proof of the insolence and audacity of Paul who dared to launch his vicious attack against the most honored of the Apostles. We would look for this argument especially in Jewish Christian circles. Porphyry, too, the strong antagonist of Christianity, seems to have misgivings about the arrogance of Paul at Antioch.¹⁰⁴ Into his own picture of Paul as the disgusting, sophistic, contradictory, mendacious and barbarous rhetorician this understanding of the passage fitted excellently. The irreverent quality of the "great" apostle against the one whom Christians claimed as the "prince of the Apostles" gives sufficient insight into the Christian character. For Porphyry, Galatians 2:11-14 just added to the picture of Christianity as the triumph of barbarianism.

¹⁰³ The passage seems to reflect a deeper lack of sympathy for Paul than is usually assumed (e.g., Hans Windisch, *Die katholischen Briefe*, (HNT, 3rd. ed., Tübingen, 1951), p. 104: "damit wird die Inspiration des Paulus von Petrus anerkannt;" also Julius Wagenmann, *Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten* (BZNW 3, Gießen, 1928) pp. 170ff. - It cannot be explained either by referring to the problem created for the early Christians by the delay of the *parousia* (Martin Werner, *The Formation of Christian Dogma*, Boston, 1957, p. 53).

¹⁰⁴ Jerome, Preface to the Commentary on Galatians (PL 26, col. 310f.): "Porphyrius in primo operis sui adversum nos libro Petrum a Paulo objecit esse reprehensum, quod non recto pede incederet ad evangelizandum: volens et illi maculam erroris inurere, et huic procacitatis, et in commune ficti dogmatis accusare mendacium, dum inter se Ecclesiarum principes discrepent."

Equally telling is the anti-pauline witness of what might be called the earliest commentary on the passage. In the Pseudo-Clementine homilies (XVII, 19) Galatians 2:11-14 is quoted with all the signs of anger and indignation. If the paragraph, as is most probable, forms part of an older Jewish Christian source, the second century *Kerygmata Petrou*,¹⁰⁵ then this text indeed is the "wütende Replik der ebjonitischen Partei" (Zahn) to the claims of Paul.¹⁰⁶ A strong anti-Paulinism has been recognized as one of the characteristic elements undergirding the theology of the whole source; the later layer of the fight of Peter against Simon the Magician has been combined with it so that in passages from the older source Paul now appears under the name of the archheretic Simon.¹⁰⁷ "You withstand me diametrically," (Gal. 2:11) Peter hectors the magician (Paul), "me the firm rock, the foundation of the Church" (cf. Matth.16,18!). If you were not the *antikeimenos* (cf. 2Thess.2:4) you would not revile my preaching by accusing me, so that I am no longer believed in my preaching, what I have heard with my own ears from the Lord while being with him; as if I were "judged", you however accepted. If you call me *kategnosmenos* (Gal. 2:11), you blame God who has revealed Christ to me, and you inveigh against him who pronounced the *makarism* on account of the revelation."¹⁰⁸ The quotes from Gal. 2:11ff are obvious. The author is fighting what he feels is a Pauline provocation with an authoritative picture of Peter clearly derived from Matth. 16:17-18. Paul for him is the arrogant enemy of the Law and thus of the roots of Christianity. The attack at Antioch was the diabolic attempt to undermine Peter's preaching of the Law which has to be seen in direct continuity with the Lord's message. The language is extremely pointed. Not only is Paul accused of presumptuousness, but in declaring Peter "judged" he directly offends God and his Christ who both have borne witness to Peter in Matth. 16.

The passage is interesting for many reasons. It seems indirectly to confirm our interpretation of Gal. 1:15f. In the quote above it is a striking fact that the "authoritative" picture of Peter set against Gal. 2:11ff does not emerge primarily from the "rock" verse Matth. 16:18 with its

¹⁰⁵ This view, held by Hans Waitz, Oscar Cullmann, Hans-Joachim Schoeps and others, had been seriously challenged by Eduard Schwartz and Bernhard Rehm. The most recent study of the literary problem of the pseudo-clementine literature, Georg Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (TU 70; Berlin, 1958), supports, however, the thesis of the Jewish Christian *Kerygmata Petrou* as one of the old sources of the novel. For a history of this question, see Strecker, pp. 1-33.

¹⁰⁶ Theodor Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 9, Leipzig, 1905), p. 110 n. 39.

¹⁰⁷ According to Waitz, another independent source, the *Periodoi Petrou*, featuring Peter's travels and his fight with Simon the Magician has been combined with the anti-pauline polemics. See Strecker (note 105), pp. 187-196.

¹⁰⁸ Hom. XVII 19, 6 (ed. Rehm), p. 240.

primatial implications, but rather from the makarism in 16:17. Peter is the one who has authentic revelation from the father. This is the point against Paul's claims—claims which must have to do with a special revelation. It is more than probable that the author here thought of Gal. 1:15f. The context confirms this line. In Homily XVII,16-17, Peter refuted Simon Magus' (= Paul's) claims for visions and "revelations" as sources of divine knowledge by pointing to their dangers and ambiguity: Visions and dreams may be sent by demons and thus be a sign of God's wrath rather than of his revelation. It is at this point already that a first reference to Matth. 16:17 occurs (XVII,18): "Thus to me also was the Son revealed by the Father", repeating subsequently in a paraphrase the story of Matth. 16:13-17. If we consider the line of the argument, the author could not have chosen a more unsuitable illustration. Peter who has just expressly refused to acknowledge supernatural knowledge as authentic, now boasts himself of "revelation." The author tries to bridge this contradiction by an artificial distinction between Peter's revelation and other "revelation." Only the kind which Peter experienced ("it suddenly came into my heart") is real revelation, *adidaktōs*, without the help of outward means such as dreams or apparitions. It is clear that the presentation here wants to refute Paul's appeal to special revelation in Gal. 1:15f. Thus for the author of the *Kerygmata Petrou* Gal. 1:15f is the immediate concern of his polemic here. But he reads the passage as an implicit quote from Matth. 16:16f. In his eyes, Paul wants to equate himself with the Peter of Matth. 16:17. Against this erroneous "confusion" the author tries to provide the correct understanding of the words: the *apokalypsis* of Caesarea Philippi is basically different from the "visionary" revelation claimed by Paul in Galatians 1. Paul "learns" from outside. Peter experiences in his heart. Thus, Peter's singularity seems guarded. That Paul's use of the Peter passage in Gal. 1:15f actually inspired the author's reference to Matth. 16:16f is supported by the observation that in his quote of Peter's confession he does not use the Matthean form with its two titles ("Christ", "Son of the living God") but rather the Pauline form of the "Son" only.¹⁰⁹

The "anti- Paulinism" is only one side of the radical solution for the confrontation Peter vs. Paul. In the eyes of the other side, the "anti-Petrinists," Galatians 2:11-14 must present an

¹⁰⁹ If a suggestion by Oscar Cullmann, "L'apôtre Pierre instrument du diable et instrument de Dieu: La place de Matt. 16.16-19 dans la tradition primitive," in: *New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson, 1893-1958*, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, Manchester, 1959, pp. 94-105, is correct, this passage might well support the assumed existence of an independent old tradition about a separate "Son-of-God"-confession which has nothing to do with the rebuked "confession" to Jesus as Jewish Messiah in Mark 8:27ff. See also Cullmann's *Petrus*, 2nd ed., Zürich-Stuttgart, 1960, pp. 206ff.; and his *Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, 2nd ed., Tübingen, 1958, pp. 286f.

excellent example in order to deepen the cleft between both Apostles and to condemn Peter. Paul here becomes the great hero of freedom and justice.

This is the case in Marcion. We know that Marcion, convinced that the new and original gospel of Jesus has been reviled by re-judaizing machinations within the Great Church, made the claim that "only Paul knew the truth, to whom the mystery has been shown by revelation."¹¹⁰ Here Marcion certainly depends on Gal. 1:15f. In his *apostolikon*, the *Corpus Paulinum* of his "Canon," Galatians occupied the first place because of its anti-Judaism.¹¹¹ Within this polemical scheme, Galatians 2:11-14 must have played a decisive role. Tertullian, in his refutation devoted twice an extensive discussion to the use of the text; it seems that in his "*Antitheses*" Marcion used Galatians 1 and 2 in a prominent place.¹¹² The guilt of Peter is heavily stressed, and Marcion extends the blame even to the other Apostles. In Peter, all who show judaistic tendencies are accused of "not walking upright according to the truth of the gospel."¹¹³

The same use of Galatians 2:11-14 in order to level heavy charges against Peter occurred in the polemic of the pagan authors. Porphyry not only used the passage for blaming Paul of "indolence," but also extracted from it the accusation of Peter. In Antioch, Peter was caught in grave error originating in bare fear and stamping him as a hypocrite.¹¹⁴ Similarly the report on Emperor Julian the Apostate's opinion, found in Cyril of Alexandria: "Julian derides the chosen one among the Apostles, Peter, calling him a hypocrite and pretending that Paul convicted him of living according to the Greek way at one time, and according to the Jewish way at another."¹¹⁵

Catholic orthodoxy in its approach to the phenomenon of Peter and Paul would not concur with either extreme. From the beginning, the tendency here was toward harmony. Both men were

¹¹⁰ Irenaeus, Adv. haer. III 13, 1. See Adolph v. Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche*, Leipzig, 1921, p. 82.

¹¹¹ Epiphanius, Panar, 42, 9. The sequence is: Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Philippians (Laodiceans?). The position of Galatians and Philippians at the beginning and the end show the polemical intention of the order.

¹¹² Tertullian, Adv. Marcionem I 20; IV 3; Harnack, *Marcion* (above, note 110), p. 73 n.1.

¹¹³ *Ibid.* (I 20): In order to prove the sharp antithesis between Gospel and Law, the Marcionites "adduce the case of St. Peter himself and of the others who were pillars among the apostles as having been blamed by Paul for not walking upright according to the truth of the Gospel." See also Adv. Marc. V, 3, and De praescr. haer. 23f. where Tertullian adds that it was the intention of the Marcionites to brand the Apostles with the mark of ignorance by referring to Peter's rebuke at Antioch—the incident being clear proof that the Apostles did not fully know the Gospel!

¹¹⁴ Adolph v. Harnack, *Porphyrius "Gegen die Christen", 15 Bücher : Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate*, Berlin, 1916, fragments nr. 21 and 26; id., "Petrus im Urteil der Kirchenfeinde des Altertums," in: *Festgabe von Fachgenossen und Freunden Karl Müller zum siebzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht*, Tübingen, 1922), 1-6; here p. 3.

¹¹⁵ Cyril of Alexandria, *Adversus libros athei Juliani* (ca. 433/41, Altaner); see Adolph v. Harnack, "Petrus im Urteil der Kirchenfeinde" (above note 114), p. 4.

recognized independently as the outstanding representatives of the apostolic generation and as such were often mentioned together (cf. 1 Clement 5:3ff; Ignatius, Rom. 4:3). As early as in Luke-Acts we observe not only the deliberate elimination of any tension in the relationship between Peter and Paul but the clear attempt to equate them as far as possible and to level down their original differences in temperament and character.¹¹⁶ Both, Peter and Paul, are characterized as the great examples of the Christian apostle, as types. The same pious tendency seems to be at work in the early traditions about their joint founding of the church at Corinth (Dionysius of Corinth, ca. 170 A.D)¹¹⁷ and their joint martyrdom in Rome (the same Dionysius, Irenaeus, Tertullian),¹¹⁸ both legends without historical foundation although the combination of the two names in Rome may suggest that the local church remembered both Apostles having been to the city and having died there.¹¹⁹

A passage like Galatians 2:11-14 must have presented a grave problem for this harmonizing trend if the passage was taken in the usual sense of an open "dissension." During the first three centuries, two main apologetic attempts can be discerned which try to interpret Galatians 2:11ff. so as not to disturb the harmony between the two great Apostles.

One of them simply eliminates the problem by pretending that the "Cephas" of Galatians is not Simon Peter. Eusebius tells us (*Historia Ecclesiastica* I. 12,2) that Clement of Alexandria featured it in Book V of the *Hypotyposes*, suggesting that Cephas was one of the "seventy."¹²⁰ The distinction between Peter and Cephas also occurs in some later apostle lists where both names appear separately as if denoting different persons.¹²¹ This grotesque argument re-appears from time to time in the exegetical literature, mostly to be refuted.¹²² Strangely enough, even today the

¹¹⁶ See Ernst Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen, 1956, pp. 90-95.

¹¹⁷ Quoted in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* II 25, 8. Cf. Hugo Koch (ZNW 19, 1919-20), p. 176.

¹¹⁸ Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* III 1; 3,2; Tertullian, *De praescr. haer.* 36; Scorpiace 15; *Adv. Marcionem* IV, 5.

¹¹⁹ This is the position of most modern authors, following the line of Hans Lietzmann's thorough study: *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, 2nd ed., Bonn, 1927. See especially Oscar Cullmann, *Petrus*, 2nd ed., (above, note 109), pp. 83ff. - For a radical position denying any Roman visit of Peter see Karl Heussi's various publications (listed in Cullmann, pp. 84-86), and Johannes Haller, *Das Papsttum. Idee und Wirklichkeit*, 2nd. ed., Basel, 1951, vol. 1, pp. 475-81, where also an excellent discussion of the early joint Peter-Paul-traditions is found on pp. 481-85.

¹²⁰ Of Clement's work, *Hypotyposes*, only fragments have come down to us in Greek. The book contained comments on selected scriptural passages. Cf. Berthold Altaner, *Patrologie*, 5th ed., Freiburg i.Br., 1958, p. 171.

¹²¹ Theodor Schermann, *Propheten -und Apostellegenden nebst Jüngerkatalogen*, (TU 31:3; Leipzig, 1907), pp. 302ff.

¹²² George La Piana, "Cephas and Peter in the Epistle to the Galatians" (*Harvard Theological Review*, 14, 1921), pp. 187-93.

idea sometimes finds advocates who are playing with the possibility of separating "Cephas" from Peter.¹²³

The other approach, while maintaining the identity of Cephas and Peter, re-interpreted the "dispute" in terms of a deliberate demonstration, pre-arranged by the Apostles themselves. Chrysostom develops this solution in detail.¹²⁴ The fight was simulated in order to make the Jewish-Christian part of the church aware that the time of the Law was definitely gone. The main support for this thesis is found in Paul's remark that Peter "feared" those of the circumcision. This seemed incredible—fear in the heart of the most courageous Apostle? The "absurdity" of such a proposition and Paul's way of telling the story were proof for Chrysostom that the incident was simulation. In the presence of the Jerusalem delegation Peter did not want to offend the Jewish Christians by silently giving in to Paul, and Paul in turn used the occasion in collusion with Peter to demonstrate effectively his point against the Jewish Christians.

b. Jerome and Augustine

Most probably Chrysostom found his interpretation already developed in Origen. This is confirmed by Chrysostom's Western contemporary, Jerome, who in his commentary on Galatians defends the same position and claims Origen as his source.¹²⁵ During his extensive stay in the East he may have found Origen's exposition, "five special volumes on the Epistle to the Galatians", among the treasures of the library at Caesarea.

For Jerome,¹²⁶ the "incident" is a game of pedagogical "dispensations," arranged by the Apostles in order to keep peace among both parts of the Antiochian Church, the Jewish and the Gentile. Peter had temporarily withdrawn from the Gentiles in order to overcome the doubts and reserves of the Jewish Christians by this "simulation." Personally, of course, he had not forgotten that the Christian was no longer bound to the Law. When, however, the intention of this act was not understood by the Gentiles, Paul, in order to overcome their indignation, had to simulate the

¹²³ Cf. Donald W. Riddle, "The Cephas-Peter Problem and a Possible Solution" (*JBL* 59: 2, 1940), pp. 169-180.

¹²⁴ Chrysostom, Commentary on Galatians, ad. loc. (PG 61, cols. 635ff.); Sermon "In illud: in faciem ei restiti" (PG 51, cols. 371ff.).

¹²⁵ Jerome, Commentary on Galatians, Prologue (above note 104) (PL 26, col. 308).

