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I.

In the latest book on the conflicts between Authority and Reason in the early middle ages the author says: 'In the pronouncements of Gregory VII papal authority was derived from the grant of the keys to St Peter. The pope was Peter's successor, and exercised St Peter's function of binding and loosing. If this is the truth about Gregory's fight against emperors and kings, archbishops and bishops, the revolution which he brought about in the history of mankind would be strangely unoriginal in symbolism and thought.

The popes must have used the keys of St Peter to justify their claims through all the ages of the church for at least seventeen hundred years. Recently many scholars have tried to prove that Gregory VII did not even use any new expressions or ideas, and that his claims may all be found in genuine letters, or at least in forgeries, of the ninth century. M. Fliche, moreover, in his book on the Gregorian Reform has shown that Gregory made no use of the later feudal concepts when he began to interfere with the kingdoms and dukedoms of this world; Fliche even denies that the homage which Gregory demanded from the King of Germany in 1081 had any special significance. Fliche thinks, indeed, that feudal law did not enter into the relations between the papacy and the secular powers before the twelfth cen-
reach the rather startling conclusion that the
greatest reform of the western world was started without any
original vocabulary or sense of values, and that the new order
was only later legalized by concepts of a secular, i.e., feudal
form. If this conclusion is true, the great fifty years between
1073 and 1122, from the enthronement of Gregory VII and the
Concordat of Worms, was void of new ideas.

I am inclined to follow the line taken by recent inves­tigations. I agree that the supports of feudal law came later,
and that Gregory's claims all existed before his time. In my
own contribution I wish to start from another point.

Gregory left the world as he had found it: in the hands
of secular princes, of archbishops and of bishops. But there
was an immense change between the first hour, when he was hailed
in the words of the 44th Psalm, and the moment, on his death-bed,
when the words of this same psalm were on his own lips. Secular
princes had been much more than secular princes or even Christian
kings. They had fulfilled a definite religious and ecclesiastical
function inside the Church of Christ. The see of the arch-
bishops and bishops had been the equals of the prima see at
Rome, to which the German bishops dared to address their letters
as late as Gregory's first years. This address was never used
later. In a fight you try not only to exalt your own right but also
to get the advantage of abasing the claims of your foe.
The Gregorian reform became a revolution through the incredible
harshness with which it lowered its opponent's position. Gregory
successfully belittled the unique character of the Roman
Emperor's ecclesiastical function. The title Emperor of the

Christianissimus
Roman Empire had had its unique importance inside the church. Gregory made the pope the one and only singular in the grammar of the Roman Church. When we read, in the dictatus papae: "Quod hoc unicum est nomen in mundo," we must add: "Imperator unicum nomen non est." Gregory in all his letters carefully avoids allowing either the singular or even the name of emperor to Henry IV. He calls his enemy one of the many réges. To him the spiritual imperator, the exorcist, the lowest grade in the church, is more than the emperor. By the very process of secularising the emperor, he singles out the pope as the only unicum nomen in the church.

By emphasizing secular pluralism Gregory makes the kingdoms of this earth appear like scattered scraps on the map which find their only geographical re-integration in, so to speak, ecclesiastical geography. His second weapon, in the process of secularising the emperor, is therefore destruction of all secular unifying claims in the western world (the imperial), and building up a more geographical concept of papal organization than had existed before.

Now these two methods in the struggle to substitute one set of concepts for another lead necessarily to a consideration of St Paul's role in the church: for the role of which the emperor and kings were deprived was never St Peter's, but much more the other apostles' and specially Paul's. Furthermore Paul, as the great traveller and missionary, always represented the geographical unity of the orbis, not the special function of the urbs (Rome). This will help us to discover certain permanent spiritual functions of the different apostles within Christianity. The role of St Paul in the eleventh century becomes but a chapter
in his posthumous life through all the ages. *Pensa che Pietro e Paolo... ancor son vivi,* sings Dante (Parad., XVIII, 131) and, I think, he is right forever. We shall read a chapter in this permanent posthumous life of St Paul when we deal with the process by which the apostolic dignity of the secular power was destroyed between 1073 and 1122 as a simoniacal presumption.

The fact has often been cited that Nicholas the first (855-867) was already called "vicarius Christi" instead of simply "vicarius Petri." But we must not forget that any contemporary Frankish king was flattered with the same expressions. The same pope who was called the vicar of Christ, Nicholas I, ascribed to the emperor the power of building and planting, changing and destroying, spreading and dispersing, *vicarius Petri.* This flattery ceased to be an innocuous play of words when the papacy was in its decay in the tenth century. The popes became so profligate and contemptible that a French synod described, in powerful words, the horror which filled the church in facing these monsters. Nobody doubted that the popes were the successors of St Peter. But what, after all, could be done with this claim after a whole century during which the world became accustomed to looking down upon these successors of Christ? A pious Christian, Rodulphus Glaber, accused Pope John XVIII of flagrant breach of the canon law for money. Odilo of Cluny, the great abbot, based all his hopes for a revival of Christianity, not on the popes but on the emperors. This tradition became so strong that even his successor did not support Gregory VII against the emperor. When he was denounced, he protested that the office of the emperor was sacred under all circumstances. Thus, about 1000 A. D. the vicars...
of St Peter ceased to be respectable, not because anybody doubted their being the successors of Peter, but in spite of universal recognition of their theoretical claim. The important question was not how far the popes were supported by old titles and canons in favor of St Peter, but how Christians could succeed in reforming the church by passing the indignant vicars of St Peter. It could be done perhaps, when Emperor was not united to Rome, when many apostles were reigning.

In this renovation of the church the emperors had a special and unique function. Constantine, the first Christian emperor, had already been called bishop of the external church. He had summoned the councils. He was compared to the apostles. Alcuin made Charles the defender of the faith against unbelievers without, and against heretics within, the true Moses, the man of God. To the pope belonged prayer for the success of the emperor, who became responsible for missions and for reforms of the liturgy. The Carolingian court introduced the crede in the mass against the will of the pope. It altered the crede by adding the famous "filioque" in the procession of the Holy Ghost in Trinit. The Ottonian emperors took up this religious function. Henry II, the only official Saint amongst the German rulers of Rome, brought the Frankish liturgy to Rome in 1014, and the city of the apostles accepted it. The monks of Cluny looked upon the emperors as their patrons and supporters in all questions of reform. Odilo, the great abbot of Cluny (996-1046) calls Otto I (936-973) the great rhinoceros, expected in the Old Testament, who was applied this same metaphor to the apostle St Paul. But more than that, the apostles Peter and Paul now became saints of the Western empire and of the emperor, to an extent unknown before. The desire for a Christian foundation for the imperial function completely superseded its secular
derivation from Caesar and from pagan Rome; the Empire was explained as a Christian and ecclesiastical necessity only.

In this respect the Ottonian Kings pass even the mark set by Charlemagne. On the sarcophagus of Otto II, Paul and Peter flank Christ, all three protecting the dead emperor. A hundred years before, a pope recognized an emperor's Paulinian function. He ascribed to the 'legation' of God which Paul vindicates. And Otto III (984-1002) is also so much a legate of God that he uses the famous formula of Paul's letters in his protocol: "Servus Jesu Christi." According to the legend of Sylvester, Peter and Paul appeared to Constantine and told him to respect Pope Sylvester, and Otto III had a dream in which St. Paul told him to contradict his teacher, Pope Sylvester III. Later the court of Otto III tried to regularize that monarch's religious function.

P. Schramm, in his recent book Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio, showed that Otto III dropped the apostolic title and conspicuously took a new one which fitted better into the ecclesiastical hierarchy; an openly apostolic function of the emperor could be de facto only, but it could never be de jure. Otto III chose the title "Servus apostolorum." But, as Schramm explains, Otto gained by this descent to a lower level. The too general and too lofty pretention that the imperial office was fully and completely apostolic could not be maintained. That it had been attempted for a moment is interesting enough for our investigation. By becoming the servant of the apostles in the plural, Otto III made Peter and Paul patrons of the empire in a fuller sense of the word than before. Hence, for the first time, we find pictures which put the emperor in the middle between Peter and Paul. The emperor guaranteed both unity (Peter) and universality (Paul). The emperor's voluntary descent to the apostles' service expressed the unique character of the imperial dignity as a reli-
igious and ecclesiastical function in an orthodox way. It created in the
church a major-domate, so to speak, of perfectly unparalleled power over
the clergy. Major domus regni, the Carolingians had been: Pipin ruled
and deposed his king. Major domus ecclesiae, the Emperors were now, and
installed and deposed their bishops in Rome as elsewhere.

The Augaean stable in Rome could now be cleaned up. Popular
feeling insisted on giving a truly apostolic function to the imperial
reformers of religion. A further instance can be added: The grand-
mother of Otto III, who had survived her husband Otto I and her son Otto
II, and who was made a saint of the church by the efforts of Odilo of
Cluny, appeared in a vision to a duke, telling him that she and her lords,
the twelve (bissenko) apostles, the judges of the whole world, do a certain thing. This expression, given by Odilo, is an excellent illus-
tration of the title _servus apostolorum_ chosen simultaneously by her
grandson. The judge of the complete circle of the earth who are not one apostle, but all. And Paul is one of their two leaders.
The emperor Henry II and Cunigunde were treated in the liturgy of their
bishopric Bamberg like Peter and Paul. Thietmar of Merseburg, a pious
bishop and a sober historian, writes that God the Father, looking out of
His heaven above, was on his way to deliver his vicar on earth, Henry II.
The hymn _ad sextam_ calls Henry _apostolus_.

Of Henry II we possess a prayer book in which he is shown
with Peter and Paul. When Stephen of Hungary, whose image is the famous horseman
in Bamberg, established Christendom in his country he too was called _ap-
Dostolus_. And as Hungary escaped the struggle of insurrection, he being still
famous as the successor of Charlemagne, he today in all the privileges of St. Stephen for his appointment
of bishops. Henry III was hailed with the title _propagator religionis_. Later, it was
doubtful to which grade of the clergy the office of the emperor should
be compared. We have many attempts at the end of the eleventh century to
settle this question. The popes succeeded in conceding no more to him than a subdeaconate. But this whole discussion was thoroughly foreign to the period of the reforming emperors. (It gave deep satisfaction to a pious candidate when the emperor used his prerogative to appoint a bishop, just because the emperor cared for nothing but the good of the church.

The best witness of this state of affairs is the great ascetic, Peter Damiani, who paved the road for all the reforms of Gregory VII. He was the most fervent of fighters for complete reform. But radical as he was, he remained sober enough to call Gregory holy Satan. Hildebrand, however, that he wrote this letter—and to speak of Henry III in terms which we must quote explicitly to show an emperor's ecclesiastical function about the year 1050: Henry III has gained a victory over the enemies of the Catholic church not unequal to the victory of Constantine. Constantine subdued the dogma of the Arian sect with the arms of the true faith; Henry destroyed the pest of the Simioniac heresy by treading upon greed. The former, propagator of the faith, pointed a schism in the unity by Arius. Henry, triumphing over concupiscence, prevented simony from taking possession of the bishops' throne in the church. Let others perspire as they weave the triumphs of kings with the thread of historiography, let them extol with songs of exquisite praise the names of wars and the strong deeds of men; run in

To me this victory which I mentioned seems much more noble, and incomparably more glorious: there no human blood is shed, no thousands of soldiers are decimated, but the whole Catholic church diffused to the limits of the Roman empire is everywhere delivered from the fetters of old damnation, as if from a horrible and most profound prison, so that, pulled out by the divine force, the church can sing to God with a free voice: "Thou hast broken, O Lord, my fetters. I will sacrifice the sacrifice of praise."

So far goes a friend of Gregory VII. No wonder that a royalist writer declares as late as 1100: The pope is only the vicar of Peter, but the king
the vicar of Christ. The chancellor of the emperor also became the chancellor of the papal court. The emperors appointed popes and deposed them. Any fight against this situation was obviously not easy.

In our introduction we mentioned that Gregory VII was especially annoyed by the emperor's unique position. He degrades emperors into simple princes or kings. He thinks that there were very few saints among them, though he does not deny the holiness of Henry II. He emphasizes that all the popes were saints.

The second method of reformers was what we may call the geographical concept. Already John VIII speaks emphatically of the hegemony of Rome, in space as well as in time. About the times he says, in wonderful words: "Sic credatis sicut s. Romana ecclesia ab ipso apostolorum principi, didicit tenuit et usque in finem saeculi tenebit, atque per totum mundiam quotidie sancte fidei urba rectaeque praedicationis semina emittit et sicut antecessores nostros, sanctos videlicet sedis apostolicae praesules, parentes vestros ab initio docuisse cognoscimus. About space his words are less rich but emphatic enough: "Ad s. matrem tuam Romanam ecclesiam... quam omnia gentium retinet principatum et ad quam totius mundi, quasi ad unam matrem et unum caput, conveniunt nationes."

But the reformers went further. In 1048 a French writer, one of the few radicals who personally hated even the pious Henry III, proposed making the whole orbit of Christianity one province of the church, and letting the pope be elected by all the bishops of Christianity. This concept goes beyond the idea of a first see amongst other sees. There is but one see in the full sense of the word, when all the other sees form the electorate of the holy see. Petrus Damiani exclaims in fact: "All other bishoprics were founded by mortals, bishops, or princes. Rome alone was established by Christ himself. Hincmar of Reims had pretended that the famous words of Christ to Peter should be understood to apply to bishops. But Petrus Damiani concentrates the word spoken to Peter on the bishopric of Rome,
though Peter had been Bishop of Antioch before he came to Rome. Narrowing these words of Christ therefore consists in identifying Peter's whole life with his life in Rome only. Leo IX already condemned the Bishop of Santiago in Spain for calling himself apostolic, because of St James. The most abstract conception of the new idea that Rome was the only bishopric in the fullest and richest sense of the word, is found in the letter of congratulation which William of Metz sent to the newly elected Gregory VII. This letter made a deep impression on Gregory. He quoted it again and again. This letter said bluntly: 'You sit on the chair from which the lights of all the virtues are diffused through the circle of countries, and to which, like the lines to the middle, which geometicians call the centre, the universe converges.'

Here the abstract conception of a circle in space dominated by the universal pope is perfectly clear. In 1118, when the pope was driven out of Rome by an imperial anti-pope, a chronicler reflected this new concept in writing: 'The new papal world is emancipated from its identity with the Roman empire. Damian, was satisfied with the fines imperii for the church.' But Gregory says: 'Plus enim terrarum lex Romanorum pontificum quam imperatorum obtinuit.' The universitas ecclesiae had become now a thing which one could see, feel, and observe in its immediate and simultaneous reactions. The church had become simultaneous. The Roman liturgy was put into effect in remote Spain. The pope criticized the policy of the Swedish kings. The geographical concept is of no value as long as time-differences play an important rôle. The geometrical metaphor of William of Metz required for its fulfillment the simultaneousness of every section as its presupposition. This simultaneousness was missing even in the powerful words of John VII: 'The Roman Church which retains the principate of all peoples (gentes) and to which, as to one mother and one head, all the nations come, is still dying quite the same merely spacious idea as it was in the answer given to the dying Gregory by one of his henchmen. Every textbook mentions the bitter last
exclamation of the pope: dilexi iustitiam, odi iniquitatem (Psalm 68, 8).

But curiously enough, the answer is always omitted: it makes the point of the story. To the man to whom Salerno seems to be an exile because it is not Rome herself, a bishop answers most conveniently: Thou canst not die in exile, Holy Father, because, as vicar of Christ and the apostles, thou hast received the gentiles as thine inheritance; and as thy possession, the borders of the earth. Gregory thought of Rome when he sighed over his exile. He still lived in the pre-Gregorian order of things. The bishop reminds him, that the world has changed. Since the borders of the earth were his rightful possession, how could he call himself exiled, wherever he was on earth?

The fact that this classical answer is not even mentioned by the modern explorers of sources is instructive in itself. The change in the geographical aspect is rarely taken into account. But let us listen to these words: as vicar of Christ and of the apostles, the pope is at home in the whole world. The apostles are, of course, Peter and Paul. The climax in which the pope is addressed as vicar of Christ, and of the apostles might seem so general that the vicarage of St Paul, who is included, might disappear.

Is it perhaps worth while, nevertheless, to delve deeper just at this point? Can the popes and did the popes ever claim to be the vicars of St Paul? Did they derive their power of binding and loosing from St Paul too? One document exists, in which John XVIII, about 1007, declared that he acts with the power of binding and loosing given to Peter and Paul, the doctor of the gentiles. This unique document is a forgery, probably of the 15th century. Indeed we may say that nowhere in the first 1000 years of the church is there the slightest doubt that the pope was never meant to be the vicar of St Paul and of St Paul's spiritual powers, but that he freely used Paul's blessing, curse and authority.

It is not easy to define the role St Paul played in the formulas of the chancery in Rome. To be sure, the chancery always draws a distinct line
between Peter's and Paul's connection with the papacy. Tertullian can say that Peter is not under Paul, evidently defending Peter hereby.