¹²⁶ The main source for the following argument is the passage on Gal. 2:11ff. in the same commentary (PL 26, cols. 338-42); a brief summary statement *ibid.*, p. 310 (Prologue).

rebuke using the same method for the sake of the Gentiles which Peter had used for the sake of the Jews: the 'educational simulation' for which Scripture already provides ample proof. Peter then was not the target of the rebuke but those for whose sake Peter had simulated. Philological evidence for this interpretation appears in Jerome's rendering of *kata prosopon* (Gal. 2:11) by "*secundum faciem publicam*," "for public show." Moreover, Jerome argues that Paul himself often acted "contrary to the freedom of the Gospel in order not to offend the Jews;" he recalls the vows at Cenchreae (Acts 18), the offerings in the temple (Acts 21), the circumcision of Timothy (Acts 17), and the *nudipedalia*, entering the temple barefoot.¹²⁷ This argument seems decisive; at the end of the passage, Jerome states that whoever would not like his interpretation, which preserves the balance of the apostolic dignity on both sides, has to show cause why Paul blames someone else for what he committed himself.

It is obvious that Jerome, while strictly rejecting the apologetics of the Cephas argument, is himself engaged in the apologetic attempt of keeping the balance of harmony between the two Apostles, a balance which seems to be endangered by Galatians 2:11-14. But with his able defense of this position the stage was set for one of the most famous exegetical controversies in ancient church history. It was Augustine, presbyter and then bishop at Hippo Regius, who in an extended correspondence challenged Jerome's apologetic masterpiece and gave the initial signal for a new line of interpretation.

The development of this exchange of letters over the years 394-419 has often been treated.¹²⁸ Augustine's first letter to Jerome (Ep. 20) presents the core of the issue. The starting point for Augustine is not so much an exegetical consideration, but rather a general hermeneutical principle. If the Antioch incident actually was a kind of "dispensatory deception," a pious play on the part of the Apostles, then Paul is "lying" when he calls Peter "reprehensible" (the Latin

¹²⁷ The word, derived from *nudipes*, barefoot, seems to occur only here (and in Jerome's Epistle 75). I was unable to trace the special reference here [no internet yet!], except for the suggestion that *nudipedalia* might refer to Jewish or pagan rites of processions.

¹²⁸ Johann Adam Möhler, "Hieronymus und Augustin im Streit über Gal. 2, 14" (in: *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Ignaz Döllinger, Regensburg, 1839), pp. 1-18); Franz Overbeck, *Über die Auffassung des Streits des Paulus mit Petrus in Antiochien (Gal 2,11ff.) bei den Kirchenvätern*, [Rektoratsprogramm], Basel, 1877; Eligio Malfatti, "Una controversia tra S. Agostino e S. Girolamo: il conflitto di Antiochia," *Scuola Cattolica* 49 (1921), pp. 321-338; Pierre Auvray, "Saint Jérôme et saint Augustin : La Controverse au sujet de l'incident d'Antioche" (*Recherches de Science Religieuse* 29, 1939), pp. 594-610; Georges Simard, "La querelle de deux saints : saint Jérôme et saint Augustin," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 12 (1942), pp. 15-38. - The critical text of the correspondence is readily available in the edition by Joseph Schmid, *SS. Eusebii Hieronymi et Aurelii Augustini Epistolae mutuae* (Florilegium Patristicum, nr. 22), Bonn, 1930. Modern English translation in: *The Fathers of the Church*, ed. Roy. J. Deferrari and others: *Saint Augustine, Letters*, vols. I-V, New York, 1951-56 (abbr.: *Letters*, I-V)

translation rendering the Greek *kategnosmenos* incorrectly as *reprehensibilis*). With this fact the reliability of the whole Scripture would be at stake. An Apostle may be wrong as a person, but never as a writer of holy Scripture. "Once we admit in that supreme authority even one polite lie, then nothing will be left of these books, because whenever anyone finds something difficult to practice or hard to believe, he will follow this more dangerous precedent and explain it as the idea or practice of a lying author."¹²⁹ The argument certainly arises out of a deep personal concern. Augustine may have remembered only all too well practices of arbitrary interpretation of the scriptures from his Manichaean experience so as to be especially sensitive at this point.¹³⁰ If the canonical scriptures would not be absolutely reliable, arbitrariness would reign throughout. "I would rather learn from it (scil. the scriptures) that people were truly approved or corrected or condemned than to allow my trust in the Divine Word to be everywhere undermined because I fear to believe that the human conduct of certain excellent and praiseworthy persons is sometimes worthy of blame." This methodological decision on the basis of hermeneutical principles opened the way for a "literal" understanding of the passage. Peter was wrong. Paul withstood him to his face because by his example he was forcing the Gentiles to judaize. Gal. 1:20 is firm proof of the truth of the event.¹³¹

But now, after these preliminaries, starting from 1Cor 9:20, Augustine builds up his own exegesis of the passage. Paul as a Jew certainly had an understanding for his fellow Jewish Christians who were still observing the Law as a custom but not as putting their hope in it as if it was "necessary for salvation."

Consequently, he did not rebuke Peter for observing his ancestral traditions, which he could do without deceit or inconsistency if he wished—they might be superfluous, but they were not harmful—but because he compelled the Gentiles to live as do the Jews. This he could not do unless he regarded these practices as necessary for salvation even after the coming of the Lord. Truth, as set forth by Paul's apostolate, proved this to be wrong. Peter knew this, but he acted as one fearing them who were of the circumcision. Thus he was himself truly corrected, and Paul told the truth. (Ep. 40).¹³²

¹²⁹ Augustine, Epist. 28 (*Letters*, I, p. 96).

¹³⁰ Augustine, Epist. 82 (*Letters*, I, pp. 392ff.).

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 393f.

¹³² Augustine, Epist. 40 (*Letters*, I, p. 175).

And yet, Augustine does not want to give up the basic harmony between Peter and Paul. Suggesting that the scene should be placed before the Jerusalem Council,¹³³ he explains that Paul's rebuke in essence was nothing else but the brotherly call to assert without fear that which they both believed.

In Ep. 82, Augustine treats in this connection the question of different "times" regarding the observance of the Law, a question which plays so prominent a role in Pierre d'Ailly's treatise.¹³⁴ Circumcision and the other ordinances had been given to the people of the Old Covenant as "signs of future things." After their fulfillment in Christ they were no longer needed. But as "prophecy" they retained their dignity. As "pious customs" they still could be observed "for a little while" by Jewish Christians lest their complete rejection might destroy the continuity of Old and New Covenant. The time between their absolute prophetic value and their total abandonment is the time of their honorable funeral. They should not be exposed immediately to the teeth of the wild animals.¹³⁵ The decisive point, however, remained untouched: as means of salvation the Law had definitely ceased since Christ, and every attempt to revive it in this quality was heresy.

The elaborate argument on the stages of the Law is already an answer to Jerome's reaction. After some first very cool and reserved echoes (Epp. 39.68.72), Jerome had answered the charges brought against his exposition in a lengthy treatise (Ep. 75). Here he not only invoked the authority of six ecclesiastical writers confirming his interpretation,¹³⁶ but even went so far as to accuse Augustine of heresy on the ground of his "three times" of the Law which in Augustine's first letters had only appeared in a casual side remark.¹³⁷ According to Jerome, the claim that after Christ the Law was still to be observed is "Cerinthian" and thus "Ebionite" heresy! There is no middle time with Christ; the Law is at an end—for Gentiles and for Jewish Christianity. On this basis, however, Peter by following temporarily the Law could only have acted in "simulation" so that Paul also was "simulating" in blaming Peter. Jerome was offended by the attack of the young bishop. That accounts for the irritated tone of his reply. But it seems that there was not much

¹³³ Augustine, Epist. 82 (see above, note 130).

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 393ff.

¹³⁵ Augustine, *Letters*, I, pp. 40ff. - Augustine here also refers to his treatise *Contra Faustum*, I, 19, 17, where Gal 2:11ff. is expounded in the same way.

¹³⁶ Augustine, Epist. 75—this is the number of Jerome's letter in the Augustinian corpus; in the corpus of Jerome's letters, the number is 112—(*Letters*, I, pp. 345f.) The six authors are: Origen, Didymus the Blind, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Alexander (of Cappadocia or Cilicia), Eusebius of Emesa, Theodore of Heraclea.

¹³⁷ Augustine, Epist. 40, 4 (*Letters*, I, pp. 174f). Cf. Georges Simard (above, note 128), p. 26.

conviction behind the wordy exegesis. It has at least not always been sufficiently noted that in some later instances Jerome himself seems to follow more or less Augustine's "literal" interpretation.¹³⁸ The apologetic construction aimed at eliminating the "fight" of Antioch by the simulation theory had definitely broken down.

3. Medieval Echoes

Gathering the results of the controversy, we find that Augustine's victory was almost complete. Henceforth, the fact of an Antiochian "clash" between the Apostles was no longer denied. Peter had rightly received the rebuke from Paul. Thus the "literal" sense as the basis for all further exegesis had won the field.¹³⁹

Jerome, however, was not forgotten. Almost all commentators on Galatians 2:11ff. during the Middle Ages referred to the famous epistolary exchange, briefly or sometimes extensively. Thus, Jerome's ideas, though neutralized through the preponderance of the Augustinian approach, were still widely known. And in his basic concern, defending the dignity of the two great Apostles, the church father of Bethlehem could always be sure of deep sympathy. Moreover, the harmonistic tendency during the Middle Ages not only dominated the relationship of the two Apostles, but of the two great teachers as well. Basically, Augustin and Jerome could not have disagreed. Thus, the exegetes again and again tried to combine the apologetic motives so prominent in Jerome with the Augustinian solution. Peter was reproached by Paul—but somehow there was justification for the attitude of both. The exegesis of Galatians 2:11-14 during the Middle Ages was clearly characterized by compromise.

This "mid-way" approach could take the form of the compassion theory excusing Peter and Paul alike by virtue of some higher values for the sake of which minor errors even of the Apostles are tolerable. Both, Peter and Paul, had made concessions in order not to offend the feelings of

¹³⁸ Jerome, Dialogue against the Pelagians (PL 23, col. 575); Commentary on Philemon 9 (PL 26, col. 648). See also Georges Simard (above, note 128), p. 35.

¹³⁹ See, e. g., Claudius of Torino, Commentary on Galatians (PL 104, cols. 860ff.); Cassiodorus, Complexiones (PL 70, col. 1344). In a normative formulation for the Middle Ages also: Peter Lombard, Commentary on Galatians. (PL 192, col. 108f.). - At this point, Karl Holl's picture of the medieval exegesis of the passage after Augustin has to be thoroughly revised. Holl thinks of a breakthrough of the Augustinian interpretation over against the one of Jerome at a time no earlier than the 12th/13th century (see below, note 168).

Jewish Christians, and they always did this in love and compassion. At Antioch, too, their actions were guided by love and compassion—Peter's for the Jews, Paul's for the Gentiles. The "fight" then was just an illustration for this very laudable intention on both sides. It had lost its harshness.¹⁴⁰

The compromise could also result in a clever psychological theory showing the necessity of the open rebuke for Peter as a means to escape the dilemma he found himself in. Personally, he had wished to eat with the Gentiles, but the fear to offend the Jewish converts induced him to act against his conviction. Thus he greatly rejoiced at the public reproach which gave his innermost desire the strong support of his great colleague. The "dispute" had lost all its offensive character; it even promoted true fellowship and understanding between Peter and his helpful friend.¹⁴¹

Most important, however, was a suggestion by Augustine himself which seemed to show how to avoid the breaking down of the harmony together with Jerome's apologetic construction. If the fight as a fact could not be denied, it still was not written in the scriptures in order to defile the reputation of the apostles. The story has her own positive "morale", her edifying value in the exemplary attitude of Peter. Peter, by accepting humbly the just reproach from his fellow apostle, taught the Christian virtue of humility. Augustine stressed this point in a side argument in order to avoid the charge that his interpretation would open the field for the attack on the character of the Apostles.¹⁴²

Peter ... received with the mildness of a holy and meek humility the reproof made by Paul for his good, with the freedom of charity. And so, by not refusing to be corrected, even by his inferior, for having accidentally left the path of uprightness, he gave a more precious and holy example to posterity than Paul did, who showed how those lower in authority might confidently dare to defend the truth of the gospel by opposing their elders with all due regard to fraternal charity. (Ep. 82)

Undoubtedly, this was no longer *ex-egesis* but a clear case of *eis-egesis*, mere speculation beyond the limits of the text. The Antiochian reaction of Peter to Paul' rebuke is not mentioned at all in Galatians, nor do we have any direct indication elsewhere as to what it was. Although it is likely that Paul's protest had some positive result,¹⁴³ the speculation as to Peter's humble acceptance of

¹⁴⁰ Godfroy of Vendôme, Opusc. 4 f. (PL 157, cols. 220f.).

¹⁴¹ Petrus Damiani, Opusc. 46, De ferenda aequanimiter correptione (PL 145, cols. 709f.).

¹⁴² Augustin, Epist. 82 (*Letters*, I, p. 410).

¹⁴³ The texts do not lend themselves to the interpretation that Paul in reality suffered a defeat at the hands of Peter and the whole church at Antioch (Paul Gaechter, "Petrus in Antiochien", above, note 102).

the blame was nothing but a concession to the general harmonistic view which could not conceive of a break or even a serious dissension between the two Apostles.

The harmonistic sweep dominating throughout the Middle Ages, however, lifted this secondary element in Augustine's treatment of the passage out of its context and made it the principal solution for the exegetical difficulty. For most authors, the rebuke remained real, but there was no "fight", no "dissension" any more. The story of Antioch had become the great example for the humility of a prelate who does not proudly rely on his superior power but who humbly bows to the necessary correction wherever it may come from. In connection with the theme of the "humble prelate", Galatians 2:11-14 appears abundantly in ever new variations: Peter writes that Paul's letters are admirable (2Peter 3: 15). Thus, he must have read Gal. 2:11ff, and yet, he does not take on the role of the Prince of the Apostles, overruling the objection by his power to bind and to loose. Real greatness takes the rebuke even from the inferior.¹⁴⁴ The first of the Apostles—this also means: the first in humility. "*Qui primus erat in apostolatus culmine esset primus in humilitate.*"¹⁴⁵ A casual remark of Augustine, historically speculating beyond the text, had become the very scope of the passage!

As a biblical prooftext for the topic of the "humble prelate" Galatians 2:11-14 found many practical applications during the Middle Ages. In a systematic treatise of the late eleventh century, the Antiochian episode could be used as proof for the general topos *Quod praelati mali sunt arguendi et corripiendi a subditis*.¹⁴⁶ It was under the same general theme that it also entered the *Decretum Gratiani*, the law book of the Church. Gratian established that no prelate should be accused by a subordinate.¹⁴⁷ But there were exceptions from this rule, and Galatians 2:11ff provided the basis for the argument here: "Paul blamed Peter who was the Prince of the Apostles. Therefore it seems as if it were to be understood that subordinates may reprehend their superior if they are reprehensible."¹⁴⁸ To be sure, Gratian wants to avoid any general conclusion on the matter: "By this example it is not proven that prelates are to be accused by their inferiors."¹⁴⁹ But he clearly admits the exception (and again Galatians 2 provides the model) "except they by chance

¹⁴⁴ Auxilius Francus presbyter, Infensor ac Defensor (PL 129, col. 1087A).

¹⁴⁵ Rabanus Maurus, Commentary on Ez. 40:18 (PL 110, cols. 924f).

¹⁴⁶ Algerus Scholasticus Leodinensis, De misericordia et justitia I, 34 (PL 180, col. 869).

¹⁴⁷ Decretum Gratiani, C. II, q.7, c. 1-27 (PL 187, cols. 638ff.).

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, C. II, q.7, c. 39 Gratian (PL 187, col. 654).

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

would deviate from the faith or compel others to deviate."¹⁵⁰ This "exception", based on Galatians 2:11-14, was soon to gain highest importance. With regard to the highest prelate of the West, the Roman pope, the exception was clearly stated in dist. 40 c.6 of the Decretum: "The one who shall judge all should not be judged by anybody, except he is found deviating from the faith." Recent research has shown how the application of this clause, prepared for by the interpretation of thirteenth and fourteenth century canonists, has shaped the ideas of the conciliarists during the Great Schism.¹⁵¹

But quite apart from the juristic implications, the Pauline "licence" of Gal. 2:11 has often been practiced. Elipandus of Toledo, the advocate of ninth century Spanish adoptianism, warned the hostile Emperor Charlemagne not to pass a quick judgment on the movement. He should be willing to listen and to accept correction—just as Peter did at Antioch who remembered the Scripture: If revelation is given to the younger brother, the elder should hold his tongue.¹⁵² Even more interesting is the same hortatory use of the passage addressed to the pope. I will only quote a few instances showing how the different ages claimed the Pauline "licence" to correct even the head of the Church. During the controversy between Rome and the metropolitan sees of the West in the ninth century, Hincmar of Rheims, one of the leading figures among the metropolitans, refers to Gal. 2:11ff in criticizing the papal condemnation of King Lothar II. Peter, because of his simulation, was reproached and blamed, but not condemned, and the great prince of the apostles accepted this rebuke, praising even those epistles in which he read his own reprehension.¹⁵³ Not much later, Charles the Bald, writing to Pope Hadrian II, is as frank. Having introduced Peter who voluntarily accepted the just blame by his fellow apostle, he charges: You--the pope--are far from acting likewise.¹⁵⁴ The "humble Peter" of Galatians 2:11-14 provides the picture of the ideal pope. During the investiture controversy of the 11th and 12th centuries we hear similar voices. Most instructive is a text from Hugh of Fleury who complains most vividly that Pope Gregory VII, by

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.* Unfortunately, this text is seldom referred to in the modern discussions on Dist. 40 c.6 (below, note 151), although its biblical foundation seems very important in view of the later conciliarist argument.