Of course St Paul's grave is in Rome in the larger sense of this word. A monastery San Paolo fuori le mura was built above the relics of the saint. He and Peter are united on the June, like Romulus and Remus, the heroes of the same date in the calendar of pagan Rome. They are the two princes, the two thrones, the two leaders of the martyrs. But Paul has nothing to do with the administration of the bishopric of Rome.

The average expression in the documents is somewhat like this: remendare compellias exparte beatorum Petri et Pauli praecipiendo mandamus. Quod si sententiae nostrae parere noluerit, virga magistratus tui, ex auctoritate s. Petri, ardentissime feriatur. That is to say, after mentioning both Peter and Paul, Peter is mentioned once more alone to make sure that he alone is sufficient. The pope can use the authority of Paul as he speaks with the authority of St Mary or of the Trinity; and because Paul is buried in Rome, his authority is therefore especially invoked. But the power of the Keys is given to the popes by Peter's office only. Though all the apostles founded churches, and though Paul played a part in founding the Roman bishopric, he has no cathedral church of his own. He is not the apostle of the keys, but of the book. When Christ is represented as legislator, he gives the keys to St Peter and the roll to St Paul. A sermon of about 455 states clearly: in the whole orbit, the first town and the greatest is given to a poor man for special government by Christ.

The number of churches dedicated to St Paul is extraordinarily small, one tenth perhaps, in comparison with St Peter's churches. And even many of the so called churches of Paul name Peter too. Paul, whose letters are more frequently quoted than any other biblical texts, Paul who is called in all literary debate 'the apostle' without any further attribute, is a rare guest in the oldest Christian art. Says a modern hagiographer: 'C'est un fait bien connu que saint Paul n'occupe pas, dans l'art chrétien primitif,
la place que semblait devoir lui conférer son rôle capital dans la diffusion du Christianisme. Sans doute, l'élévation de sa doctrine et la rude dialectique de ses épitres le préparaient mal à être un saint populaire.

Though this is true for his individual and isolated appearance, together with Peter he is always welcome. In an old plaque of lead (reproduced N. 1).

Paul and Peter flank a cross on a staff. Peter has a key upon his chest, and Paul's right hand stands a spear. The medals are still more interesting in connection with the movement of the 11th century. Paul is in a different status (of aggregate) from Peter. He is the atmospheric, the merely spiritual leader of Christianity. Peter has the status (of aggregate) which a governor needs.

The wonderful expression of Hieronymus for Paul's different status (i.e. aggregate) is: Paulus effusus est super faciem universae terrae (in Amos 5).

This reminds us of Peter Damian's concept of the Church 'diffusa est per Romani fines imperii circumquoque', and corresponds to a phrase of John VIII: sicut ecclesia dei toto terrarum orbe diffusa et in omnibus gentibus dilatata cantat. The apostle is diffused like the church. His dash glistened from Jerusalem and its environments to Illyria, and to the borders of the earth, he was the loudest voice of the divine thunderbolt in the mystic wheel of the gospel which revolved through the circumference of the earth.'

The Roman mass recognises his universality by praying on the day of the conversion of St Paul: 'O God, who hast taught the universal globe by the preaching of thine apostle, who hast revealed the mysteries of the secret heaven to him'.... Nought stands in the true religion which is not founded by his discipline, and the multitude of believing nations feel him to be their intercessor whom they know, and have as master and teacher.

No word expresses this role of Paul better than the word orbis.

In the hymns sung from the earliest times in the honour of Peter and Paul, the orbis circle of the earth, connected with Paul, The
Roman ritual and chancery in the first thousand years refused the title 'universalis' to the pope. The canons are very severe in this point. The popes foresaw that when they became universal the bishops would lose their genuine and independent dignity. But Paul, who has no 'power' in the sense of episcopal jurisdiction, teaches the 'universal globe'. Gregory I says that though the church of Peter and Paul has all things in common, nevertheless he wished to provide some special property for St Paul, because it would be a shame if he had not enough shining candles who as a herald of the faith filled the whole world (totum mundum) with the light of his sermons.

Because Paul is the apostle of the orbis, he is so closely related to the function of the emperor. On the mediaeval maps the twelve apostles possess each one twelfth of the surface of the earth, appropriate to their 'measure'. But the emperor, like St Paul, has no special quarter or direction. Their responsibility goes into every direction. This explains the usage of an emperor who, like Otto III, went in a couple of months from South Italy to Alsace and Giesen and back to Rome again to frame his letters according to St Paul's.

The fact that Paul's missionary work was charismatic, irregular, exceptional, or at least not episcopal, prevented Paul himself from being monopolized by the popes. Indeed, his name was played up against the pope on the side of the Greeks during the quarrels between the popes and the patriarchs of Constantinople. The acts of the seventh universal council which met at Nicea in 787 give a quaint instance of this role of St Paul. The council meets in the times of Charlemagne and is the popes' last attempt to join with the Greeks and escape the Frankish yoke. (The attempt failed. The libri Carolini are the famous outburst of the Frankish court against this attempt.) From the side of the Greek court, the wish for a compromise with Rome was sincere, too, because the authority of the government of a juvenile emperor and his mother needed some fresh gloss. The council, therefore, was a rotten thing from the very beginning, a wrong compromise on
religious questions for purely external reasons. No wonder that sincerity was not the strongest virtue of the proceedings. Much harm was later done by the use of false translations from the Greek text into Latin, by Charlemagne's theologians. But falsifying of texts was already the rule during the proceedings of the council itself. Among these bad translations Saint Paul enters the scene. The pope's letter, which was read before the council by his representatives, without whose partnership a universal council would have been void, was falsified St Paul.

Hadrian wrote: "si ecclesiae b. Petri apostolorum principis amplexi fueritis censuram et sicut antiquitus..... ita et vos ..... eius vicarium ex intrino dilexeritis corde .... Ipse princeps apostolorum cui a domino deo legandi solvendique peccata in caelo et in terra potestas data est crebro vobis protector existens omnesque barbaras nationes sub vestris prosternens pedibus ... ubique vos victores ostendat.Peter, and Peter alone, gives victory against the pagans.

This text underwent a complete transformation when it was prepared for the Greek audience on the spot. The Greek text says that the pope is the vicar of Peter and Paul, that the church of the two princes of the apostles to whom the power of binding and loosing was given will give victory to the Greeks. Later, Hadrian had expressly written that Christ invested Peter with the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. The Greek text says the two thrones of Peter and Paul govern the faith.

The reason for this discrepancy is shown by a rather flippant remark of the Byzantine patriarch who had followed upon quite a series of patriarchs called Paul in Constantinople: I am ready to agree with the pope because Paul the apostle in writing his letter to the Romans, sponsors the righteousness of your faith. Thus Paul, the doctor of the gentiles, and especially of the Greeks, forms the link between Byzantium and Rome. Paul's authority at a Greek and Oriental council is better
than Peter’s. The Pope is overruled by the needs of the Greek Council. The Pope does not rely on Paul for his power of binding and loosing. But the Greeks make him rely on Paul because this makes it easier for the court of Constantinople to come to terms with Rome!

We discover a special function of St. Paul. He connects Rome with the outside world, pervading both with his evangelizing spirit. Alcuin gave the same function to his emperor Charles to Paul.

Turning now to the eleventh century we shall not be astonished to find Paul used in this role by both parties. Perhaps it is wise to say here, what is a matter of course, that the tradition of the old church prevailed perfectly through the eleventh century. Petrum and Paulum, said Odilo of Cluny, coelos dicimus Non est Paulus inferior Petro, quamvis ille Ecclesiae fundamentum. Nam et hic sapiens architectus scien
dentium fundare populorum... Cum primo... facile conferendus et nulli secundus. It emphasized that Paul acknowledged Peter’s authority.

Gregory, the teacher and model of Hildebrand, collecting money in 1045 to rebuild the churches of Rome, used the traditional formulas with their flexible varieties between singling out Peter in one phrase and gathering Peter and Paul together in the next: beati apostolorum principis (Petri!) sedem... recognoscunt, salutem et absolutionem omnium peccatorum per benedictionem et merita beati Petri et Pauli principum apostolorum... Rapinae contra ipsum ecclesiae caput, beatum videlicet Petrum... exortae sunt. Proinde propria ipsius ecclesiae, et B. Pauli (Petri et Pauli), quae propria-ipsius-esse illorum corporibus per totum orbem refugent et sua odore suaque pietate omnes ad se gentes provocant, iam... ruinam minantur. Twice Peter alone, twice Peter and Paul.