¹⁵¹ For the discussion of the clause in Dist. 40, c.6 (PL 187, cols. 214f.), see Tierney (above, note 1), p. 57 n. 3, and his references to the studies of Anton Michel and Walter Ullmann; also Tierney, pp. 57ff (canonistic interpretation from the 13th century on). Still valuable is Johann Friedrich von Schulte, *Die Stellung der Concilien, Päpste und Bischöfe vom historischen und canonistischen Standpunkte und die Päpstliche Constitution vom 18. Juli 1870*, Prague, 1871.

¹⁵² Elipandus of Toledo, Epist. 3 ad Carolum Magnum, c.4 (PL 96, col. 869C). – The "Scripture" is an (illegal!) variant of 1Cor 14:30, substituting *juniori* and *senior* for *sedenti* and *prior*.

¹⁵³ Hincmar of Reims, De divortio Lotharii et Teuturgae (PL 125, col. 749).

¹⁵⁴ Carolus Calvus, Epist. ad Hadrianum Papam (PL 124, col. 885).

bis absolutistic demeanor, has confounded the minds of many believers.¹⁵⁵ "I fear that I shall be told that it is none of my business to blame the venerable and great men whose sins the father alone has reserved the right to forgive. But at this point everybody whoever he be, might remember that the most blessed apostle Peter whom the Lord addressed with [the words of] Math. 16:18f--that Paul as a recent convert dared to blame him. If such a great apostle, afflicted by the weakness of the flesh, was found reprehensible, how much more then (the pope) whose heart is boasting and whose eyes look enchanted as if they were thinking great things ... God often would instruct the wise man by some simple-minded person."

4. Conciliarist Literature

We may expect in advance that the hortatory application with the pope in view reached a new peak during the Great Schism when theologians and advocates of the *via concilii* called upon the obstinate pontiffs again and again to follow in the footsteps of the "humble Peter" and not to seek their own. Direct support for this motif of the "humble Peter" and the "humble pope," however, was mainly drawn in here from Bernard of Clairvaux' famous treatise, *De consideratione*.¹⁵⁶ The great saint of the twelfth century, with this pastoral guide for his pupil who was about to mount the papal throne as Eugenius III, had set forth the Gregorian picture of the "true" pope which now again inspired the hope of a "reformation" of head and members. Galatians 2:11-14 meanwhile had found another standard place as biblical proof text in the argumentation of contemporary writers: the theme of the "erring pope."

Brian Tierney, in his important study on the *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory*, has shown that the conciliarism of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was rooted in the ideas of twelfth and thirteenth century canonists.¹⁵⁷ In fact, there is hardly one issue in the conciliar debate the context of which cannot be traced back to earlier canonist theories. In the *Decretum* and its world we find the living background of most of the heated debates; Gratian's *distinctiones* and

¹⁵⁵ Hugh of Fleury, *Liber de regia potestate et sacerdotali dignitate*, 2 (PL 163, cols. 969f.).

¹⁵⁶ The text is found in PL 182, cols. 727-808; excerpts in Carl Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus*, 5th ed., Tübingen; 1934, pp. 164ff. For a sympathetic evaluation of the "Gregorian" ideal of a pope in this treatise, see Joseph Hubert Reinkens, *Papst und Papstthum nach der Zeichnung des hl. Bernhard von Clairvaux. Übersetzung und Erläuterung seiner Schrift De Consideratione*, Münster i.W., 1870.

¹⁵⁷ See above, note 151.

causae provided as much material for quotations as did the scriptures, and they enjoyed almost equal authority.

The major obstacle to any conciliar action toward settling the Schism within the framework of the medieval church and her constitution was juristic in nature. It resided in the canonical principle: "*Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur*."¹⁵⁸ This principle itself merely drew the consequences from the accepted theological proposition that by divine prerogative the Roman Church, constituted in its head, the *vicarius Petri*, could never err in faith (Luke 22:31f)¹⁵⁹ and therefore had no human court of appeal besides and above her. It was the task of the conciliarist theory to break through the frustrating circle of this principle which did not reckon with the empirical fact of a schism within the Roman Church itself.

The focal point of the conciliarist assault on this foundational ideology were the "theological" presuppositions behind the juristic definitions. The first conciliarist treatise properly speaking after the outbreak of the Great Schism, Conrad of Gelnhausen's *Epistula Concordiae* of ca 1380¹⁶⁰ launched the frontal attack against the "Petrine" prerogative of the Roman Church and set the stage for the conciliarist argument, drawing at the same time heavily upon the fruits of earlier "radicals" such as Marsilius of Padua, William Ockham, and Peter Dubois. In a first movement he broke the alleged prerogative of the Roman Church by a sharp distinction between *ecclesia Romana* and *ecclesia Universalis*. The divine prerogative of Luke 22:31f. intended the establishment of the Universal Church, not of any particular Church. Only the Universal Church as such possessed the full residue of power which Christ wanted to leave to his Church; only she, the *congregatio omnium fidelium*, could be certain of the unfailing guidance of the Lord promised

¹⁵⁸ Albert Michael Koeniger, "Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur," in: *Beiträge zur Geschichte des christlichen Altertums und der byzantinischen Literatur, Festgabe für A. Ehrhard*, Bonn, 1922, pp. 273-300. Cf. the Dictatus Papae by Gregory VII, propositio 19 (Mirbt, *Quellen*, nr. 278), and the commentary by Karl Hofmann, *Der Dictatus Papae Gregors VII. Eine rechtsgeschichtliche Erklärung*, Paderborn, 1933, ad loc.

¹⁵⁹ Gregory VII, Dictatus papae, propositio 22 (Mirbt, *Quellen*, nr. 278); earlier already: *Decretales Pseudoisidoriana*, ed. Paul Hinschius, Leipzig, 1863, p. 454: "Haec sancta et apostolica mater omnium ecclesiarum Christi ecclesia quae per omnipotentis Dei gratiam a tramite apostolicae traditionis numquam errasse probatur nec hereticis novitatibus depravanda succubuit (follows quote of Luke 22:31f);" Pope Hormisdas (514-23): "in sede apostolica immaculata est semper catholica servata religio" (cf. Erich Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, Bd. 2, Tübingen, 1930, pp. 129ff). - For an (incomplete) account of the interpretation of Luke 22:31f in the Ancient and Medieval Church see Joseph Langen, *Das Vatikanische Dogma von dem Universal-Episcopat und der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes in seinem Verhältniss zum Neuen Testament und der exegetischen Ueberlieferung*, 2nd ed., Bonn, 1876, 2. Teil, pp. 43-74.

¹⁶⁰ Text in Edmond Martène and Ursain Durand, *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum*, Paris, vol. II, 1717, pp. 1200-1226. Franz Bliemetzrieder, *Literarische Polemik zu Beginn des Grossen Abendländischen Schismas (Kardinal Petrus Flandrin, Kardinal Petrus Amelii, Konrad von Gelnhausen)*. *Ungedruckte Texte und Untersuchungen*, Wien, 1909, pp. 111-140. Also Tierney, p. 3f, and Matthew Spinka, in: LCC, vol. XIV (see above, note 57).

in Luke 22:31f. and therefore stay free from error. All claims of a particular church to possess what belongs only to the Universal Church were blasphemy. This was proven in a second movement from historical evidence. Popes of the Roman Church have erred (the examples: Pope Marcellinus¹⁶¹ and Pope Anastasius¹⁶² will occur over and over again in the conciliarist literature), and from this basic fact of "erring popes," Conrad concluded that the Roman Church as the particular church of the *vicarius Petri* was not free from error. We notice that the alleged identity of Roman Church and pope on the basis of a Petrine dogma was not dissolved. But what had contributed so much to strengthening the position of the papacy in the past, became now the hinge of the argument against it. The actual failure of individual popes made it impossible to conceive of their particular church, even the church of Peter, as not stained with error. The promise of Christ is applied to the Universal Church only. Thus it is her authority, residing in the General Council as the representation of the corporate body of all believers, that had to be regarded as superior to any single organ of church government.¹⁶³ All authority in the Church apart from the *congregatio omnium fidelium* had derivatory character and was liable to be withdrawn in case of misuse.¹⁶⁴

The thesis of the "erring pope"—this was the starting point of the attack. And here, at the very heart of the argument, the biblical reference to Galatians 2:11-14 joined the conciliar armour. Not only in the historical development of the Petrine structure of papacy and Roman church "inerrancy" is a fiction; the proof goes back to the very beginnings, to the Petrine source itself. Even the "first pope" was unable to claim inerrancy for himself if he was rightly reproached by

¹⁶¹ Pope Marcellinus (295-304) is said to have denied his Christian faith in persecution (cf. Erich Caspar, "Kleine Beiträge zur älteren Papstgeschichte I", *ZKG* 46, 1928, pp. 321-33; idem, *Geschichte des Papsttums* [above, note 159], vol. I, pp. 98-99). For his picture in the Middle Ages see Ignaz Döllinger, *Die Papst-Fabeln des Mittelalters*, 2nd ed., Stuttgart, 1890, pp. 48ff. - Marcellinus and Anastasius II are mentioned together by Johannes of Breviscoxa, *Tractatus de Fide et Ecclesia* etc. (*Du Pin*, I, p. 807).

¹⁶² Pope Anastasius II (496-98) tried to put an end to the unfortunate Acacian schism by offering concessions to the East. But the harsh verdict of the strict party in Rome against him survived the story of his merits. It appears in the *Decretum Gratiani*, Dist. 19, c. 9 (PL 187, col. 111A) and thus determined his picture throughout the Middle Ages. See Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, Bd. II, p. 37; Döllinger, *Papst-Fabeln* (above, note 161), pp. 146ff.

¹⁶³ The principle as such is already clearly stated in John of Paris' treatise, *De potestate regia et papali* (1302/03): "Orbis maior est urbe et papa, concilium maius est papa solo", and, as is well known, forms a keystone in the system of Marsilius of Padua. Cf. Friedrich Heiler, *Altkirchliche Autonomie und päpstlicher Zentralismus*, Munich, 1941, p. 294 Anm. 50.

¹⁶⁴ Dist. 40 c.6. of the *Decretum Gratiani* (above, note 151), to be sure, had already attempted to find a canonical solution for the problem of a factually heretical pope. This solution, however, consisted in a restrictive clause ("nisi deprehendatur a fide devius") attached to the statement of papal inerrancy, and thus created an ambiguous situation. The canonists found a way of combining both, the clause about the inerrancy of the Roman See and the possibility of a factually erring pope by claiming that a heretical pope, by virtue of his heresy, has automatically ceased to occupy the Roman See. Cf. Tierney, pp. 60ff.

Paul in Antioch. Wherever the thesis of the "erring pope" appeared, Galatians 2:11-14 almost automatically popped into the picture.¹⁶⁵ To be sure, Peter's prerogative as such was not questioned. He was singled out from the Apostles to be the first among them. But, as Dietrich of Nieheim put it, "it cannot be true that Peter therefore was made impeccable; as long as he was a pilgrim on earth, he could err and sin because of his free will. We read that he denied his Lord, and at a time did not walk upright according to the truth of the gospel. Thus it is erroneous to pretend that whoever is promoted to the papal office will therefore automatically be holy, though the canonists with many words favor the opinion that the See of Peter either finds him or makes him holy."¹⁶⁶ If it is true that Peter himself could err and did err, then the supra-individual, the representative character of his prerogatives is clear: All that Christ bestowed upon him, he received vicariously for the Church Universal.

Focusing on the use of Galatians 2:11-14 in this context we discover that it is no longer simply the morale of Augustin's "humble prelate" that dominated the conciliarist understanding of the passage. Rather, it was a revival of the very heart of Augustine's argument against Jerome that took place here. The reality of the blame was used to establish the reality of Peter's error and fall. The picture of the "erring pope" had found its prototype in the "erring Peter" of Galatians 2:11-14. Thus the Augustinian interpretation reached a new victorious peak. In its light the Antiochian scene immediately came alive. If the position of the pope really excluded any appellation from him, then Paul would have violated divine as well as human law. His resistance, however, and his insisting on a public confrontation constituted a clear appellation to a higher authority, the church, the *congregatio fidelium*. Had Peter not given in, he should have been condemned by the church. It follows that the pope as successor of Peter may be attacked publicly by a doctor in theology as successor of Paul, if he showed deficiency in his faith.¹⁶⁷ Galatians 2:11-14 had become the prooftext for a theory that needed Peter's fall. It is in this context that the passage also was read by Martin Luther about a century later.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵ See, e.g., the above mentioned treatise by John of Breviscoxa (note 161), *Du Pin*, I, p. 807, where the passage appears right in the introduction.

¹⁶⁶ Dietrich of Nieheim, *Avisamenta in Concilio Constantiensi* (1414), ed. Finke, *Acta*, IV, 1928, p. 592.

¹⁶⁷ John Gerson, *Quomodo et an liceat in causis fidei a Summo Pontifice appellare seu ejus judicium declinare*, *Du Pin*, II, p. 304. For the historical context of the treatise cf. the (apologetic) remarks by John L. Connolly, *John Gerson. Reformer and Mystic*, Louvain, 1928, p. 186 (n.5 and 6).

¹⁶⁸ See Karl Holl, "Der Streit zwischen Petrus und Paulus zu Antiochia in seiner Bedeutung für Luthers innere Entwicklung," in: *Gesammelte Aufsätze, Band III: Der Westen*, Tübingen, 1928, pp. 134-46.

e. Gal. 2:11-14 in the Work of Pierre d'Ailly

Our outline has provided us with the necessary background for an evaluation of Ailly's exegesis in its proper context. We have to be familiar with the entire development in view of the fact that "originality" was not the special strength nor even the intention of a late medieval theologian. The authority of the great fathers and teachers of the Church overshadowed the whole scene to such an extent that it often seems frustrating to search for a "personal" and "original" contribution among the extensive quotes of patristic literature. The interpreter of medieval theological literature has not only to find his way through an immense mass of material, often incredibly prolific and unpolished in its language, but he also has to learn to draw conclusions from the mere nuances and the context of quotes. Thoroughly rooted in the school traditions of his day, Pierre d'Ailly certainly was no better in this respect than other theologians. On the contrary, it may be true that the years of the Great Schism showed a more rapid decline of the general intellectual climate than other periods. Father Ehrle once complained that "he (*scil.* Ailly) actually was a representative of a theology which was debilitated and watered down by the decline of fourteenth century intellectuality, no longer drawing from the sources, no longer reading the fathers and great theologians themselves but relying upon easy promptuaries and materials from canonistic literature ... The turbulence of the time unfortunately did not allow him to produce more than a poor, bloodless theology of accommodation."¹⁶⁹ In a broad sense, this judgment certainly is accurate. The immediate pressures of the situation were not favorable to meditative and speculative theological activity. It now was the turn of those theological "practicioners" who were able to apply complicated theories to an inflammatory situation where more was at stake than a mere question of "outward" order. Ehrle himself credits Ailly with having been aware of the temporal deficiency of the theological scene, admitting by this "apology" that there are deeper dimensions to the personality of the Cardinal than the charge of a "superficial" mind would suggest. But he has rightly put his finger on one of the major limitations of the personality of Pierre d'Ailly. It will be necessary to keep these basic limitations in mind as we proceed to our detailed investigation.

In spite of the declining "spirit of the time", a close look into the literary expression of the late medieval mind always provides new surprises. The picture is by far not as gloomy and uniform as a general summary may lead us to believe. In tracing one single motif, one single

¹⁶⁹ Franz Ehrle, *Martin de Alpartilis Chronica actitatorum temporibus domini Benedicti XIII*, 1906, pp. 463f.

element, in the thought of Pierre d'Ailly, we obtain a most vivid picture of a man whose "biblical" faith deeply informed his life's action, and in this he certainly was not very different from many theologians of his days. It may be a surprise, but it is probably fair to say that the development of his whole active life is mirrored in his understanding of Galatians 2:11-14, transforming the rich background of tradition into the personal attempt to make biblical exegesis fruitful for his task as a churchman. By sketching the different aspects of his use of the passage throughout his career we are also providing the frame for our discussion of the place of the treatise we are editing.

Of course, Ailly knew about the motif of the "humble prelate" and its relationship to Gal. 2:11ff. Peter "learning" humility in order to understand better the weakness of others is an example for all clergymen and priests. In a talk on Gal. 6:1ff. addressed to the clergy of his Cambrai diocese, the bishop quoted Augustine to illustrate his point:

Nothing does a better job in soliciting our compassion than the meditation of our own endangerment. The Lord allowed the prince of the church to fall in order that he might learn for himself how to have compassion with those closest to you (Ecclu. 18:13)¹⁷⁰

Far more interesting, however, is Ailly's sharing of the conciliarist interpretation of the passage. His writings during and after the Council of Constance, where his conciliarism found its definitive shape in the fire of the disputes between the partisans of the various power groups, witness clearly to the central role which Galatians 2 occupied in the foundation of his conciliarist convictions. His programmatic treatise, *De materia Concilii Universalis*, of 1416¹⁷¹ contains one of the most precise statements about the place of Galatians 2:11-14 in conciliar theory since Conrad of Gelnhausen, starting out with the definition of the Council's dignity.

Hence the aforesaid conclusion appears, namely that authority and determination of the Council has to be ascribed to the determination of the Holy Spirit, since it says there (Acts 15:28): It pleased the Holy Spirit and us etc. ... From this some go on saying that the Universal Council cannot err in matters of faith. This also being meant by that word of Christ: Peter I have prayed for you lest thy faith cease (Luke 22:32), since this is not said of Peter's personal faith, as he himself has erred, but of the faith of the Universal Church which is represented in the General Council. About her, in the same place (sic!) it is said: The gates of hell will not prevail against her (Matth. 16:18), i.e. the Church. It does not

¹⁷⁰ First Synodical Sermon (*Tractatus et Sermones* in the 1490 Strasbourg edition, s.p.); cf. also Tschackert, pp. 110f.

¹⁷¹ First edited by Bernhard Meller (see above, note 6) pp. 289-346 (Anhang). The first part is printed in *Du Pin*, II, pp. 24-29; part three in *Du Pin*, II, pp. 903ff (= *Von der Hardt*, I, pp. 409ff); part two existed in manuscript form only. The work had been prepared for publication in 1412; however, it was not edited in the full form (including part three) until 1416.

say: against you, i.e. Peter. Therefore it appears that the judgment of the Council is to be preferred to the pope's judgment because he may err in matters of faith. Just as Peter, too, [could err] about whom Paul says in Gal. 2: I withstood him to his face since he was reprehensible not walking toward the truth of the gospel.¹⁷²

The line of the "conciliar" argument in this text is utterly clear. The proposition about the divine authority of the Council as bestowed by the Holy Spirit leads to the conclusion that the General Council cannot err—a position which Ailly himself did not share. Proof for this thesis comes from Luke 22:32, and it is in the conciliarist interpretation of this crucial text that Gal. 2:11ff. holds the hermeneutical key position. Peter erred. Therefore the deficiency of Peter's faith instead of the indeficiency for which Jesus prayed (and his prayers are heard: Hebr. 5:7!) cannot mean Peter's *personal* faith but means the faith of the Universal Church which he represented. Ailly concludes: Therefore, the judgment of the Council is superior to the pope's, because even Peter could err in faith. Gal. 2:11ff. provides the firm scriptural ground for Ailly's conviction of the "erring pope." The "erring Peter" of Gal. 2 as a biblical fact is the prototype demonstrating the issue in all its desired clarity.

It was nothing less, but also nothing more than the "*erring* Peter" that Ailly found in Gal. 2. The qualification of this statement appears a few paragraphs later in the same writing. Ailly was not a radical, and the conclusions he drew from the conciliar position of the "erring pope" were not meant as an attack on the papacy as such. It is true, in a heated moment he could state without qualification that "the council is above the pope", and his enemies would "withstand him to his face" as they themselves boasted.¹⁷³ Still, he was not willing to identify the "erring pope" with the "heretical" one as the radical wing of conciliarists did in order to avoid the necessity of negotiating with "popes" who were opposed to the Church's welfare. For Ailly, the "erring pope" is a sad fact which certainly demands that the Council must have a judiciary function independent from and superior to him, but this practical necessity does not place the pope on the bench of the heretics. Ailly quite agrees: to leave the pope with unrestricted power would mean to give him authority to "destroy" rather than to "edify" (Gal. 2:18 !). But Gal. 2 also shows that in the altercation between Peter and Paul there was *no heresy* involved:¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² Oakley, p. 306f.; Meller (above, note 6), p. 330; cf. Finke, *Acta* III, p. 50, a very similar text.

¹⁷³ *Von der Hardt* (above, note 80), VI, p. 61; Tschackert, p. 192.

¹⁷⁴ *Von der Hardt*, VI, pp. 333f.; Oakley, p. 310.

Although Peter was reproached by Paul, and rightly so, because Peter did not walk upright according to the truth of the Gospel, yet neither the text nor the Gloss allow the conclusion that Peter was a heretic or committed a heretical error. Similarly the pope may be reprehended and corrected in certain cases where there is no heresy.

The famous dist. 40 c. 7 in the Decretum Gratiani about the "heretical" pope¹⁷⁵ is not sufficient reason against this interpretation. The definition: "lest he be seized deviating from the faith" is taken in the wide sense of "not walking according to the truth of the gospel." In some way, papal action really may stir up genuine scandal and promote the destruction of the Church—in this case he can be corrected, accused, and judged, but he is not necessarily a heretic. It is clear that this picture is informed by Augustine's "moral" interpretation of Galatians 2:11-14. The "erring Peter" as well as the "erring pope" do not suggest that no hope is left after the "fall". If the correction is humbly accepted by the person concerned, then the purpose of the blame must be seen as being fulfilled.

In a third line of argument on Gal. 2:11ff. in this connection the passage serves to illustrate the special role of the cardinals in the situation of the schism. Ailly personally thought very highly of his task as a cardinal and of his responsibilities. For him, as for medieval theology in general, the Roman church's hierarchy parallels the hierarchy of the apostolic times, the college of cardinals forming the *collegium* of the Apostles gathered around Peter as the head. Pope and cardinals together represent the true apostolic succession in which both parties are equal in terms of their exercising the same general office of preaching. In case of a deficiency on the part of the pope, therefore, the cardinals have to take care of the Universal Church and to assemble the General Council. Their responsibility vis-a-vis the pope here is the same which Paul took upon himself when he reproached Peter.

The cardinals, succeeding the Apostles in the general ministry of the Word of God ... are bound to teach the world the necessary truths. They are successors of Paul in the same equalness in which Paul in his preaching office (scil. of the evangelical law) by the holy doctors is said to have been equal to Peter, and according to his example they can resist the successor of Peter if he violates the scheme of the Christian religion (Gal. 2). For even though he is the general vicar of Christ and the greatest in office and authoritative rank, he still, regarding the ministry of preaching and Christian doctrine, must count himself among the other bishops.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁵ See above, note 151.

¹⁷⁶ Ailly, *Tractatus de Ecclesiae, Concilii Generalis, Romani Pontificis et cardinalium auctoritate* (*Du Pin*, II, p. 935).

In all three cases, Gal. 2:11ff. substantiates Ailly's position under the basic aspect of the "erring Peter." Peter has erred—therefore the pope can err and be held responsible by the General Council as the appropriate court of appeal. Peter has erred—this, however, does not mean that he was a heretic. Peter has erred—therefore the cardinals have to perform the task Paul took on at Antioch correcting Peter's failure.

The situation at Constance obviously constituted the most severe test for Ailly's exegesis of Gal. 2:11ff. Here the passage finally shaped into the most valuable tool of support for conciliar action by a convincing biblical argument. Within the parameter of Ailly's own use of the passage the end of a development seems to have been reached. However, for the French theologian, Gal. 2:11ff. had not always served as the basis to urge action against the "erring pope." Even in 1406, at the Paris Winter Council when Simon de Cramaud vigorously demanded the continued subtraction of obedience to the rival popes, Ailly still defended Benedict XIII and the *via copromissi*. Instead of Simon's proposed solution à la Gal. 2:11ff. ("*affin de pooir contraindre la dureté de ces deux gens, faisons comme fit Saint Paul à Saint Pierre. Ne resista-t-il pas in facie?*")¹⁷⁷ he preferred the less violent method of Matth. 18:15, the way of brotherly admonition. Radical solutions were not his taste in those years. The most "healthful" way in all things is the *via media*. In a remark on the interpretation of the scriptures he once said: "This is the way which moves right in the middle—between the two evil extremes," referring to Aristotle as his "master" in terms of this conviction.¹⁷⁸

This careful and well-balanced way which eventually was leading up to the determined position at Constance replaced after 1400 the aggressive mood of the young Ailly's use of Gal. 2:11ff. It may well be that the bishop of Cambrai, in the stormy beginning of his episcopate, had learned how to move more slowly and to restrain his temper which occasionally asserted itself boldly during his academic years. As a mature and definitive example of the earlier period we may quote the *Apologia* of the Paris Theological Faculty in the case against Jean de Montson, where Ailly was setting forth the arguments for Montson's condemnation, after having returned from Avignon (1388).¹⁷⁹ The major difficulty for Ailly and the Faculty had been Montson's appeal to St.

¹⁷⁷ Louis Bourgeois du Chastenet, *Nouvelle histoire du Concile de Constance*, Paris, 1718, p. 123. Cf. Louis Salembier, "Les oeuvres françaises de Pierre d'Ailly," *Revue de Lille*, 25, 1906-07, p. 789.

¹⁷⁸ Tractatus de Ecclesiae etc. (above, note 176), Du Pin, II, 926.

¹⁷⁹ *Apologia Facultatis theologiae Parisiensis circa damnationem Joannis de Montesono* (*Du Pin*, I, pp. 709-22; d'Argentré, I, pp. 71-135). Cf. Salembier, *Le cardinal Pierre d'Ailly*, pp. 74f.

Thomas Aquinas as an "approved" teacher of the Church. The young Paris doctor challenged St. Thomas' authority in this special case by claiming that "approbation" of a doctor does not mean unrestricted approval as "impeccable." Of course, Saint Thomas is not a heretic, but this does not exclude that he held *in part* erroneous or even heretical doctrines. Thomas himself made this distinction between "heretical" and "erroneous. If doctors are in disagreement even in matters of faith, which are not yet decided by the Church, then there is no stain of heresy. Only obstinacy after an approved decision is heretical. Ailly's comment points out that Thomas here is speaking of the dissension between Jerome and Augustine.¹⁸⁰ To substantiate his conclusion, he gives examples of "holy men" who were not free from error in matters of faith. Significantly enough, the first one is the "erring Peter" of Gal. 2. He is followed by Cyprian, Jerome, Peter Lombard, Gratian, Anselm, Hugh of St. Victor and finally Thomas Aquinas himself. Ailly's exegesis here does not yet show the sincerity and conviction of his later days. The rhetorical form, the play with the argument, still dominate the context. But the argument is well put:

To proceed *a maioribus ad minora*, let us first take the example about the doctrine of Saint Peter which in all matters of faith undoubtedly is more approved than Paul's. Now it is evident that his doctrine in some part was erroneous, namely where Paul reproaches him (Gal. 2:11) "because he was reprehensible." And he adds the cause for this reprehension of Peter and the others that erred through this doctrine in v. 14: 'Because certainly he did not walk rightly toward the truth of the gospel.' And thus it appears that he erred against the truth of the gospel, his doctrine being at this point erroneous in faith. Hence it also appears that in an error of faith a minor may reprehend any superior, if Paul so reprehended Peter, the Prince of the Apostles. Therefore, it may not be judged strange and presumptuous when minor doctors reprehend Saint Thomas when they can show that he has erred in matters of faith.¹⁸¹

The problem of error in connection with authority must have occupied the mind of the young scholar ever since the outbreak of the Schism. His nominalistic scepticism elicits the basic doubt concerning the reliability of all human sources of authority. Gal. 2:11ff. provides the necessary basis from the "authoritative" scriptures. It is again the aspect of the "erring Peter" that makes the passage attractive, but we note that here it is not the "erring pope," but the "erring saint" who is the target of Ailly's argumentation.

¹⁸⁰ Ailly quotes Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* II/IIae, quaestio 11 de haeresi, art. 2, ad 3: "Et haec dicit S. Thomas propter dissentionem inter Hieronymum et Augustinum circa cessationem legalium" (*Du Pin*, I, p. 716).

¹⁸¹ *Du Pin*, I, p. 780.

Actually, this theme in its special application is nothing more than a speculative variant of the "erring pope" theme. That Ailly by the time of the anti-Montson treatise had knowledge of this basic conciliarist concept so closely connected with Gal. 2 is evident from his doctoral transactions where the discussion of Galatians 2:11-14 in its significance for church politics appears for the first time in his work—two years after the outbreak of the Schism. Many of his later ideas are already developed here, most probably in close contact with, if not in direct dependence on Conrad of Gelnhausen.¹⁸²

Ailly's *Vesperiae* confront a series of *assertiones* which assert the inerrancy of Universal Church, General Council, Roman Church, cardinals and pope (if canonically instituted) by a series of *in contrarium* statements starting with the pope: "For one thing, a pope, even when canonically instituted, can still err against the faith, since Peter and many others are said to have thus erred."¹⁸³ The possibility of an "erring pope," inferred from Gal. 2:11-14 is already a standing argument for the conciliarist ideology.

The *Resumpta* develops the topic further. The most articulate statement on the Galatians passage is found here in a complicated scholastic argument against the proposition that the *lex Christi* inevitably becomes "defective" if, with Ailly, it is assumed that the faith of the Universal Church can be preserved in a single lay person only. The adversary had pointed out that in this case no priest would be involved whose task it is to administer the necessary sacramental grace as instituted by the *lex Christi*. Ailly counters by stating that the efficacy of the priesthood of Christ depends on Christ himself alone. The continuous presence of a priest in Christ's place, even a high priest, to administer the sacraments never guarantees that no error is involved. A priest, too, can err and be a heretic (!), and yet administer the sacraments validly.

It is a fact that somebody might be priest, even High priest, and yet errs against the law of Christ as the Apostle Paul witnesses in Gal. 2.¹⁸⁴

Error, or even heresy, and effective distribution of the sacraments are not mutually exclusive. We see how the burning practical problems of the Schism almost naturally enter the picture and challenge the theologian to come up with an answer. Yet in the background of all the arguments

¹⁸² Conrad of Gelnhausen left Paris together with other professors during the pro-clementine terror of Louis of Anjou in 1381: Salembier, p. 62. Ailly must have had some contact with the famous teacher, although he never mentions him directly.

¹⁸³ Brown, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*, 1690 (above, note 41), p. 523D.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 536C.

derived from the "erring Peter" at this time stands the motif of the "erring pope." Just a few paragraphs later we read: "The pope is *persona publica*, representing the whole church, and yet he can err against the faith, and similarly the General Council."¹⁸⁵ The last clause enlarges the realm of possible "error" still farther, beyond the person of the pope. Even the corporate personality can err. In this connection, Ailly also lists the Roman Church: she can err as well, if she deviates from the faith, as did the Antiochian Church. Everywhere, the authority of all the different organs of the Church may be questioned. The theme of errancy and inerrancy in the realm of the empirical church has already here gained overwhelming importance in the treatment of Galatians 2:11-14.

However, the earliest traces of Ailly's exegesis of the passage go back into the time prior to the Schism and lead us once again to the dispute between Augustine and Jerome which in the scholastic world of the Middle Ages went under the topic "On the time of observing the law." This was the heading under which Gal. 2:11ff. also appeared as early as 1378 in Ailly's commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. In his chapters on the sacraments the Lombard had listed opinions about the time when Christian baptism was instituted to replace circumcision as the sign of the covenant. (*Sent. IV dist. III 2 q.5*).¹⁸⁶ It seems that different starting points can be considered: e.g., John 3:5, Matth. 28:19; the Lombard himself opted for Mark 6:7, where Jesus "sent them out two by two to preach in Judea and to baptize." This difference leads to the further question, whether circumcision lost its power immediately with the institution of baptism or not (*dist. III, 2 q.8*).¹⁸⁷ The Lombard's answer is that actually "all commands of the Law were terminated by the death of Christ," the cross constituting the turning point of the ages.