We have to face all the aspects of this normal situation carefully for our purpose. Accordingly I mention the custom, though perfectly well known to any diplomatist, that all the donations given to the papacy are styled as donations given Sancto Petro. In the long list of imperial donations
Peter is always the only saint addressed. Therefore the only important exception (Theiner I, 12) deserves a special attention which it has not received from historian of the war of investiture.

Of private documents I find but one old will of the ninth century mentioned as exemplar ipsius testamenti per quod Gerardus comes ... tradidit res principibus apostolorum Petro et Paulo tradidit.

I need not say that abbreviations of the list of saints are very common in all mediaeval documents. For example, Cluny was dedicated in honour of Peter and Paul. But almost all the donations are given to St Peter. The church of St Paul in Halberstadt, founded about 1008, was refounded later in the honor of Peter and Paul. But Peter is never mentioned in the documents even after the second foundation. In Cluny Paul had not even any representation, either in sculpture or in painting. Because picturae literature paupertatum (sunt) without pictures no tradition kept.

But this is not the case at Rome. In Rome, Mad limina apostolorum, the very donor recalls both apostles always. It is therefore by purpose and not by indifference that all the donations were given to Peter only. The popes themselves, as a matter of course, call their possessions always the aeternae et Petri. The flag is Peter's flag, without pictures no tradition kept. It is therefore by purpose and not by indifference that all the donations were given to Peter only. The popes themselves, as a matter of course, call their possessions always the aeternae et Petri. The flag is Peter's flag, without pictures no tradition kept.
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But this is not the case at Rome. In Rome, Mad limina apostolorum, the very donor recalls both apostles always. It is therefore by purpose and not by indifference that all the donations were given to Peter only. The popes themselves, as a matter of course, call their possessions always the aeternae et Petri. The flag is Peter's flag, without pictures no tradition kept. It is therefore by purpose and not by indifference that all the donations were given to Peter only. The popes themselves, as a matter of course, call their possessions always the aeternae et Petri. The flag is Peter's flag, without pictures no tradition kept.

But this is not the case at Rome. In Rome, Mad limina apostolorum, the very donor recalls both apostles always. It is therefore by purpose and not by indifference that all the donations were given to Peter only. The popes themselves, as a matter of course, call their possessions always the aeternae et Petri. The flag is Peter's flag, without pictures no tradition kept. It is therefore by purpose and not by indifference that all the donations were given to Peter only. The popes themselves, as a matter of course, call their possessions always the aeternae et Petri. The flag is Peter's flag, without pictures no tradition kept.
course, the popes were frightened by any excessive praise of Paul, and in
1647 Innocence X condemned Arnaud for giving full equality to Peter and Paul
in terms which were used freely in the eleventh century. Then people in
Rome began to write books on the scandalizing tradition in art which
painted St Paul at the right side of Christ, and Peter at his left. Once
the better side, the right side, was given to Paul, Protestant heresy might
capture new groups from St Peter’s flock. After 1517, and Luther, a Pauline
christendom was set up against the Petrines of Rome; and attention to
St Paul characterised German protestantism for better and for worse. But
are there any traces of such a differentiation in older days? Was there a
change in the role of St Paul during the war between emperors and popes?

Writers contemporary with the war of investiture answer this
question clearly. A change in the role of the pope was necessary. Burchard
of Worms, canonist under Henry the saint, still wrote about the relationships
between emperors, popes, and God himself, with perfect simplicity. In his
collection of canons, and as a monk on canonicals, he says:

because there are men of different conditions, nobles and serfs, in the
church, the clergy or the laymen who happen to be their superiors, must
act mildly against them and must show that they are their brothers and
have one Father, who is in heaven, to whom they pray; and one Mother,
Holy Church, who nourishes them in the inviolate womb of the holy fountain.

Gregory III, seventy years later, also writes a letter to all the
laymen, ‘ad omnes fideles’, but he says: All those who are known by the name
of Christians in the world, and who truly know their Christian faith, know
and believe that St Peter, the prince of the apostles, is the father of all
Christians, and the first shepherd after Christ, and that the Holy Roman
Church is the mother of all the Churches, and their teacher.

Here the laymen are brought under a double yoke. Their future
in heaven is determined by the pope — because Gregory identifies himself
with Peter, and the Roman church claims to be the mother in whom laymen
live. This identification of at least four links: 1, God, the Father to whom we pray; 2, Christ; 3, the vicar of Christ, Peter; 4. the vicar of Peter, the pope — includes the free Spirit, the atmospheric and misspreading (not English, pioneering?) spirit in the geometrical circle with Rome as centre described by William of Lætze.

No wonder that men's first endeavor, in the new times, was to create a collection of canons to supersede Burchard's. Anselm II of Lucca, a fervent admirer of Gregory's, accomplished this task before 1083, and by the arrangement of his collection showed that the Holy See aimed at establishing two ideas, Motherhood of the Roman Church and the Fatherhood of the Roman Pope. The first volume of Anselm's new work is the primatus sedis apostolicae. It establishes the motherhood of the Roman church over all the churches in Christendom in the new 'geographical' way. The second volume secures the direct approach of inferior people in the Church to the Holy See. Up to 1060, this rule prevailed: non licere cujuslibet ecclesiae filium ad majorem ecclesiae proprii reatus episcopi, et quaeque sunt corrigenda, deferret. The average Christian could not bring his case to Rome. The new fatherhood idea includes a chance for every Christian to get a decision from the pope or at least from his court. Anselm of Lucca's second volume is therefore entitled: De libertate appelleationis. By this new organisation the popes took over the function which St Paul had fulfilled in his day, and which emperors and missions had helped the episcopate to fulfill in later centuries. Orderly stabilization and the movement of evangelisation are two different functions. Gregory VII took over complete responsibility for both. Liberty of appeal was a practical device to weave a new web between thousands of individual Christians and the papacy. The primacy of St Peter was an old doctrine. The new contribution of the canonistic theory for this connection between primacy and appeal was to add a new title, and some new canons mentioning Paul's authority. Under Leo IX (to whom Peter and Paul appeared on his death bed,
the leading manual of the new order of things (in a collection of 74 titles) begins with the title De primatu Romanae ecclesiae. The second title goes on: De eadem et quod Petrus et paulus passi sunt eadem die (this is demonstrated by three quotations). Instinctively, the author wishes to find canons which will mobilise the treasures of St. Paul, including the date of his death, in favor of the primacy. For us it is difficult to see why the date of the martyrdom mattered. But the execution of the apostles led to their definite spiritual union; when the blood of Paul, shed by the sword of the executioner, covered Peter, a mystical union was achieved. The reality of blood touching a man and enlivening him had a part in this logic of the legend.

The two apostles (20) brought up by this first canon of Lucca, the idea set forth by his forerunners about the perfect union of Peter and Paul in martyrdom. Five inscriptions (I, 66-70) deal with Peter and Paul. But one, of course, adds any real lustre to the primacy of the popes, the topic of this part of the book. His strongest argument is his quotation from Ambrosius: Petrus et Paulus doctores sunt

saepe accedere ad beati Pauli corpus vel sudarium. It is a quotation from Gregory I's letter in which he refuses to give away any of St. Paul's relics and threatens anyone who approaches the body with serious consequences.

But the fact that this paragraph was put into the book shows the author's keen desire to mention Paul and to give him at least one special inscription: canon 70 is the only canon on Paul alone! The five canons 66-70 make a strong attempt, with poor means, to introduce the authority of St. Paul into the doctrine of the primacy.

As for the second book, the liberty of appeal, we know the original author of this idea. Petrus Damiani wrote to Pope Alexander II proposing to introduce the episcopate from any inferior to the superior church.
He motivated the proposition with a reference to Peter's patience when Paul corrected him like a superior: \\
\( \text{Petri plane in faciem resistens Paulus objurgat (Gal. c. 8).} \) He supported the direct access for any Christian to Rome, making the Pope the visible father of the oppressed, all over the world, by a biblical precedent to the effect that the lower bishops are compared with Peter, whereas the Pope himself (assumes) the function of Paul.

If St Paul's function belonged to the Pope, like St Peter's, so that all other officeholders were mere tenants of a papal leasehold, it did not matter which of the apostles rated higher. Odilo of Cluny had treated Peter and Paul as equals. Peter Damiani wrote a book on Peter and Paul, which is highly significant. Undoubtedly an aggressive pioneer of the reform, he did not hesitate to rate Paul higher than Peter. His considerations are the more interesting, as they are blurred by his modern orthodox editor. The abbot who prints this tract of Petri and Pauli, hastens to explain that Damiani is mistaken in giving too much honor to Paul. (This abbot writes under anti-Protestant inhibitions unknown in the times of Damiani.)