Commenting on this text gave young Pierre d'Ailly, at that time *baccalaureus sententiarius*, the first occasion to deal extensively with Gal. 2:11ff. He did his work, as was expected, in very close contact with the commentaries of the "great" masters, here (*dist. III, 2*) especially to Duns Scotus' famous *Opera*.¹⁸⁸ Over large stretches Ailly simply reproduced the

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 537CD.

¹⁸⁶ Elizabeth F. Rogers, *Peter Lombard and the Sacramental System*, New York, 1917, p. 91; cf. also Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* II 6,4.

¹⁸⁷ Rogers, p. 94.

¹⁸⁸ In Duns Scotus' commentary upon the Sentences, we distinguish today not two, but three major "editions": *Lectura prima* (Oxford), *Opus Parisiense* (in different "reportationes") and *Opus Oxoniense* ("ordinatio" in a supplemented form). For the complicated literary relationships see Karl Balić's standard study: *Les commentaires de Jean Duns Scot sur les quatre livres des Sentences. Etude historique et critique*, Louvain, 1927. A comprehensive bibliography has been compiled by Odulf Schäfer in 1955 (see bibliography). Ailly seems to have known both the *Opus Oxoniense* and several Parisian Reportationes. A careful study of the exact sources for Ailly's commentary would go beyond the limits of the present investigation, although this would be an important *desideratum*. - The

argument of Scotus. This is of great interest for us. As we compare our manuscript treatise with the text on Gal. 2 in Ailly's Sentences commentary, we find a very close relationship in argument as well as in wording. Knowing that the passage in Ailly's commentary is largely dependent on Duns Scotus, we have already the clue to the most important source behind our text. Tschackert had noted that Ailly in our treatise mainly "reports", but could not identify the source.¹⁸⁹

The theme of Ailly's exposition of art. 3 q. II is "Whether by the institution of baptism circumcision was abrogated." It is being dealt with in three sections:

1. When was baptism instituted?
2. When did baptism become obligatory?
3. When was circumcision abrogated?

It is within the third *punctum* that Galatians 2:11-14 has its place. In a series of *propositiones* Ailly develops the thesis that there are four different times concerning the observation of circumcision: When it was a) necessary, b) useful but not necessary, c) neither useful nor necessary but not deadly, d) definitely deadly and prohibited. Jewish Christians, he observes, could still keep circumcision, if they wanted, until, at a given date (probably after the fifth year of Nero in which the New Testament ends), God declared through Apostles or their successors that the Law was to be completely abandoned.

At this point Ailly raises the objection ("*contra*") from Gal. 2:11-14. Did not Paul reproach Peter for keeping the Law a long time before that date of termination? The *sententarius* hints at the debate about the matter between the two eminent Apostles as well as the two great doctors and then goes on answering in four propositions. *Ad 1*: With Augustine, he holds that Peter must have erred, otherwise Paul as a writer of Holy Writ would be lying. *Ad 2*: Peter's error was not the observation of the Law, since Paul himself observed the Law afterwards. *Ad 3*: The error may be that Peter did observe the Law and in so acting wrongly withdrew from the Gentiles. Or it may be that he did not observe the Law and out of "fear" changed his mind. At this point Ailly refers to Duns Scotus, "*in quo videndum est de hoc plenius.*" *Ad 4*: This error, however, was a venial one, although the fact of an error itself cannot be removed. Peter's good intention is no excuse.

relevant texts of Ailly are found in his *Quaestiones super libros sententiarum*, ed. Strasbourg, 1490, under the rubric: IV sent., q. 2, paragraph "T" through "U" [see above, note 45].

¹⁸⁹ Tschackert, p. 74.

The closeness of this text from Ailly's *Sentences* commentary to our treatise is striking. But apart from that, many of the later ideas on Gal. 2:11ff. are already present here. The Paris scholar started out by looking at the passage as a proof-text for his understanding of the "times of the Law." Shortly after the outbreak of the Great Schism, we observe the shift to the new motif of the "erring Peter" as the prototype of the "erring pope," and even, in a more comprehensive sense, of the "erring saint." This theme, finally, dominates completely Ailly's later use of Galatians 2:11-14 although we find here and there the traces of the "humble prelate" theme, the signal contribution of the Augustinian heritage. A fascinating development emerges as the result of our stock-taking which highlights the existential challenges the church was facing during those exciting decades.

PART II : THE TREATISE

1. The manuscript

In addition to the materials on Galatians 2:11-14 which we could extract from the writings of Pierre d'Ailly in general, the Cardinal has left a short treatise dealing exclusively with the problems of this passage. The only extant copy of the work is preserved, among other manuscript materials, in a volume at the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris.

The early editions of Ailly's works, especially the rich collection of his *Tractatus et Sermones*, printed in 1490¹⁹⁰ did not include the treatise, neither is there any modern edition which might be consulted. This fact may justify our attempt to draw attention to this "lost" piece from the pen of the great French Cardinal by making its text accessible. The integral text is reproduced in the appendix, the only addition consisting of the paragraph numbers which are also added to the English translation and should help to orient the reader. Despite its relative inaccessibility, however, the treatise has not gone unnoticed. Both biographers mention it. Tschackert, in his valuable *appendices* where he published several *inedita*, reproduced the first and last lines of the manuscript but did not read the treatise himself.¹⁹¹ Even in the brief extract we find numerous misreadings. Salembier in his bibliographical lists always mentions the work without going into details.¹⁹² A most valuable notice is found in Friedrich Stegmüller's indispensable *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi* (s.v. Petrus de Alliaco) where incipit and explicit are printed in addition to more general information.¹⁹³

According to a property note on the first leaf, probably added at the time of the re-binding in the XVIIth century, the manuscript volume Paris nat.lat. 3122 comes from the ancient library of the Collège de Navarre where Ailly had spent so many years as a student and later as rector. In his last will he had made arrangements for his books to pass into the possession of the institution

¹⁹⁰ *Tractatus et Sermones*, Strasbourg at J. Flach Father. - This edition was several times reprinted, i.e., early by Nicolaus Wolff at Strasbourg, 1500; later by Leander a San Martino at Douai, 1634. I have been fortunate to find the original 1490 edition in a copy at Rose Memorial Library, Drew University.

¹⁹¹ Tschackert, *Appendix IX*, p. (28f.) Tschackert obtained his information about the manuscript from a colleague, Professor August Reifferscheid of Breslau who had transcribed the original in Paris for him (see his *Vorwort*, p. VIII).

¹⁹² See above, note 5.

¹⁹³ Friedrich Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, vol. 4, Madrid, 1954, nr. 6412, 1.

which he had richly endowed during his earlier years.¹⁹⁴ The volume contains, in a neat hand of the late 15th century, a number of documents related to Pierre d'Ailly's life and career, most of which are works by the Cardinal himself. His name first appears in a cursive hand of the 15th century different from the scribe's (probably the rubricator's) in the margin of the first text: "*Propositio coram papam facta per magistrum petrum de Alliaco contra montesono ordinis fratrum praedicatorum.*" This is the well known address at Avignon (1386)¹⁹⁵ in which the young magister, in the name of the university, called the pope's attention to Jean de Montson's "heresy" (Du Pin I, 202-209). Next comes the 1385 Avignon lecture ("*quaestio in materiam symoniae*") against Jean Blanchard, the chancellor of the University whose practice of exacting fees from degree candidates had aroused the protest of the faculty:¹⁹⁶ "*Utrum haereticum sit dicere quod liceat pro docendi licentia pecuniam dare vel recipere*" (Du Pin I, 74; 778). The marginal title to his "*Tractatus in oratione dominica*" (cf. *Tractatus et Sermones* in the 1490 Strabourg edition) mentions again the name: P. Daillym[agister] on fol. 224b.

The text of the treatise on Galatians 2;11-14 fills the folios 64-66 and is followed by the three parts of the doctoral transactions. After these, we find sermons of Ailly. The title in the margin reads: *Quaestio de reprehensione Petri apostoli a Paulo.*" The script in a typical 15th century book hand is not particularly difficult to read, although a very elaborate system of abbreviations is used throughout. Quotations from the scriptures usually are identified by red underlinings. Occasionally the paragraphs are marked by paragraph sign in blue or red .

2. Short Analysis of the Treatise

Although the text of the treatise, seen against the background of the tradition as we have outlined it, speaks for itself, it might be helpful to preface the edition and translation by a short analysis laying down the principal line of the argument.

The introduction characterizes the treatise as a "*quaestio*," the routine form of all exegetical discussions in the academic world of the time. The question itself is formulated in two

¹⁹⁴ See Louis Gabriel Michaud, *Biographie Universelle ancienne et moderne*, Paris, vol. 1, 1811, p. 349.

¹⁹⁵ See above, p. 17.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

parts: It asks for a description of the different opinions on the Antioch event, and then for an evaluation of both sides, especially in the light of the Jerome-Augustine controversy.

In his exposition of the answer, Ailly does not exactly follow the line of the two parts. He refers to the opinions of the theologians in the course of his own solution which he develops at length. According to exegetical practice, the first part consists in a short running commentary on the text in the literal sense. Ailly uses the method of the *scholion*—brief explanatory remarks interspersed with the continuous reading of the text—which is the primary technique of the interlinear Gloss. The Latin text (the late medieval Vulgate, not without minor mistakes) thus appears in form of a paraphrase. We note that our exegete ends the passage at v. 14a, that he regards the *quidam a Iacobo* as representatives of the Jerusalem "bishop," that he defines the table fellowship with the Gentiles not in a eucharistic sense but as "not recognizing a difference in food", and that *gentiliter vivere* is explained as "observing the Gentile rules on the discretion of foods."

The main issue of the passage is described (3) as the question of the "observation of the Law after Christ." Jerome's and Augustin's (4) respective positions are roughly sketched. Then a decision is voiced in favor of "Paul and his follower Augustine."

In support of this argument, Ailly launches six "propositions," four of which closely resemble the ones in his commentary on the Sentences mentioned above (5).¹⁹⁷ The first proposition is easily solved. With Augustine, Ailly is convinced that Peter was really reprehensible; the denial of this fact would make Paul a liar (6). The second proposition, however (7), extends into a broad discussion of the different "times" of the law where Jerome's two (8) and Augustine's three times (9) become four (10) just as it had been in the Sentences commentary: Time 1: Up to the time of Christ (11), Time 2: From the "institution" of the law of Christ to its "publication" at Pentecost (12), Time 3: from the "publication" to the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15 which Ailly does not seem to identify with Gal. 2:1ff. (13-14), Time 4: from the Jerusalem Council to an unknown but definitive date beyond the New Testament (15). The solution of the proposition points out that Peter was not simply reprehensible by observing the Law but by the circumstances of his observance (16-17). Their discussion constitutes the third proposition: the lack of concern for the Gentiles (18), the bad example (19), the simulation expressed by Peter's

¹⁹⁷ See above, pp. 43f.

shifting fronts (20), the bowing to the "authority" of the Jerusalem Jews (21). Whatever precise reason might be preferred, Peter was reprehensible on account of his dangerous simulation. This is the fourth proposition. However, Peter only committed a pardonable sin (22). The fifth proposition stresses that despite this mild judgment there is no excuse for Peter in the fact that his intention had been good (23-24). The scandal for the Gentiles caused by his attitude has greater weight. The sixth proposition then confirms that it was Paul's right and duty to reprehend Peter on this occasion (25-26). The treatise closes with Augustine's application of the "humble prelate" theme, although in the final outlook Ailly attempts to relate the motif to the burning questions of Church politics: Superiors—and the popes are certainly included!—should not despise the correction by those of lower rank, particularly when it comes to matters of *doctrina religionis* or *materia fidei*.

3. The Question of the Date of Writing

The manuscript does not provide any date for the treatise, and even apart from this fact, we do not have any direct clue which would allow us to fix the date within a definitive time period. Tschackert, judging from internal reasons, is inclined to date it to 1380,¹⁹⁸ the year of Ailly's promotion, and Salembier, too, seems to favor a date near 1380. The outward evidence actually is very scanty. One could point to the fact that in the manuscript the treatise appears right before the academic promotion acts and thus belongs in the same period. We notice, however, that in other instances the manuscript does not preserve the chronological order. The treatises against Jean de Montson and Jean Blanchard are found at its very beginning, although they are much later.

More important seems the argument from the literary form. The treatise elaborates the answer to a "*quaestio*" in two parts. Since this technique as part of the disputation pattern is at the base of academic forms of expression, the *quaestio* must go back to the years of Ailly's active engagement in the Paris university life. Can we fix the precise date even more exactly? We know, e.g., that as *baccalaureus* Ailly had to pass his tentative with a solemn disputation and as *formatus* had to assist in the solemn disputations of young masters or fellow graduate students. However, from Ailly's own academic promotion acts we have a better idea of what a "solemn" disputation looked like at his time. In our treatise, all the formality which we would find there is lacking.

¹⁹⁸ Tschackert, p. 74 and 350

There is no corollary, no *contra*, no determination, no elaborate formal structure which would suggest the setting of a solemn public act. The tone is rather informal. The line of thought, though consistent, is not pressed into a tight scheme. All the official acts one could think of are ruled out as possible occasions.

The informality is accentuated by the way the person or persons posing the question are introduced: *Caritas vestra*. Among equals, this form of addressing individuals is very common in epistolary literature during early Christian and medieval times.¹⁹⁹ In Augustine's sermons it is also used to address the entire assembly. Any official occasion would have required a more elaborate address. On the other hand, the form of a "*quaestio*" without theses to be opposed by a respondent also renders doubtful the assumption that we are dealing with an "official" disputation.

For a possible solution of the problem one may find a good starting point by considering the relationship between the treatise and Ailly's commentary on the Sentences. The argument basically and in many details is the same. But in the treatise the material seems to be used in a freer way than in the commentary where the author clings very closely to Duns Scotus. Moreover, the treatise uses additional material. It would then seem that the treatise was written after the commentary or the lectures on the Sentences. The material has been worked over and focused into a broader, more general direction. By these considerations we could establish 1377/78, the time when Ailly was lecturing on the Sentences, as a possible date *a quo*. A date *ad quem* might be suggested by another observation. In the course of the development of Ailly's exegesis of Galatians 2:11-14 we noticed the shift from "the times of the law" as a theme to the motif of the "erring Peter" with Ailly's academic promotion acts of 1380/81. From then on, the "humble prelate" as a third theme may still appear, but the dominating line was the conciliarist interpretation in which the "erring Peter" alone played the decisive role. Our treatise is still focused on the "times of the law." Beyond this major theme we only find the "humble prelate" being used, but no trace of the conciliarist interpretation whatsoever. We observed that at the beginning of the Great Schism the young Paris scholar was not yet much concerned about the issues of the day. By 1380, however, this attitude had definitely changed. It is not impossible that the final side glance at the prelates who should accept correction, especially in matters of *doctrina*

¹⁹⁹ See Sister Mary Bridget O'Bricey, *Title of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography to 543*, PhD Dissertation (Patristic Studies 21; Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1930); Augustine, Sermons 4.8, 45.8; also *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* 3, 462: 43-60.

religionis and *materia fidei*, reflects some concern about the situation of two "obstinate" popes. A date between 1378 and 1380 would then have the highest probability for dating our treatise.

As original setting one could conceive of one of the more informal exercises in which the *formatus* had to participate with his master and fellow students, or perhaps one of the more "intimate" Saturday disputations at the College de Navarre where the theologians disputed as a group in the setting of their domestic institution.²⁰⁰ The *quaestio* might have come up in connection with lectures on the fourth book of the Sentences but, as such, it certainly reflects the situation of the beginning of the Schism when the interest in the passage arose among theologians and students in the light of the "erring pope" theme but did not yet get the answer which the "conciliarists" will give very soon. Ailly might have kept the notes of his presentation which then were used by the compiler of the Navarra Codex.

²⁰⁰ For an account of these more or less informal occasions see Salembier, p. 33, who draws on Launois (above, note 33) at this point.

4. The Latin Text

Petrus de Alliaco, Quaestio de reprehensione Petri apostoli a Paulo

[Transcription of Codex Parisiensis nat. lat. 3122, fol. 64-66]

Fol. 64b

[1.] Quærit a me caritas vestra, quid super reprehensione Petri, quam coapostolus eius Paulus in epistola ad Galatas fecisse testatur, doctores sciant, cumque super hoc doctores eximii Augustinus videlicet et Jeronymus aperte dissenciant, cuius horum sententia verior habeatur.

[2.] Pro cuius quaestionis ambiguitate solvenda prius est historiae veritas explananda. Cum, inquit, venisset Cephas Antiochiam, quæ locus gentium erat, in faciem ei restiti, et non temere hoc feci, quia reprehensibilis erat; et causam subdit: prius enim quam venirent quidam a Jacobo, id est quidam Judæi missi a Jacobo ecclesie Jerosolymi episcopo, cum gentibus edebat, non habens discrecionem in cibis; cum autem illi venissent, subtrahebat et segregabat se, id est, per se gregem cum Judeis faciebat, timens eos, qui ex circumcissione erant, id est, de Judea conversi, simulans cum eis idem sentire, ne scandalizarentur; et simulacioni eius consenserunt ceteri Judei, qui erant Antiochie, tamquam discernent cibos, ita ut Barnabas duceretur ab eis in illam simulacionem Judaice comestionis et seperacionis a gentibus. Sed cum vidissem, quod non recte ambularent ad veritatem evangelii quidquid esset quo ad intencionem, dixi Cephe coram omnibus, ut omnes illius obiurgacione sanarentur; non enim utile erat errorem qui palam nocebat, in secreto emendari. Si tu, cum Judeus sis nacione, scilicet et gencie, gentiliter et non Judaice vivis servando gencium et non Judeorum ritum de discrecione ciborum, quomodo gentes cogis judaizare? Non quid docent imperio, sed conversacionis exemplo, quia omnia que vident in te putant saluti necessaria esse.

[3.] Nec igitur obiurgacio circa legalium observacionem post Christum, quæ inter Petrum et Paulum principuos apostolos precessit, eciam successit inter Augustinum et Jeronimum doctores eximios. Jeronimus enim ait, Petrum non ideo observasse illa legalia, quia vellet eos post servari eciam a Judeis sicut nec debebant, sed invitum fecisse et dispensacionem simulasse, ne (glossa) Judeos amitteret; nec in hoc peccabat, qua bona intencione id agebat, eciam si illi pecca //

Fol. 65a

rent, qui quasi eius exemplo judaizabant; nec fuit reprehensio vera, quia nil in eo reprehensibile, sed dispensatoria, ut per hoc scirent gentes non esse judaizandum, videntes tantum apostolum in hoc reprehendi.

[4.] Augustinus vero dicit Petrum servasse illa legalia non dispensatorie, sed vere, quasi eis subiectum, sed non in eis spem ponentem, et eum vere peccasse non illa servando, sed alios suo exemplo judaizare cogendo, ut reprehensio vera sit et non dispensatoria; alioquin mentitus est Paulus, si hoc fecit Petrus, quod facere debuit, cum dicat eum non recte fecisse.

[5.] In hac autem tantorum virorum controversia salva Petri et defensoris eius Jeronimi reverentia Pauli et sequacis eius Augustini sententiam teneo veram esse et a doctoribus confirmatam. Ad cuius declarationem hec sunt per ordinem inquirenda. Primum, utrum Petrus ex hoc facto vere reprehensibilis fuerit, secundum, utrum ideo reprehensus sit, quia tunc legalia servaverit; tertium, utrum ex alia et ex qua causa reprehensibilis extiterit; quartum, utrum in illa simulacione peccaverit; quintum, utrum propter scandalum evitandum excusari potuerit; sextum, utrum a Paulo corrigi debuerit ...

[6.] In primum ergo querendum est, utrum Petrus ex hoc facto vere reprehensibilis fuerit; qui enim hoc negat, errori videtur consentire blasphemantis Porphyrii, qui Paulum et Petrum puerili dicit inter se pugnasse certamine, ymo exarsisse Paulum invidia et ea scripsisse iactanter, velque non fecerit, vel si fecerit, procaciter fecerit, id in alio reprehendens, quod ipse commisit, cui blasphemiae primus Origenes respondere nisus est, quem se insequi Jeronimus confitetur hanc reprehensionem non veram quidem, sed dispensatoriam esse asserens. Sed melius est cum Augustino fateri, hanc reprehensionem veram esse et Petrum vere reprehensibilem fuisse. Sed etsi apostoli in verbis vel actibus in quantum homines mentiri potuerint vel errare, secundum illud prophete: omnis homo mendax, tamen nullus eorum in quantum scriptor vel autor alicuius scripture canonice sic erravit, quia, secundum Augustinum, si ad scripturas divinas admixtum fuerit aliquod mendacium, quantumcumque parvum seu officiosum, nichil remanebit in ea solide veritatis, qua adversarius vincatur; his ergo solum libris vel viris, qui canonici nominantur, hunc inquit didici honorem reverentiamque deferre, ut nullum eorum illorum in scribendo errasse firmissime credam. Cum ergo Paulus in epistola ad Galatas, quae est pars scripturae canonicae, asserat, quod Petrus reprehensibilis erat et quod non recte ambularet ad veritatem evangelii, firmiter tenendum est, verba ista simpliciter vera esse.

[7.] Sed ad videndum, quis sit horum verborum intellectus, ut vera sint, inquirendum est, utrum Petrus ideo a Paulo reprehensus fuit, quia tunc legalia servaverit. Hoc enim non videtur, nam secundum hystorias post istud factum Paulus circumcidit thimotheum, et eciam post hoc ipse per multos annos purificatus est Paulus secundum legem, et tota multitudo conversa in Judea legalia observabat, sicut actuum apostolorum testatur hystoria; qua ergo fronte, qua audientia Paulus in altero reprehendisset, quod ipse post ea commisisset!

[8.] Ideo circa legalium observacionem varia distinguenda sunt tempora, unde secundum Jeronimum duo tempora tam distinguenda sunt: unum ante Christi passionem, in quo legalia suam vim habuerunt, aliud post eius passionem, in qua statim mortua et mortifera fuerunt. Itaque servantes ea mortaliter peccaverunt, nec aliquid fuit tempus medium, in quo fuerint indifferentia sic quod nec bona nec mala, sed in prima tempore fuerunt bona, in secundo vero mala non solum hiis qui ex gentibus, sed et hiis qui ex Judaico populo crediderunt. Ideo, secundum eum, apostoli post passionem Christi non servaverunt legalia secundum veritatem, sed solum secundum quandam piam simulacionem, ne Judeos conversos scandalizarent et aliorum conversionem impedirent. Hec autem simulacio non sic intelligenda est, quasi apostoli illos actus veraciter non fecerunt, sed quia illos non quasi legales servaverint, quemadmodum pius medicus aliquid simulare diceretur, quod faceret, non quia in se esset veraciter sanativum, sed quia utile esset secundum infirmi iudicium, ut ipsum alliceret.

[9.] Sed quia indecens est talem simulacionem dicere fuisse in apostolo circa veritatem vite seu doctrinam religionis, ideo melius est secundum Augustinum tria tempora distinguere: unum, in quo legalia cursum suum habuerunt; aliud, in quo mortua fuerunt et eciam mortifera; tertium autem fuit tempus medium, in quo fuerunt mortua, quia nullam vim habuerunt, tamen non erant mortifera, quia conversi de Iudaismo illa licite servare poterant, dum tamen in eis non ponerent spem quasi necessariis ad salutem.

[10.] Adhuc autem secundum quosdam primum tempus potest subdividi ita ut quatuor distinguantur tempora: primum, in quo legalia erant necessaria; secundum, in quo erant utilia, sed non necessaria; tertium, in quo nec erant utilia nec necessaria, sed mortua cum licita; quartum, in quo erant omnino illicita et mortifera.

[11.] Primum tempus fuit ante legis Christi institucionem, nec duravit, ut quidam dicunt, usque ad Christi mortem vel passionem, quando dicit: consummatum est [Joh 19, 30], nam ante illud tempus nova lex erat instituta, quare pro tunc non erat necessaria veteris legis observacio.

[12.] Secundum tempus fuit ab institutione legis Christi usque ad eius publicationem augustam et solemnem, quod fuit in die penthecostes in Jherusalem, quando apostoli misso spiritu sancto solempniter predicarunt, unde ante hoc baptismus non erat de precepto, sed de consilio, quia lex christiana non prius obligavit quam esset publicata, tamen volenti baptizari circumcisio tunc non fuit necessaria, sed utilis et licita ita quod tunc cucurrit sub disiunctione una lex cum alia, nec prima subito tollebatur nec subito imponebatur secunda.

[13.] Tercium tempus incepit a solempni legis Christi publicatione, et quantum ad Gentiles conversos saltem duravit usque ad tempus illius tertii concilii in Jerosolimis, ubi decretum fuit legem non imponi debere gentilibus conversis ad fidem; sed quantum ad Judeos conversos multo post illud tercium consilium apostolorum circumcisio et alia legalia licite servabantur, sicut ex actibus apostolorum superius tangebatur.

[14.] Hec autem licentia servandi ad tempus legalia instinctu Spiritus sancti facta est; decens enim erat, quod lex vetus, quae bona fuerat, sed pro tunc mortua esset, tamen cum honore duceretur a tumulum, unde si conversis de Judaismo statim fuisset inhibita legis ritus sicut conversis de gentilitate ydolatrie cultus visum fuisset, quod lex semper fuisset mala, sicut ydolatria gentilibus ante conversis non inerat ista causa, propter quod Paulus circumcidit Thimoteum ex matre Judea natum, Titum vero ex utroque parente gentili circumcidere noluit, ut ipse in epistola ad Galatas ait. Gentilibus tamen imposita fuit in illo tercio concilio supradicto quorundam legalium observatio, scilicet ut abstinerent a sanguine et //

Fol. 66a

suffocato, non tamquam necessariis ad salutem, sed tanquam convenientibus ad Judeorum et gentilium amicabilem societatem, nam Judei illa abhorrebant; sepe autem fit, ut quis a cibo absteat, quem socio abhominabilem estimat, procedente autem tempore cessante huius observancie causa cessavit effectus; secundo successu temporis non solum gentibus, sed eciam in Judeis conversis illicitus fuit legalium ritus.

[15.] Quartum ergo tempus tunc fuit, sed ex scriptura canonica non habemus, quando inceperit, quia usque ad illud tempus scripturarum hystoria non procedit; forte tamen Deus per apostolos vel per eorum successores determinato tempore simpliciter legalia prohibuit, quod ideo veresimile videtur, cum ecclesia Hebionitarum errorem tanquam heresim dampnaverit, qui credentes in

Christo propter hoc solum teste Jeronimo a patribus anathe[matiza]ti sunt, quod legum ceremonias christi evangelio miscuerunt.

[16.] Hec est ergo brevis omnium precedentium somma, ut dicamus Petrum et Paulum ex Judeis conversos a tempore publicacionis legis Christi eciam multo post tempore illius tercii concilii inter gentes licite ab omnibus abstinuisse legalibus et se conversis gentibus conformasse, ed tamen inter Judeos conversos licite legalia observasse, dum tamen in eis non ponerent spem tanquam necessariis ad salutem, quia sed pro tunc essent licita, non tamen necessaria, ymo nec utilia. Ideo quod Augustinus dicit, Petrus illa inter Judeos servasse quasi eis subiectum, non est intelligendum de subiectione necessarie obligacionis, sed pie compassionis. Ex quibus consequencia est, quod Petrus non ideo reprehensibilis fuerit, quia tunc legalia servaverit.

[17.] Sed tunc restat inquirendum, ex qua ergo causa reprehensibilis extitit. Cum enim, ut predictum est, tunc licita fuerit aliorum observacio legalium, videtur, quod nec eciam illicita fuit discrecio ciborum, quare Petrus non ideo reprehensibilis erat, quod discernendo cibos legem servabat.

[18.] Dicendum est ergo Petrum reprehensibilem fuisse non simpliciter propter observacionem legis, sed propter modum observacionis, et haec potest secundum varium modum solveri, vel quia nimis curiosus erat de observando legem, maxime inter gentes; cum eni dicat Ambrosius: ad quamcumque ecclesiam veneris, illi te conformes, reprehensibilis fuit in ecclesia gentium se non conformare modo vivendi eorum;

[19.] vel quia exemplo suo dabat occasionem gentibus servare legem quasi necessariam vel simpliciter ad salutem vel secundum quod, scilicet ut essent digni ad Judeorum comunicacionem, vel saltem quod laudabilius esset gentibus legem servare quam oppositum facere, et ad hoc potest referri illud dictum Pauli: gentes cogis judaizare.

[20.] Vel quia prius non servans legem coram gentibus, postea venientibus Judeis eam servabat corde non reputans esse faciendum quod in opere simulabat, et ad hoc potest referri illud: simulacionem eius consenserunt ceteri.

[21.] Vel quia utendo auctoritate erat remissus, cum enim simpliciter esset licitum Judeis non servare legem maxime inter gentes, et ipse esset prelatus superior illis Judeis nunciis Jacobi, magis debuit suis inferioribus veritatem constanter suo exemplo monstrare, quam propter timorem ipsorum flecti et eorum affectioni condescendere, et ad hoc illud potest referri: segregabat se

timens eos qui ex circumcissione erant. Predictis ergo quatuor modis vel eorum altero Petrus reprehensibilis erat fuit.

[22.] Sed numquid Petrus in illa simulacione peccavit? Sane dici potest, quod sit ymo de singulis quatuor modorum supradictorum posset discuti qualiter et quantum fuerit peccatum, melius tamen est dicere, quodlibet fuisse veniale quam mortale, nec mireris Petrum aut aliquem aliorum apostolorum eciam postquam receperunt spiritum sanctum venialiter peccasse, cum Johannes, apostolorum unus nec minimus, hoc palam confiteatur: Si dixerimus, inquit, quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus et veritas in nobis //

Fol. 66b

non est.

[23.] Sed numquid Petrus illam simulacionem faciens propter scandalum Judeorum vitandum a peccato excusari potuerit? Hoc enim sentire videtur Ambrosius dicens: quod Petrus timens non miscebatur gentibus, quod si esset solum non esset reprehensibilis, sicut et ipse Paulus pro scandalo alteri cessit. Hoc tamen non obstante dicamus non posse totaliter excusari peccatum, quia Petrus hoc faceret propter scandalum Judeorum vitandum, quia in hiis, quae pertinent ad veritatem vite seu doctrinam religionis utilius scandalum nasci permittitur quam veritas relinquatur, nec est aliquid illicitum committendum propter quodcunque scandalum; hic eciam non erat materia scandali perfectis vel parvulis, sed tamen phariseis, de quo non erat curanduu, nam de scandalo talium dicebat Christus: Sinite illos; ceci sunt et duces cecorum. Sic autem fuisset hic, quia ex genere actus nullus debuisset scandalizari, nisi male sensiens de evangelica libertate, ymo inversabiliter ex actu opposito sequebatur scandalum gentibus adhuc parvulis in fide, et hoc est, quod idem Ambrosius subdit: Sic in hoc, inquit, erratum est, quod gentes cogebat judaizare suo exemplo, dum a gentibus se dividens Judeis se jungebat.

[24.] Adhuc autem ultimo quaeritur: esto, quod Petrus reprehensibilis fuerit, esto quod peccaverit--numquid a Paulo corrigi debuerit? Ob hoc enim blasphemus Porphirius teste Jeronimo Pauli arguit procacitatem, quod principem apostolorum Petrum ausus est reprehendere et arguere in faciem.

[25.] Unde propter hoc dicunt quidam, quod Paulus in faciem restitit ei tamquam par sibi; hoc inquunt non auderet facere, nisi sciret se non imparem fore.

[26.] Sed si alicui hoc non placet, dicat cum Augustino, hoc valere ad magnum prelatorum exemplum, ut in eo qui primus est, discant ceteri mites esse et humiles; ipse enim Petrus quod a Paulo fiebat utilius libertate caritatis sancte ac benigne pietate humilitatis accepit atque ita exemplum posteris dedit, tanto sanctius quanto ad imitandum difficilius, quod non dedignentur maiores, sicubi forte rectam tramitem reliquissent, eciam a posterioribus corrigi, et hoc maxime, ubi esset error in doctrina religionis seu materia fidei.