In considering paintings from an earlier period Damiani wonders why Paul has the better place, on the right side of Christ. Like Bruno of Würzburg, another writer of the eleventh century, he explains it by the fact that Paul belongs to the tribe of Benjamin, which means the son of his right arm. Paul is this true son of God's right arm. He describes this function of St Paul in words of unmatched eloquence: \\

He fights against the fury of all the vicious and iniquitous spirits, and brandishing the sword of heavenly eloquence, like the flashing hand of Christ, he slays the necks of God's opponents. Righteous Paul obtains the dignity of the right side of the Saviour who undoubtedly exercises the power of God's right hand... Almighty God extends this son of his right arm like his proper right hand, over the breadth of the whole world always, and collects together the nations of...
adoption into the unity of the faith. The Highest Sower uses this right arm throughout the area of his church and with it he fans the seeds of the spirit. God extends this right arm far, when Paul runs through the whole world to collect the nations.

Paul is nearer to Christ than any other apostle; Damiani’s logic is rather intricate on this point. Here common sense would decide that Jerusalem was the first see, because Christ was crucified there. But common sense is mistaken. The authority of the canons gives the first place to the Roman church, the second to Alexandria; Jerusalem has but the fifth. The death of Christ, therefore, has no local meaning, does not indicate the special place of his suffering; but Christ as the one shepherd presides over all the sees and bishoprics without any distinction. The visible church is organized according to the privilege of Peter, not according to the incomparable excellence of the Redeemer who holds no special bishopric. Paul, therefore, has a certain similarity with Christ, because he too owns no cathedral church, no episcopal see, but presides over all the churches.

When Paul visited Peter in Jerusalem, he went to see Peter, not to learn from him, to preside over all the churches, without any predilection, to be extended like the right hand and arm of God over the breadth of the whole church, to visit Peter but not to learn from him,—these are the two functions given to St Paul by Damiani. These are exactly the qualities or functions which the Papacy developed simultaneously, putting Paul over Peter for correction; the bulls by the free appeal to the pope.

The bulls of Alexander II, the pope contemporary with Damiani, have the inscription: *exaltavit me Deus in virtute bracii * out. It seems not impossible to me that this alludes to Paul’s function emphasized by Damiani that Paul is the power of Christ’s arm which exalts the pope. We can expect that a book like this, eloquent, original, and eminently to the point, would stir up interest everywhere. Fifty years
This is a resurrection. Light inundates the universe. Paul had been in the grave. Five hundred years before, John Chrysostom had envied the Romans for having the protection of Paul's sepulchre; so that I was be allowed to kneel at the tomb of Paul, to gaze upon the dust of this body which by suffering for us supplied what was lacking in the sufferings of Christ, the dust of his mouth which did not shrink from speaking before kings and which by showing who Paul was revealed, his mastery to look at the dust of his heart, of his mouth, of his heart, more sublime than heaven, more comprehensive than the universe as well the heart of Christ as of Paul (Homily XXXII).

Now, before the delighted eyes of Damiani, the world-heart has risen from its grave. He sees Paul no longer in the dust of the relics, but exalted as God's a right arm over the whole breadth of the earth. eternal.

What is Paul's office? To preside over all the churches without any preference like Christ himself, or predilection like Christ himself, to be extended like the right hand of God over the breadth of the whole earth, to visit Peter, but not to learn from him. These are the functions given to Paul by Damiani.

Now, these are exactly the qualities or functions which the pope developed simultaneously, putting Paul over Peter for Max being able to correct the bishops by the first appeal to the pope.

The bulls of Alexander II., the pope contemporary of Damiani, have the inscription: *exaltavit me deus in virtute brachii sui*. It seems not impossible to me that this alludes to Paul's function emphasized by Damiani that Paul is the power of Christ's arm which exalts the pope.

We can expect, anyhow, that a pamphlet like this, eloquent, original, and eminently to the point would stir up interest everywhere. We can even prove that it had a white circulation. Fifty years later
later it is used in England as the basis of a violent attack against Peter: Peter may be seen in Rome on the left side of Christ. Furthermore, Peter is but the apostle of the Jews. Paul is the true apostle of the Gentiles, the apostle plainly. The English author concludes not only that Paul stands higher than Peter, but that Paul may serve as a weapon against Peter: The monopoly of Peter's authority in the hands of the papacy seemed convincing, but the monopoly of Paul was not immediately acknowledged. We con-
clude from his method his opinion that by favoring Paul, the English writer hopes to undermine the popes' authority. The German bishops, writing deliberately to the bishop of the first see—one of the last letters written with this address—rely on Paul's authority. They complain: Gregory deprives the bishops of all the powers invested in them by the grace of the holy spirit. Nobody can be a bishop or a priest without borrowing that grace from the pope. You throw into miserable confusion what the doctor of the gentiles (Paulus) so often recommends and teaches as the most beautiful distribution of the members of Christ. Henry II writes, too, that St Paul, who cursed the angels, would also curse Gregory. In 1103 Sigebert of Gembloux quotes Paul's resistance face to face with Peter, the first apostle: Why, therefore, cannot the bishops of Rome be criti-

cized and set right? The abbot Goeffridus repeats this thought, and says: If the pope wishes really to act like Peter he should look out for a Paul to set him right. This had become impossible since the popes acted as vicars of Paul. What can be found in Rome's own utterances?

Hildebrand was prior, not the abbot, of San Paolo fuori le mura before he became pope. St Paul appeared to him in a dream. In the first year of his papacy Hildebrand cared for the equipment of this church. That is natural. But not natural for him to harangue St Paul. He forbids any infraction of his donation by the power of the last judgment, and of ours which consists of St Peter's, thy co-apostle. Hildebrand wrote to the great preacher, the master of the gentiles in
faith and truth, the apostle Paul. The pope uses the authority of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth given to Peter and to thee, Paul.

As far as I see, this is unique in any papal document. Since the only other document which mentions Paul's power of binding and loosing is a poor forgery, the papal privilege of 1074 is important. I dare we cannot pretend. Paul is perhaps more frequently quoted in the first year of Gregory (cp. Reg. I, 13; 15; 44) than later. But I cannot find that the formulae of other documents betray any important message on our problem.

Gregory had a plan of changing the organization of San Paolo, but it does not appear that he succeeded. Later the monastery is still under the emperor's protection and the Emperor, Lothair acts for San Paolo in a way which certainly shows the religious foundation as independent of the secular arm. But there are other features which give Paul a better share in the events of the war of investiture than he had before. In 1080 Paul and Peter, adjured by Gregory, were asked to show their authority at the deposition of Henry. It seems to be the second and last official document which gives the power of binding and loosing expressly to Paul as well.

The whole world shall recognize, that if you, most sainted princes of the church, are able to bind and to loose in heaven, you can on earth take away and give empires and kingdoms. No wonder that this fervent admirer of the complete union between Peter and Paul interferes with the papal mint. That was correct, because coins give the picture of the political authority, which is represented by Peter alone. But Gregory puts on his coins Peter and Paul, with Paul on the right side, until Christ himself appears on the coins (after Mussolini's concordats). The seals of his successors follow the coins.
This novelty was carefully imitated by his counterpart, baptized in a rather insipid way with a short-lived nickname 'Petripaulentius' to show that his authority rested on the two apostles.

A document of Henry VII which gave a monastery to Rome (V. Romanae descripti ecclesiae sanctorumque Petri et Pauli habere gubernationem) is obviously incorrect, because Paul has no government, and we know that a worthless forger. Another writer in the north takes it for granted that Peter and Paul are buried in one tomb, and that Henry VII took his oath over this common tomb. The apostles dealt with the first Simonist, with Simon the sorcerer. The chapter is the eighth of the Acts, whereas Damascus is the ninth. Later in Rome Peter and Paul, according to the legend, convince Nero's friend Simon so that he falls and breaks his neck. His death has nothing to do with simony. But Leo IX prays to Christ that the Simonists may be converted 'like as Thou hast prescribed, by thy apostles Peter and Paul,' the downfall of Simon.

The same projection of Paul back into the lifetime of Jesus is found in art. Except in the representations of the Cross, Paul is present in many a scene of the life of Jesus in painting.