Explicit

5. An English Translation

Fol. 64b

1. Your graciousness is asking what scholars think regarding the rebuke of Peter which his co-apostle Paul, according to his own witness in the Epistle to the Galatians, launched against him. Furthermore, you want to know, since the two great scholars Augustine and Jerome are in open disagreement here, whose opinion should be held as the more accurate one.
2. To solve the ambiguity of this question, we first have to consider the historical truth. The passage reads: 'When Cephas had come to Antioch' which is a place of the Gentiles, 'I withstood him to his face.' I did this not rashly, [but] 'since he was reprehensible.' And Paul adds the reason: Namely, 'Before certain people came from James,' that is: certain Jews sent by James, the bishop of the Jerusalem Church, 'he ate with the Gentiles,' not using any discretion in [eating] food. 'However, when those men came, he withdrew' and separated, that is, he formed a group apart together with the Jews, 'fearing those who were of the circumcision,' that is, of the converts from Judea, 'simulating agreement with their point of view' so that they might not be scandalized. 'And the other Jews consented to his simulation,' those in Antioch, as if they made distinctions between foods, 'so that even Barnabas was carried away by them into the same simulation' of a Jewish common table and of separation from the Gentiles. But 'when I saw that they did not walk rightly according to the truth of the Gospel' whatever the intention might have been, 'I said to Peter in front of all,' in order that by his rebuke all might be healed. There was no point in emending secretly the error that did so much harm openly. 'If you, being a Jew,' namely by ethnic origin, and that means by tribe, 'are living in Gentile fashion and not in the Jewish manner,' observing the Gentile and not the Jewish rules on the discretion of foods, 'how can you force the Gentiles to judaize?' They do not learn anything by command but by living example, since they believe that everything they see in you is necessary for salvation.
3. This same rebuke about the observation of the Law after Christ which first occurred between Peter and Paul, the two main Apostles, occurred again between Augustine and Jerome, the two excellent doctors. For Jerome said that Peter did not observe those legal prescriptions because he wished to see them kept later on by the Jews, although they needed them no longer, but that he did it against his conviction and simulated the dispensation in order not to lose the Jews. And he did not sin in that he did it with good intention, even though those

Fol. 65a

who so to speak through his example were judaizing, did commit sin. Neither was the rebuke real, because there was nothing reprehensible in him, but a dispensatory intention, so that the Gentiles by seeing such a great Apostle reproached in this matter might learn that they should not judaize.

4. Augustine, however, says that Peter observed those legal commandments not in a dispensatory, but in a true fashion, as if he were subject to them, though not setting his hope on them, his sin being real and consisting not in observing them, but in forcing others by his example to judaize, so that the rebuke was real and not dispensatory. Otherwise Paul would have been lying when he maintained that Peter was wrong in doing [only] what he was obliged to do, although he [Augustine] said that he [Peter] had not acted correctly.

5. In this controversy of such great men I hold that without prejudice to the reverence towards Peter and his defender Jerome, the opinion of Paul and his follower Augustine is correct and confirmed by the doctors. In order to substantiate this pronouncement we have to investigate step by step the following points: First, whether Peter was truly reprehensible by his action; second, whether he was rebuked because on that occasion he kept the legal prescriptions; third, whether he was reprehensible for any other reason and for which one; fourth, whether he sinned by that simulation; fifth, whether he could have been excused because of the necessity of avoiding a scandal; sixth, whether he had to be corrected by Paul.

6. First, therefore, we have to ask, whether Peter was truly reprehensible by what he did. For whoever denies this, would seem to agree with the error of the blasphemer Porphyrius who said that Paul and Peter merely conducted a childish fight with each other; Paul became inflamed with envy and wrote this boastfully; this was either not the case, or if it was, he acted insolently, blaming another person for what he himself committed. Origen already undertook to answer this blasphemy, and Jerome confesses to have followed him, maintaining that this rebuke was not real, but dispensatory. It is better, however, to confess with Augustine that the blame was real and that Peter truly was reprehensible. But even if the Apostles could lie or err in words and deeds in as much as they were humans, according to the word of the prophet: "All humans are liars" [Ps 114:11; Romans 3:4], yet none of them has erred in this way as a writer or author of any canonical Scripture, for according to Augustine if any lie, as insignificant and officious as it may be, were mixed in with the scriptures, nothing of a solid truth would remain in them by which an enemy could be convinced. To those books and writers only that are called canonical I have learned, he

says, to pay such honor and reverence, that I most firmly believe that none of them has erred in his writing. Now when Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians, which is part of the canonical Scripture, asserts that Peter was reprehensible and did not rightly walk according to the truth of the Gospel, then it must be firmly held that these words are simply true.

7. But in order to see what the meaning of these words is, so that they are true, we have to ask whether Peter was rebuked by Paul because he was at that point keeping the prescriptions of the Law. Now this does not seem to be the case, since according to the historical reports Paul circumcised Timothy after this episode; he also purified himself afterwards for many years according to the Law, and the entire crowd of converts in Judea observed the prescriptions of the Law as the report in the Acts of the Apostles testifies. With what a brazen forehead, what impudence would Paul have rebuked in someone else what he himself committed afterwards!

8. Therefore we have to distinguish various times with regard to the observation of the Law. According to Jerome, two times are to be distinguished in this way: one before Christ's passion, in which the prescriptions of the Law had their force, another one after his passion, in which they were immediately dead and deadly. Therefore those who observed them committed a deadly sin; there was no middle time in which they were indifferent in a way that they would have been neither good nor bad; rather in the first time they were altogether good, in the second bad, not only for those who came from the Gentiles, but also for the believers from among the Jewish people. Therefore, according to him, the Apostles did not observe legal prescriptions after Jesus' death in truth, but only according to some pious simulation, in order not to scandalize the converted Jews and to hinder the conversion of others. This simulation, however, must not be understood as if the Apostles did not truly perform those actions, but they did not observe them as legal prescriptions; just as a conscientious medical doctor might be said to simulate something he would do not because it is truly healthsome in itself, but because it might be useful to influence the patient's disposition that it may win him.

9. But since it is indecent to say that the Apostle was involved in such a simulation when dealing with the truth of living or the teaching of religion, therefore it is better to distinguish with Augustine three times: one in which the legal commandments were in force, another one in which they were dead and also deadly; a third one, however, was a middle time, in which they were dead, since they had lost their power, yet not deadly, because the converts from Judaism were still

allowed to use them, although they were not to base their hope on them as if they were necessary for salvation.

10. Furthermore, however, according to certain scholars, the first time may be subdivided so as to distinguish four times: the first, in which the legal prescriptions were necessary; the second, in which they were useful yet not necessary; the third, in which they were neither useful nor necessary but dead while still being allowed; the fourth in which they were altogether prohibited and deadly.

11. The first time was before the institution of the law of Christ and did not last, as some say, until Christ's death or passion, when he was saying: It is finished [John 19:30], because already before that time the new law was instituted so that by that time the observance of the Law was no longer necessary.

12. The second time stretched from the institution of the law of Christ until its dignified and solemn publication which happened on the day of Pentecost, when the Apostles after the sending of the Spirit solemnly preached. Therefore, before that [event], baptism was not a matter of precept but of counsel, because the Christian law was not binding earlier than when it was published, yet for the one who wanted to be baptized, circumcision was not necessary at that point, but it was useful and lawful so that one law by that time was going along with the other in disjunction; and the first one was not suddenly abolished nor was the second suddenly imposed at once.

13. The third time started from the solemn publication of the law of Christ and, as far as the converted Gentiles were concerned, lasted only until the time of that third Jerusalem Council where the decree was passed that the Law was not to be imposed on Gentiles converted to the Christian faith; as far as the converted Jews were concerned, however, even a long time after this third consultation of the Apostles circumcision and the other legal prescriptions were lawfully observed, as we touched upon earlier from the Acts of the Apostles.

14. This license of temporarily observing legal prescriptions was granted by the incentive of the Holy Spirit. For it was befitting that the Old Law, which was good but dead by that time, should be carried to the grave with honor. Therefore, if the converts from Judaism had been prohibited at once from practicing the rites of the Law just as the converts from Gentility were from practicing an idolatrous cult, the impression would have been that the Law always was as bad as idolatry. For Gentiles who were already converted, that problem did not exist; therefore Paul circumcised

Timothy, who was born from a Jewish mother; Titus, however, both of whose parents were Gentiles, he did not agree to circumcise as he himself says in Galatians [Gal 2:3]. Yet at that above-mentioned third consultation the observance of certain legal prescriptions was imposed upon the Gentiles, namely to abstain from blood and //

Fol. 66a

strangled things. This not as necessary for salvation, but rather as appropriate for those who came to the amicable assembly of Jews and Gentiles, for the Jews abhorred those things. It often, however, happened that somebody would abstain from a food which he thought was a horror to his fellow. In the course of time, when the reason for this observance ceased, the outcome also ceased. At a second successive moment, the observance of legal rites was not only illicit among the Gentiles, but also among the converted Jews.

15. This, then, was the fourth time, but we cannot gather from the canonical scripture when it started, because the scriptural history does not run through to that time. God has perhaps through the Apostles or their successors at a determined moment simply prohibited the legal prescriptions; this seems all the more probable since the Church has condemned as a heresy the error of the Ebionites who, although they believed in Christ, were anathematized by the fathers, according to the witness of Jerome, on the reason only that they mixed the ceremonies of the Law with the Gospel of Christ.

16. This, therefore, is in brief the sum of all the foregoing that we say that after the time of the publication of the Law of Christ and also much later at the time of that Third Council, Peter and Paul being converts from the Jews have lawfully abstained from all legal prescriptions and conformed to the converted Gentiles. Among converted Jews, however, they lawfully observed legal prescriptions, although they did not set their hope on them as if necessary for salvation; but even when they still were licit, yet they were not necessary and not even useful. The word of Augustine, therefore, that Peter observed them among the Jews as if he were subject to them, must not be understood of the subjection under a compelling obligation, but under faithful compassion. From which it follows that Peter was not reprehensible because at that time he was observing legal prescriptions.

17. The question then still remains to be asked, why he actually was reprehensible. For if, as we said, the observance of other legal prescriptions was lawful, it seems that neither was the

discretion of foods illegal. Peter, therefore, was not reprehensible because by discerning foods he was observing the law.

18. We have to say, therefore, that Peter was reprehensible not simply because of his observing the Law but because of the mode of this observance. Now, this problem can be solved along different lines: He was either too anxious about the observance of the Law, especially among the Gentiles. For if Ambrose says: To whichever church you come, conform to it, then Peter was reprehensible in a church of Gentiles by not conforming himself to their way of living.

19. Or, because by his example he suggested to the Gentiles the observance of the Law as something necessary, be it simply for salvation, be it in order to be worthy of living in communion with the Jews, be it because it was at least more praiseworthy for the Gentiles to observe the Law than doing the contrary, and this may be the reason why Paul says: "You are forcing the Gentiles to judaize."

20. Or it was because having first not observed the Law among the Gentiles, he later on observed it when the Jews came, although in his heart he did not think that it was necessary to do what in his action he simulated. This may be the reason for Paul's other phrase: "To his simulation the others gave their consent."

21. Or it was because he was remiss in using his authority. For since the Jews were simply allowed not to observe the law, especially among Gentiles, and he himself was a higher ranking prelate than those Jews sent by James, he was all the more under the constant obligation to demonstrate by his example the truth to those inferior to him rather than to bow to those people because of fear of them and to condescend to their inclination. It is to this that the other phrase may refer: "He segregated himself fearing those who were of the circumcision." On account of these four ways, or of one of them, Peter was reprehensible.

22. But did Peter by this simulation commit sin? Indeed this can be said, even if in regard to each single mode of the four mentioned above one could debate in what way and to what extent it was sin. Yet it is better to say that it was some a pardonable sin rather than a mortal one; and you will not be astonished that Peter or some of the other Apostles did commit pardonable sin even after they received the Holy Spirit, as John, one of the Apostles and not the least one, confesses openly: "If we are saying that we do not //

Fol. 66b

have sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us" [1 John 1:3]

23. But when Peter was acting out this simulation in order to avoid a scandal for the Jews, could he be excused from sin? Ambrose seems to think so when he said that the Peter who out of fear did not mix with the Gentiles would not have been reprehensible if it had been him alone, just as Paul too gave in to someone else when it was for the sake of [avoiding] a scandal. Despite this deliberation we would have to say that his sin cannot be completely excused on the ground that Peter did it in order to avoid a scandal for the Jews. For in matters pertaining to the truth of life or the doctrine of religion it is more useful that a scandal be permitted to rise than that the truth be relinquished, and it is not permissible to commit something illicit just because of some scandal. Here it also was not the case of a scandal for the perfect or the little ones, but rather for pharisees, about which one should not care, because Christ said about a scandal for those men: "Leave them alone! They are blind and guides of the blind" [Matth. 15:14]. This is the way it should have been here, because by the nature of the act nobody should have felt offended except the person who does not think highly of the evangelical freedom. On the contrary, from the act [to which Paul] objected, there arose a scandal for the Gentiles who still were little ones in their faith, and that is why the same Ambrose adds: "Thus, Peter was in error because by his example he forced the Gentiles to judaize, when he separated himself from the Gentiles and joined the Jews."

24. A last question still remains to be asked: Even if Peter was reprehensible, even if he sinned—was he to be corrected by Paul? For this was the reason why, as Jerome testifies, the blasphemer Porphyrius criticized Paul's audacity that Paul dared to blame Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and to rebuke him to his face.

25. Some say therefore that Paul withstood Peter to his face as one who was equal to him. This, they say, he would not have dared to do, had he not known that he was not unequal.

26. But if anybody does not like [this argument], let him say with Augustine that this [incident] has its value as a great example for prelates that from the one who is first others also may learn to be meak and humble. Peter himself accepted what was done by Paul more fruitfully in the freedom of a holy and blessed love, in selfless humility, and in this way gave an example to posterity which was all the more holy as it was more difficult to imitate, an example that superiors, if they perhaps should have left the right path, might not disdain to be corrected even by those of lower rank, espececially if it is an error in religious doctrine or in matters of faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Altaner, Berthold. *Patrologie. Leben, Schriften und Lehren der Kirchenväter*, Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 5th edition, 1958.

d'Argentré, Charles du Plessis de. *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus qui ab initio duodecimi seculi ... proscripti sunt*. Paris: Andreas Cailleau, 1728-36.

Balić, Karlo. *Les commentaires de Jean Duns Scot sur les quatre livres des sentences. Etude historique et critique*. Louvain: Bureau de la RHE, 1927.

Baluzius (Baluze), Stephanus. *Miscellaneorum liber primus ... hec est, collectio veterum monumentorum quae hactenus latuerant in variis codicibus ac bibliothecis*, Paris: Franciscus Muguet, 1678-1715.

Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, 2 vols., Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1845, 2nd ed. by Eduard Zeller, 1866-67.

Bliemetzrieder, Franz. *Literarische Polemik zu Beginn des grossen abendländischen Schismas (Kardinal Petrus Flandrin, Kardinal Petrus Amelii, Konrad von Gelnhausen). Ungedruckte Texte und Untersuchungen*, 2 vols. (Publikationen des österreichischen historischen Instituts in Rom), Leipzig: Freytag, 1909.

Blumenthal, Hermann. *Die Vorgeschichte des Constanzer Concils bis zur Berufung*, Halle a.S.: C.A.Kaemmerer & Co, 1897.

Bonnard, Pierre. *L'épître de S. Paul aux Galates. L'épître de S. Paul aux Ephésiens* (Charles Masson), Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, Neuchâtel-Paris: Delachaux, 1953.

Du Boulay (Bulaeus), César Egasse. *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, Paris: F. Noël, 1665-73.

Bourgeois du Chastenet, Louis. *Nouvelle Histoire du Concile de Constance*, Paris: Le Mercier, 1718.

Brown, Edward and Gratius, Ortwin. *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum, prout ab Orthuino Gratio Presbytero Coventriensi editus est Coloniae A.D MDXXXV*, Londini: Impressis Richardi Chiswell, 1690.

Burton, Ernest deWitt. *Critical and Egegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. The International Critical Commentary, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.

Caspar, Erich. *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, 2 vols., Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1930-33.

Connolly, John L. *John Gerson. Reformer and Mystic* (Université de Louvain, Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres de Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie, 2ème série, 12ème fasc.), Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, London-Saint Louis, MO: B. Herder, 1928.

Cullmann, Oscar. *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957, 1958².

Cullmann, Oscar. *Petrus - Jünger, Apostel, Märtyrer. Das historische und theologische Petrusproblem*, Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1952, 2nd revised edition 1960.

Curtis, William Eleroy. *The Authentic Letters of Columbus* (Field Columbian Museum Publication nr. 2, vol. 1, nr. 2), Chicago, 1895.

Denifle, Heinrich and Châtelain, Emile. *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 4 vols., Paris: Delalain Frères, 1889-1897.

von Döllinger, Ignaz. *Die Papst-Fabeln des Mittelalters. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte*, München: J.G. Cotta, 1863.

Ehrle, Fanz. *Martin de Alpartils Chronica actitatorum temporibus Domini Benedicti XIII*, Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1906.

Finke, Heinrich. *Acta Concilii Constantiensis*, 4 vols., Münster i.W.: Regensberg'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1928.

Finke, Heinrich. *Forschungen und Quellen zur Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils*, Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1889.

Göller, Emil. *König Sigismunds Kirchenpolitik vom Tode Bonifaz' IX. bis zur Berufung des Konstanzer Konzils (1404 -1413)*, Freiburg i.Br.: Caritas-Verband, 1902.

Goldast, Melchior. *Monarchia Sancti Romani Imperii*, 3 vols., Hanoviae: Thomas Willierus, 1612-1614.

Haenchen, Ernst. *Die Apostelgeschichte. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, begründet von H.A.W. Meyer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.

Haller, Johannes. *Das Papsttum. Idee und Wirklichkeit*, 5 vols., Basel and Stuttgart: Benno Schwabe, 1951-19532.

von Harnack, Adolf. *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 45 = Reihe 3. Bd. 15), Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1921.

von Harnack, Adolf. *Porphyrius 'Gegen die Christen,' 15 Bücher (Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate)*. (Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 1), Berlin: Verlag der Akademie, 1916.

Haskins, Charles Homer. *The Rise of Universities*, New York, NY: Henry Holt and Co., 1923.

von Hefele, Carl Joseph. *Conciliengeschichte*, 9 vols., Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 1869-1890.

Heiler, Friedrich. *Altkirchliche Autonomie und päpstlicher Zentralismus. Die Katholische Kirche des Ostens und Westens, Band II. Die Römisch-Katholische Kirche, 1. Teil*, München: Ernst Reinhardt, 1941.

Hofmann, Karl. *Der Dictatus Papae Gregors VII. Eine rechtsgeschichtliche Erklärung* (Veröffentlichungen der Görres-Gesellschaft zur Pflege der Wissenschaft im katholischen Deutschland, Sektion für Rechts- und Staatswissenschaft, nr. 63), Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1933.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Golgotha* (Angelos. Archiv für neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte und Kulturkunde, Beiheft 1, herausgegeben von G. Polster), Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1926.

Kitts, Eustace J. *Pope John the Twenty-Third and Master John Hus of Bohemia*, London: Constable and Co., 1910.

Kneer, August. *Die Entstehung der konziliaren Theorie. Zur Geschichte des Schismas und der kirchenpolitischen Schriftsteller Konrad von Gelnhausen (+1390) und Heinrich von Langenstein (+1397)*, Rome: Tipo di F. Cuggiano, 1893.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Das Neue Testament. Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme* (Orbis Academicus. Problemgeschichten der Wissenschaft in Dokumenten und Darstellungen, III,3), Freiburg i.Br. - München: Verlag Karl Alber, 1958.

Langen, Joseph. *Die Kirchenväter und das Neue Testament: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Erklärung der wichtigsten neutestamentlichen Stellen*, Bonn: Eduard Weber, 1874.

Langen, Joseph. *Das Vaticanische Dogma von dem Universal-Episcopat und der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes in seinem Verhältniss zum Neuen Testament und der exegetischen Ueberlieferung*, 4 vols., 2nd ed., Bonn: Eduard Weber, 1876.

Launois (Launojus), Guillaume. *Regii Navarrae Gymnasii Historia*, Parisiis : Apud Viduam E. Martini, 1677.

Leclercq, Jean. *Jean de Paris et l'ecclésiologie du XIIIe siècle*, Paris: J. Vrin, 1922.

Lenfant, Jacques. *Histoire du Concile de Pise et de ce qui s'est passé de plus mémorable depuis ce Concile jusqu'au Concile de Constance, enrichie de portraits*, 2 vols., Utrecht: Corneille Guillaume le Febvre, 1731.

Lietzmann, Hans. *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 4 vols., Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 2nd ed., 1937-1938.

Lietzmann, Hans. *Petrus und Paulus in Rom : Liturgische und archäologische Studien* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, nr. 1), Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 2nd. ed., 1927.

Little, Andrew G. and Pelster, F. *Oxford Theology and Theologians, c. A.D. 1282-1302*, Oxford University Press, 1934.

MacGowan, John Patrick. *Pierre d'Ailly and the Council of Constance*, PhD Dissertation, Catholic University, Washington, DC., 1936.

Martène, Edmond and Durand, Ursin. *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium amplissima collectio*, 9 vols., Parisiis: apud Montalant, 1724 -1733.

Martène, Edmond and Durand, Ursin. *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum*, 5 vols., Paris, 1717.

Martin, Victor. *Les Origines du gallicanisme*, 2 vols., Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1939.

Meller, Bernhard. *Studien zur Erkenntnislehre des Peter von Ailli. Mit einem Anhang: Ailli's Traktat De materia Concilii Generalis*, Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 1954.

Meyer, Eduard. *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 3 vols., Stuttgart und Berlin: J.G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, 1921-1923.

Mirbt, Carl. *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 5th ed., 1935.

Munck, Johannes. *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte* (Acta Jutlandica XXVI,1. Teologisk Serie, 6), Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1954.

Oepke, Albrecht. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament), Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2nd ed., 1957.

Overbeck, Franz. *Über die Auffassung des Streits des Paulus mit Petrus in Antiochien (Gal. 2,11ff.) bei den Kirchenvätern* (Programm zur Rektoratsfeier der Universität Basel 1877), Basel: Universitätsdruckerei S. Schultze, 1877.

Du Pin, Louis Ellies. *Joannis Gersonii Doctoris et Cancellarii Parisiensis Opera Omnia*, 5 vols., Antwerp: Sumptibus Societatis, 1706.

Rashdall, Hastings. *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. A New Edition in Three Volumes*, ed. by Frederic M. Powicke and Albert B. Emden, 3 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.

Rehm, Bernhard, ed. *Die Pseudoklementinen. 1. Homilien* (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 42), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1953.

Reinkens, Hubert. *Papst und Papsttum nach der Zeichnung des heiligen Bernhard von Clairvaux. Übersetzung und Erläuterung seiner Schrift De Consideratione*. Münster i.W.: F.C. Brun, 1870.

Rogers, Elizabeth Frances. *Peter Lombard and the Sacramental System*, PhD Dissertation, Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University, New York, NY, 1917.

Salembier, Louis. *Le Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly, chancelier de l'université de Paris, évêque du Puys et de Cambrai, 1350-1420* (Société d'études de la province de Cambrai. Recueil, no. 35), Tourcoing: Imprimerie Georges Frère, 1931.

Schäfer, Odulfus OFM. *Bibliographia de vita operibus et doctrina Johannis Duns Scoti Doctoris subtilis ac mariani saecul. XIX et XX*. Romae: Orbis Catholicus-Herder, 1955.

Schermann, Theodor. *Propheten- und Apostellegenden nebst Jüngerkatalogen des Dorotheus und verwandter Texte* (TU 31,3 = 3. Reihe, 1. Band, 3), Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1907.

Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Galater* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, begründet von H.A.W. Meyer, 7. Abteilung), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 11th ed., 1957.

Schmid, Joseph., SS. *Eusebii Hieronymi et Aurelii Augustini Epistolae mutuae* (Florilegium Patristicum, ed. B.Geyer and J. Zellinger, nr. 22), Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1930.

Schoeps, Hans Joachim. *Paulus. Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959.

von Schulte, Johann Friedrich. *Die Stellung der Concilien, Päpste und Bischöfe vom historischen und canonistischen Standpunkte und die Päpstliche Constitution vom 18. Juli 1870 mit den Quellenbelegen*. Prague: F. Tempsky, 1871.

Seidlmayer, Martin. *Die Anfänge des grossen abendländischen Schismas. Studien zur Kirchenpolitik insbesondere der spanischen Staaten und zu den geistigen Kämpfen der Zeit* (Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft, 2. Reihe, Band 5), Münster i.W.: Aschendorff, 1940.

Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, Oxford: Blackwell's. New York: Philosophical Library, 1941, 2nd ed. 1952.

Spicq, Ceslas. *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen-âge* (Bibliothèque Thomiste, 26), Paris: J. Vrin, 1944.

Spinka, Matthew, ed. *Advocates of Reform. From Wyclif to Erasmus* (The Library of Christian Classics, vol. 14), Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.

Stegmüller, Friedrich. *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*. 6 vols., Madrid: Consejo superior de Investigaciones Científicas. Instituto Francisco Suarez, 1950-58.

Stegmüller, Friedrich. *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, 2 vols., Würzburg: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1947.

Strecker, Gerhard. *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (TU 70 = 5. Reihe, 15. Bd.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958.

Tierney, Brian. *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory. The Contribution of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism* (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, New Series, vol. 4), Cambridge University Press, 1955.

Tschackert, Paul. *Peter von Ailli (Petrus de Alliaco). Zur Geschichte des grossen abendländischen Schismas und der Reformconcilien von Pisa und Constanz. Anhang: Petri de Alliaco anecdotorum partes selectae*, Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1877.

Ullmann, Walter. *The Origins of the Great Schism. A Study in Fourteenth-Century Ecclesiastical History*,. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1948.

Valois, Noël. *La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident*, 4 vols., Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1896-1902.

Von der Hardt, Hermann. *Magnum Oecumenicum Constantiense Concilium de Universali Ecclesiae Reformatione Unione et Fide*, 6 vols., Helmstedt: Christianus Genschius, 1697-1700.

Wagenmann, Julius. *Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten* (Beihefte zur ZNW, nr. 3), Gießen: Töpelmann, 1928.

Werner, Martin. *The Formation of Christian Dogma. An Historical Study of its Problems*, London: A.& C. Black, 1957.

Windisch, Hans. *Die Katholischen Briefe* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Band 15), 3rd ed., revised by Herbert Preisker, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1951.

Zahn, Theodor. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, herausgegeben von Theodor Zahn, vol. 9), Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1905.

Articles

Auvray, Paul , "S.Jérôme et S.Augustin: La controverse au sujet de l'incident d'Antioch," *Recherches de science religieuse* 19, (1939), pp. 594 - 610.

Bauernfeind, Otto, "Die Begegnung zwischen Paulus und Kephas, Gal.1, 18-20," *ZNW* 47, 1956, pp. 268 - 276.

Bauernfeind, Otto, "Der Schluss der antiochenischen Paulusrede," in: *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis. Festschrift für Karl Heim*, Hamburg: Herbert Reich, 1954, pp. 64-78.

Baur, Ferdiand Christian, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 4, 1831, pp. 61ff.

Caspar, Erich, "Kleine Beiträge zur älteren Papstgeschichte, I," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 46, 1928, pp. 321- 333.

Cullmann, Oscar. "L'apôtre Pierre, instrument du diable ou instrument de Dieu?," in: *New Testament Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson 1893-1958*, ed. by A.J.B. Higgins, Manchester University Press, 1959, pp. 94-105.

Gaechter, Paul, "Petrus in Antiochien (Gal. 2,11-14)," in his: *Petrus und seine Zeit. Neutestamentliche Studien*, Innsbruck-Wien- München: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1958, pp. 213-257 (= *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 72, 1950, pp. 177-212). -

Goguel, Maurice, "L' apôtre Pierre, a-t-il joué un rôle personnel dans les crises de Grèce et de Galatie?," *Revue d' Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse* 14, 1934, pp. 461-500.

von Harnack, Adolf, "Petrus im Urteil der Kirchenfeinde des Altertums," in: *Festgabe für Karl Müller zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Fachgenossen und Freunden*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1922, pp. 1-6.

Hirsch, Emmanuel, "Zwei Fragen zu Galater 6," ZNW 29, 1930, pp. 192-197.

Hirsch, Emmanuel, "Petrus und Paulus. Ein Gespräch mit Lietzmann," ZNW 29, 1930, pp. 63-76.

Holl, Karl, "Der Streit zwischen Petrus und Paulus zu Antiochien in seiner Bedeutung für Luthers innere Entwicklung," in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze III: Der Westen*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1928, pp. 134-146.

Koeniger, Albert Michael, "Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur," in: *Beiträge zur Geschichte des christlichen Altertums und der byzantinischen Literatur, Festgabe für A. Ehrhard*, herausgegeben von Albert Michael Koeniger, Bonn - Leipzig: K. Schroeder, 1922, pp. 275-300.

La Piana, Georges, "Cephas and Peter in the Epistle to the Galatians," *Harvard Theological Review* 14, 1921, pp. 187-193.

Leclercq, Jean, "Points de vue sur le Grand Schisme," in: *L'Eglise et les Eglises. Neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l'Orient et l'Occident: Etudes et travaux sur l'unité chrétienne offerts à Dom Lambert Beauduin (Collectior Irénikon)*, Chevetogne, Belgique: Editions de Chevetogne, 1954, pp. 223-240.

Lietzmann, Hans. "Zwei Notizen zu Paulus, 2. Die Reisen des Petrus," in his: *Kleine Schriften II: Studien zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Kurt Aland (TU 68 = 5. Reihe, 13. Band), Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958, pp. 287-291.

Malfatti, Eligio, "Una controversia tra S. Agostino e S. Girolamo: il conflitto di Antiochia," *Scuola Cattolica* 49, 1921, pp. 321-338; 402-426.

Michaelis, Wilhelm, "Judaistische Heidenchristen," *ZNW* 30, 1931, pp. 83-89.

Riddle, Donald W., "The Cephas-Peter Problem and a Possible Solution," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 59:2, 1940, pp. 169-180.

Möhler, Johann Adam, "Hieronymus und Augustin im Streit über Gal. 2, 14," in his: *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Ignaz Döllinger, Regensburg: G. Joseph Manz, 1839, pp. 1-18.

Saint-Blancat, Louis, "Luthers Verhältnis zu Petrus Lombardus," *Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie* 22, 1953, pp. 300-311.

Saint-Blancat, Louis, "La théologie de Luther et un nouveau plagiat de Pierre d'Ailly," *Positions Luthériennes* 4, 1956, pp. 61-81.

Salembier, Louis, "Ailly, Pierre d'," in: *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* 1, 1909², col. 646-650.

Salembier, Louis, "Le Grand Schisme d'Occident au point de vue apologétique," *Revue pratique de l'apologétique* 4, 1907, pp. 581-584.

Salembier, Louis, "Les oeuvres françaises du Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly, évêque de Cambrai, 1350-1420," *Revue de Lille* 25, serie 3, vol. 7, 1906-1907, pp. 40-49; 110-124; 201-221; 350-360; 782-795; 866-882; 1057-1071.

Salembier, Louis, "A propos de Pierre d'Ailly, évêque de Cambrai. Biographie et bibliographie," *Société d'émulation de Cambrai. Mémoires*, vol. 64, 1909, pp. 99-126.

Salembier, Louis, "Ailly, Pierre d'," *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastique* 1, 1912, pp. 1154-1165.

Schmithals, Walter, "Die Häretiker in Galatien, ZNW 47, 1956, pp. 25-67.

Simard, Georges, "La querelle des deux saints: S.Jérôme et S.Augustin," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 12, 1942, pp. 15-38.

Valois, Noël, "Un ouvrage inédit de Pierre d'Ailly: le De persecutionibus ecclesiae," *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* 65, 1904, pp. 557-574.

Zahn, Theodor, "Petrus in Antiochien," *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 5, 1894, pp. 227ff.

Abbreviations

HNT *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, founded 1906 by Hans Lietzmann.

ICC *International Critical Commentary*, Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, since 1870.

JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*, published by the Society of Biblical Literature as a Quarterly since 1912.

NKZ *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, published from 1890 to 1947, Erlangen-Leipzig: Deichert.

NTS *New Testament Studies*, published by the SNTS (Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas) since 1954.

PG Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Cursus Completus*, 165 vols., 1857–58, Paris.

PL Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae Cursus Completus*, 221 vols., 1844–55, Paris.

TU *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, founded by Adolf Harnack and Oscar von Gebhardt, 1883 to 1941, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs (partly for the Preußische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin), since 1942 Leipzig-Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.

WA Weimar Ausgabe: *D. Martin Luthers Werke*. 120 vols. Weimar, 1883–2009.

ZKG *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, founded 1877, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag.

ZNW *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, founded by Erwin Preuschen 1900, Giessen and Berlin: A. Töpelmann; Berlin etc.: Walter De Gruyter.