In his famous speech in Milan Peter Damian declares Rome the only church founded by Christ. Therefore Milan is under Rome. But he adds that this is not the only reason for the allegiance owed to Rome. Because Peter sent Nazarius to the place, and Paulus sent two of his di-
Gregory VII takes the same turn to introduce the ordo Romanus in Castile and Aragon. Because the blessed apostle Paul says that he approached Spain and because later seven bishops sent from the city of Rome for the instruction of the natives of Spain were directed by the apostles Peter and Paul, the concord between Rome and Spain was always perfect. And Gregory even risks saying that the church of Rome was founded by Peter and Paul on a rock. Obviously the great pride of the Spaniards on behalf of the journey of St. Paul to their country is flattered by this deviation from the regular formula. Only twenty years before, the archbishop of Santiago had claimed to be apostolic and had been condemned for this boldness. Now at last Paul connected Spain personally with Rome. The German chronicler remarks: Thus the counterpope by the power of the emperor obtained Rome, but GALILEUS the universality of the church. After fourteen centuries of discord and confusion, the first step towards a compromise into the recognition of a pope that the imperial dignity of the German king was something particular and unique (The very claim, Gregory had tried to overrule), this was in 1118. Later, the Pope Calixt II, when sending the last and final embassy to Germany which succeeded in concluded the Concordat of Worms did not fight for St. Peter as the popes of the eighth or the tenth century would have done.

With reconciliatory intentions, he tries to give to Caesar what he can give, - the assurance that he wishes only to serve God in the justice of his Church: "This Church has the holy apostles Peter and Paul as its lords and patrons."

I think it remarkable that the only letter in which Peter's name does not stand in isolation was the bridge of peace; the concordat after fifty years. In all these cases Paul helps as a mediator between the world of the papacy and the world outside. But another case dates back into the times of Damiani. Bucke of Halberstadt had been a mediator between the
court of the boy-king Henry IV and the Holy See. Thanks for this delicate and efficient mediation are expressed by a papal bull bestowing the pallium on the simple bishop as a special favour. The protocol speaks of the beautiful distribution of the members of Christ described by the doctor gentium, which the German bishops hold up ten years later against Gregory. The minister of God, the dispensor of His secrets, founded many institutions gently and spiritually,” says Alexander II. 

Jumbo shall be treated, the pope assures him, according to the doctrines of St Paul as a true citizen of the Roman church though used for business between the apostles on one side and the emperor on the other.

The effect of this special reference to the institutions founded by Paul on Bucko of Halberstadt may be traced into his activities as a builder. Because Bucko and the archbishop of Bremen are the two princes of the German church, who made up for a negligence shown to Paul, and erected a special foundation in his honour.

The fact of the rather modest number of churches dedicated to Paul illustrated an earlier paragraph in this essay. The numerous monasteries in honour of Peter and Paul, Roman monasteries of the tenth and eleventh centuries, are not at all an argument for any special interest in Paul. But the foundations of Halberstadt and Bremen are of a different character. The same is true of Worms. In the same period the St Paulus church in Worms, built with the stones of a fortress which the count of the palatinate had owned inside the city and which was finally extorted from the count by the bishop under the influence of the emperor Henry II (1002-1024).

Because this older St Paulus church in Worms was built by nobody else but the same Bucko whose canons we have already mentioned in a collection of Bucko’s works, perpetuated the memory of a local event within the empire. The donation of this fort-
ress under the pressure of the emperor is hailed by a "signum libertatem
civitatis." This symbol of the liberty of his city, he named after the
apostle of Christian liberty, St Paul.

No such church existed in Bremen or in Halberstadt, then. The
see of Bremen-Hamburg was the greatest missionary centre of the north,
for all Scandinavia. In spite of this Paulinian function, the archbishop
had only a cathedral in the honour of St Peter, and a chapel for the love
of St Peter. Even Adalbert of Bremen in his early days paid no attention
to Paul. But in his later years he was made a permanent legate of the pope
for the North. By this measure the Bonifatian legacy of the Paulinian
mission and the Petrine function of a permanent see were blended. Then,
as Adam of Bremen reports, Adalbert founded a special church in the honour
of St Paul.

The building of houses bearing the name of Paul leads us on to
some iconographical problems about Paul. We have already mentioned his ap-
pearance on coins, but the old artistic tradition gave nothing but a book
or a roll into Paul's hands. I have been able to make a rather complete
survey on St Paul in painting, sculpture, ivory, miniatures, seals and
coins with the generous help of the Poggio Museum, Cambridge, and of Pro-

fessor Forey of Princeton University. I can therefore take the risk of
saying, after a study of almost all the images made between 200 and 1200,
that the overwhelming majority of representations paint him with a book
or roll, whereas Peter has the book or the key. After 1200, the regular
attribute of Paul becomes the sword, and Peter has not one but two or
three keys. Durandus, writing in the early thirteenth century, requires
the sword for Paul as a normal attribute. Sometimes Paul has both
the sword and the keys. Why did
What happened to bring the sword into the hands of St Paul, the
sword with which he was beheaded by Nero’s executioner, but which re-
minds us simultaneously of the sword of the faith?

The oldest sculpture of Paul with a sword is dated by Dosschevets
1179. But Porter, whom he quotes, thinks this sculpture in Langueonne
may be of somewhat older origin than the building it is in now. Then
there is an isolated tradition: In Fuentillo, an Umbrian monastery, so-
called Langobardic sculptures may be seen. Peter and Paul. Paul, who is
much bigger than Peter, carries a colossal sword. The traditional date
of these sculptures - 724 - seems impossible. I suspect the time of that it
longs from the eleventh century. But as I am no expert, and have all the experts
against me, I appeal for a new trial of the obviously oldest sculpture
monument, which adorns Paul with a sword. The second is equally undated. On a
fan of ivory, made in France in the ninth century and now in the collec-
tion Carrand in Florence, the figure of St Agnes was replaced in early
times by a St Paul with a sword. The experts have not stated the pe-
riod of this suplementary work, but they seem to think that it is not
very recent.

In classical times, the spear is shown on Paul’s side on the medal
described before. This may be irregular, now we now enter the period of
Gregory and his immediate successors. How we know that the put a
sculpture, showing St Mary, Peter and Paul. On his coins, the two apostles
have no attributes; Peter wears neither keys nor cross, Paul neither a
roll nor a sword.

The only source which communicates us something is a popular one:
the pilgrims who came to the graves of the apostles, wished to take home
some token. Some of these tokens were excavated by A. de Vaal. He
showed that a medal in the year 1200 the income from these medals was
considerable. He distinguished two types of the medals: on the later
one, Peter carries keys, Paul a sword. The older medals, however, show
Peter and Paul, each holding one big key. The same misunderstanding
that we found in the chronicler who spoke of the altar of Peter and Paul,
can be found on these popular medals. The man in the street, the pil­
grim, did not distinguish the functions of Peter and Paul. To him, the
dispensation for which he hoped from his pilgrimage, was guaranteed by
two apostles and de Staal thought that the indulgences, the
powers of loosing bestowed upon a pilgrimage, were expressed by the keys
in Paul's hand in Peter's hand.

However, it is a kind of test for our investigation that in Rome
of the eleventh and twelfth centuries this wrong attribution of a key to
Paul became possible! The later form - with the sword - looks like an
official readjustment or correction. This would mean that the sword was
invented, to get rid of Paul's more than doubtful key which certainly
made but a transient appearance on the scene.

It was an abuse on the papal side
which may be compared with the bond of bronze of 1000 on which the emperor carried the dove
of the Holy Ghost.

We are now prepared to consider two great episodes of the war of
investiture where St Paul is in almost the same position as on these re­
markable medals and in the two great conciliar council Paul IV
Gregory in 1044 and in 1080. Old conciliar council of 1050
The dying Gregory promised to pardon everybody who believes un­
doubtedly that "I own this special power in vice apostolorum et Pauli."
The vicarius Petri, the vicarius Christi - both expressions are familiar
to us; "viceritus Petri et Pauli" was the great pope of the papal revolution
at the end of his reign wishes to be.

The Concordat of Parma, signed in 1798, after Callixtus had
written his reconciliatory letter to Henry IV, uses the doctrines, the
ideas, the consequences which had been developed in the last seventy years,
but without the concordatianism of Gregory.

The Concordat discriminates between a church of Peter and Paul and a
church of Peter. Peter's church is the church of Rome, in the narrow and
old sense of the word, to which the emperor gives back its earthy possess­
sions. The church of Peter and Paul is the worldwide catholic church,
universal Church that she was urbs and orbis, Roman and not Roman. Now that is exactly the expression pope in 1007 used for St. Paul. Victor III (Migne 149, 87) writes: Beatissimus Paulus et Romanus erat et non Romanus erat. This universal church was represented by Peter and Paul, or in this hour we should rather say by Peter plus Paul. It was to this church that the emperor finally gave the investiture of all the churches.

This was a new idea. The diocese ceased to be local bishoprics. The pope was made, by the concordat, the trustee of all of them. The old universal claim of the emperor over the whole Roman world, debased by Gregory into a mere kingdom, used once more its old universality, but only to abandon one of his essential claims. The concession made by the pope was the formal recognition of the old imperial privileges. They are not handed over to the pope with the same intention as the local possessions in Rome are given to S. Peter. For not the pope of the Urbs but the trustee of the other bishops is acknowledged. Each bishop and each electorate has really a share in what is given formally to the pope. The elections all over the breadth of the empire are given back to the Holy Ghost and the Liberty of his choice. Thereby, the function of St. Paul is buried or solemnly incorporated now into the function of the popes, vicars of Peter. Paul, who had been the forerunner of the established church by his travelling office, became now the deliverer of this established church to its original freedom.

The Concordat of Worms distinguished two conceptions of the Roman church, or two aspects of it: one universal, one local. Gregory, finding himself in exile outside of Rome, and his bishop, seeing the one and united homestead of the pope extended over the whole breadth of the earth, were right. The Concordat of Worms respects the new role of the pope as well as his old.
1. [Text not legible]

But two and three run as follows:

2. Possessiones et regalia beati Petri quae ablata sunt ... idem sanctae
Romanae ecclesiae restituo.

3. Possessiones etiam aliarum ecclesiarum reddam.

The most beautiful distribution between the members of Christ, quoted
by the bishops in 1075 as founded by St. Paul, was not and could not be
simply restored, because broken pots never can be made brand-new. A patch
remains a patch. Peter plus Paul had now strenuously to protect the other
bishoprics from the tyranny of their respective kings. To equip the pope
with the credentials for the other bishops Paul had joined Peter.

This success saved the liberty of the church against arbitrary power.
But Paul, who had been Roman and now Roman, a dependency of the Roman
See for the next four hundred years exclusively. He disappears from
discussion immediately after 1122. All the queer expressions of Paul as
the predecessor of a pope, of the pope as Petripaulus, of papal
Pauli which we had observed in the heat of the battle, vanish. After 1122,
the documents are perfectly correct again. But something has happened. Before
1144, the decretum Gratiani, in Distinction XX, I, gives secular power to
the pope. In 1147 the same claim is expressed by Eugen X. It is based on the
quality of the pope as vicar of Christ. We have seen in
the beginning that this is of no importance because kings were vicars of
God. The new formulas are translations of Gregory's prayer to Peter
and Paul in 1080: Show the whole world that you can give empires, king
doms, dukedoms, as you give and take bishoprics and abbeys. The disguise
of this claim in an less specific formula can not suffice to emit the
main link in the evolution, i.e., the innovation of Gregory. He, and no
body else has first claimed secular power to the same extent as spiritual.

For that purpose, Paul has served his prior well. No direct connection
exists between Nicolaus I, who claims supremacy in the spiritual and Eugen III, who claims both swords. The solution of their resemblance must be found in the fact that vicarius Christi meant something different in the ninth and in the twelfth century. In the twelfth, Paul has reinforced Peter's primacy into a real government of the world.

Before summarising the stations of the road we have passed, in some survey, we may perhaps take a look into the times after 1122. What was the role of St. Paul? The answer must be: honourable but not independent. He is compared to the moon now like the emperors, by Hugo of St-Victor, Peter being the Sun. Paul has served his turn and is more or less dismissed now. Even the great ancestor of the doctors of scholarship, Abailard, greets the doctor of the Gentiles with traditional words though his Tuba Domini Paule Maxima is a beautiful hymn.

Joachim de Floris, the prophet of the twelfth century— and that is always overlooked—distinguished but two significates or significatives in the life of the church: the significatus Petri and the significatus Johannis. Joachim’s dream of the third empire— so popular today— is based on a dualism which ignores any function of Paul between Peter the man of the rock and John the man of the pure spirit of love. The Spiritualists of the Middle ages did not look to Paul. How could it be otherwise, since Gregory had pretended that Paul and Peter had built the church on the rock? An independent Paulinian period or Paulinian function was inconceivable for the rest of the middle ages.

But Paul came back. Paul, the man of the missions, the doctor of the gentiles became the master of the new learning. His preaching gave rise to a form of the church based merely on preaching. This Paulinian heresy of Luther influenced the popes. Eager to surpass the heretics, the Paulinism which was condemned in Trent without sparing the apostle himself, Paul IV. made the apostle Paul the successor of the Roman Emperor Marcus.
The church of Christ will always know the functions of Peter the priest, Paul the Levite, and John the Samaritan.

The emperors had made Paul a priest—as Paul is shown on the most beautiful ivory of the Ottonian period in Echternach. When they thought of him like a priest, it was conceivable that the threatened clergy vindicated Paul for the visible priesthood. Only the twentieth century sees an atonement of this troubled harmony. The newest piece of official papal art presents the the two apostles in a gemination. Yet it draws a line between Peter and Paul as though one was a public person, wearing the mitre, the other, Paul no official at all but a private character, talking confidentially in a room of his house to a friend. A wise solution!

I think this breaks into the troubles of a fight between Visible and Invisible church elucidates the importance of the events in the eleventh century. Paul had helped, it is true, to restore the dignity and worldwide influence which the successors of Peter had lost for a time. Paul helped Peter to humiliate the apostolic Majesty of kings. Because the German emperors, in their majordomate of the Church, had been backed by all the apostles, the victory of the papacy could not be achieved without relying on Paul too.

But in helping Peter, Paul’s personal function in the church deteriorated. His blood refreshed Peter. But he himself was buried. Perhaps this is Paul’s permanent experience. Today he is the great scandal for the grandsons of the German Lutherans.

The fate of Paul in the course of history was his being buried. But sometimes through the centuries you listen particularly to the voice of the buried.
Before 1050 Peter represents the unity Paul the University of the church.
The Greeks insert Paul whenever the Pope speaks of Peter alone.
The pope vicar of Christ but the emperor vicar of God too, or of an apostolic legation. The spirit administered by an apostolic Majesty. The emperor servus apostolorum. The twelve apostles back the emperors. The vicar of Peter despised. S. Paul appears to Otto III.
Burchard of Worms does not relate, in his collection of Canons, S. Paul to the Papacy. He dedicates his church to Paul in Signum libertatis.
Petrus Damiani and Odilo of Cluny praise the Emperors as new Constantines and Reformers of the church.

1047-1075 A French writer proposes to make the whole world one ecclesiastical jurisdiction.
Williams of Metz compares the universal Church to a geometrical circle, with Rome in the centre.
The collection of 74 titles collects some canons about S. Paul in order to support the title concerning the supremacy of the Pope. The simultaneous martyrdom of Peter and Paul is stressed. Damiani praises Paul as the right arm of God, not only diffuse like the church over the whole earth but presiding all the churches and deserving the precedence before Peter.
Alexander II chooses a device reminding of Damiani's description of Peter and Paul.

Gregory VII. His Church is bigger than the Fince imperii
On his coins, Paul gets the right side, Peter the left.
Paul and Peter have founded the church on the rock. Peter is addressed by his prior and the power of binding and loosing is given to him though he was never a bishop and in the old art not taken as a priest.
The two apostles together have full domination of the spiritual plus the temporal.
On his deathbed, Gregory pardons all who acknowledge him to act vice Petri et Pauli.
The Pope at home now on the universal earth like Paul.
Petripaula nickname of a counterpope.
Popular coins give one big key to Paul as well as to Peter.
Paulus Romanus et non Romanus est (Victor III)

1122 The Concordate of Worms gives the free election of all the clergy in the empire to Peter and Paul, the possessions in Rome to Peter alone.

The popes claim secular power as vicars of Christ. Feudal law regulates their relations to secular powers.
1. A. I. Macdonald, Authority and Reason in the early Middle Ages. 
Hulsean Lectures University of Cambridge, Oxford 1933, P. 114.

2. The expression Revolution is frequently used for the struggle of investiture, see f. i. P. Fournier, Mélanges Archéol. 14(1904) p. 196. A special justification for it may be found in my book on Die europäischen Revolutionen, Vol. II(1927), 206: "Gregory's conclusion was historically justified. There was here nothing new or revolutionary." 

3. For ex: W. Wihr, Studien zur Gregors VII. Kirchenreform und Welt-
politik München 1930, E. Voosen, "Papsttum und Feudalismo", l'époque de Grégoire VII Gembloux 1927. Extreme is the statement of A. J. Carlyle Medieval political theory Vol II(1927), 206: "Gregory's conclusion was historically justified. There was here nothing new or revolutionary."

4. A. Fliche La Réforme Grégorienne II, 413: Le droit féodal a pu fortifier la conception grégorienne qui en vertu de la primauté romaine, prétend 'lier sur terre', mais cette fusion n'est opérée qu'après le pontificat de Grégoire VII.


6. This coincidence seems not to be mentioned by any biographer. But we know that the letter of congratulation sent to Gregory by one of the members of the radical Lorraine party, Williams of Metz, made such an impression on him, that he shaped his own phrases in some decisive aspects according to Williams suggestions. So it deserves attention that Williams hailed him with Psalm 45(43), 31, and ergo accingere gladium super femur tuum. (Mabillon, Analecta Vetera Paris 1723, p. 165). And Gregory's last sigh quotes vers 8 of the same psalm (Dilexisti iustitiam et odisti iniquitatem). The scene at his deathbed is treated note 46.

7. The emperor in the Church in Rosenstock and Wittig Das Alter der Kirche, Kapitel und Akten l( Berlin 1927 ), 359 ff.

8. Wittich, Vita pontificum 373 ff.

9. Reg.III, 21 ed Casper p. 204, §/XX/ § X and § VIII.


12. Abbot Lupus writes to king Charles a. 934-44 MG. Epistolae XVI, 64nr. 64: Vobem vos gerere del qui ignorat?

Notes

for -osenstock-Hüssy St. Paul

Notes 13a. Ego et Romani minime convenimus moribus see L. M. Smith, Cluny 1930, XXX, XVIII.

Note 14 Lit. II, cap. 4 Mon. Germaniae Scriptores III, 586 = Migne 142, C33f.

Note 15 L. M. Smith, Cluny p. 82 n. 1

Note 15a: Hence the emphasis in the eleventh century on the following idea of St. Paul: Ex I Cor. XV manifeste colligitur, quod praeter illos duodecim et alii discipuli non inconvenienter apostolxi nominentur Migne 144, 650.


Note 18 Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands III, 523, l, 269.

Note 19 in Job 39, 2. Migne LXXI, 12 Versus in Ottonem Imperatorum Edilonis Clm.

Note 20 Dobschütz (Note 100) p. 21, Migne LXXI, 12

Note 21: Marie Development of the schools of Italian painting I (Hague 1923), 152

Note 22: Quia et vos christianissimi imperatoris Augusti qui sanctae reipublicae alemanni I Isaacio affectu gubernatis imperium, pro Christo fungi legatione videmini pro Christo ergo dum pro pace rogatis legatione fungimur tamquam deo exhor- tende. I tante per nos John VIII, 679 nr 243 I Paulus ad Corinthios II, 5, 20

Note 23: See below note 25. In his saxon home, the devotion for the emperor went so far that Otto II was put on a bowl of bronze, carrying a dove (the dove of the holy Spirit) for the Christam and a tank of oil for the catechumens. Witte, Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst 32 (1919), 38 Anm. 7.

Note 24: Migne 142, 522 C. (Rolulphus Glaber) On the greatest representation of Paul in Ottonian times, an ivory originated obviously under the influence of the court, Paul is not represented in the mantle of the apostles but as a priest. With great emphasis the dei gratia is stressed: Dei gratia sum id quod sum. It is reproduced in Goldschmidt, Elfenbeinskulpturen II, Berlin 1918, xxx. Though from Chartres it is now in the M
Note 24 cont. Nr. 25 Though from Echternach, it is now in the Musée Cluny as Nr. 1046.

Note 25 Leipzig 1929, 157-160; 34.

Note 26: München Clm 4452 (Henry and Cunigund). Offertorium Bamberg. Otto III. crowned by Peter and Paul, frequently reproduced, f. i. RMH at de Pierre, La Messe V, 190

Note 27 Me mesque dominus bisserrro apostolos, totius videlicet indices oratis Miracula Adelheidis Migne 142, 986.

Note 28: Migne 14C, 31 and 53. Acta Sollandorum III Martii, 266 E.

Note 29 VI, 8 ad annum 100%: 'Vicarium suinet in terris (=Imperatorem) Deus pater ingenitius liberaturus erat XXX e coelis'

Note 30 Migne 141, 163: Augustus atque Apostolus
Quam rara longis nomina.

Note 31 4453 Clm. in G. Leidinger-Miniaturen I (1912) and V (1913) see Dobschütz (Note 100) p. 75n. 67

Note 32 Monumenta Germaniae hist. Scriptores XI, 235.

Note 33 e. g. Vita Lietberti Mon Germ. XIII 1450: Thriumphabat Christianus orbis pacifici regis sustentatus brachio. p. 1456: Water ecclesia plaudebat domni Lietberti electione praesertim ad praerogatvm c
lectionis imperatoris( Henrici secundi 100° - 24).

Odilo of Cluny praised the 'shame' of Cluny where an emperor deposed and installed popes, undisturbed by any resentment: dans gloriam deo qui Romanam imperium (sic) electo iustissimo praecipui

dominis catholice reipublicae principe voluerit. Vita Odilonis in Neu-
Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde XV, 119.

Note 34: 'sicut sedes dei filii præstantor est apostolorum-sede, ita-se-
des regis præstator est sacerdotum seda'. Tractatus Eboracensis Mon Germ. Libelli de Lite & III, 669.

Note 35 Reginald Pole, Imperial Influence on Papal Documents, passim

Note 36 Rosenstock, Die Europ. Revolutionen p. 135

Note 37: Migne 126, 349 Nr. 236.

Note 38 Migne 126, 846 Nr. 236.

Note 39 Fiat una provincia in spatio ecclesiae XIXXIXX totus orbis
Mon. Germaniae Libelli de Lite I. 11, it is characteristic of the
glott given to this viewpoint by historians that the editor of this
text has changed against all the manuscripts totus into totius. This
changes the great, unheard-off novelty of a Fiat, fiat totus
orbis, the Orbit shall be made one province in so far as our eccle-
siastical matters are concerned—XXIX into a lukewarm in the
space of the church of the whole orbit which is ever illogic.

It is especially this Lorraine—Theory which is perfectly
inconsistent with the long fight of the popes against the title
universal or ecumenic. See note 56 b.

Note 38 Migne 145, 91
Hincmar, Migne 126, 362, quoted pope Leo I in favour of this interpretation: *Quod dicitur ... Petro, transivit in alsio apostolos et ad omnes ecclesias principes.*

This is well understood by the writer of 1034 in Libelli lupe Lita-1, 455 who excludes the East. On the other hand the anonymous of York (H. Boehmer, Staat und Kirche in England 1029, 455) defends the petrinian privileges of the East fiercely like an angli­can of 1040 when the anglicans and Lutherans founded their bishop­ric in Jerusalem. The anonymous refuses to believe that the can­ nons could deprive Jerusalem as Damiani had said. The Crusaders of the twelfth century put St. Peter on the coins of his former chair, of Antioch.

Mabillon Analecta Vetera Paris 1723 (Misprint 456 instead of page I55): 'te ... illius nunu cathedrae facit esse sessorum, a qua per orbem terrarum maxim omnium virtutis lumina diffunduntur, et ad quam velut in circulo lineae ad illud medium quod centrum geometrici vocant, universa convergent. Williams of Metz made such an impression on the pope with this letter that Gregory quotes it again and again (Casper, ad Reg Gregorii VII., Berolini 1920, I, 11). cupboard Gregory himself writes (II, 49): Cum mentis intuitu partes occidentis sive meridiei aut septentriones video, vix legal les episcopos ... invenio. 'Principi totius orbis terre, Gregory is called in 1032 Registrum IX, 29 a.

Meyer von Kronau, Jahrhücher des deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV. und Heinrich V. Vol VIII., 74n. 35

Gregory VII never mentions the imperium. ThexmaxmaGermans never get more than the regnum Teutonicorum; he himself takes the fines christianitatis. Reg. V, 7 a. 1077. Compare Migne 148, 363 with 790 about Franciae but Teutonicorum regnum.

Registri Gregorii II, 75: Plus enim terrarum max Romanorum pon­ tificum quam imperatorum obtinebat. This repeats a remark of a poem on Charlemagne who subdued nations of which the Romans did not even know the names. Non Germ. Poetae IV, 70 versus 651/2. Alphanumeric of Salerno sings le s. Petro apostolo: Ecce tibi cunctus servit aut sidere mundus.

Non potes, Domine, mori in exilio in vice Christi et apostolorum eius divinitus accepisti gentes haereditatem et possessionem ter­ minus terrae (= Psalm2,8) Parsius Berthried cap. 18, 102 Migne 189, 20f.

Jaffé 3962, printed in Gallia Christiana XIV 1906, printed in Gallia Christiana XIV 1906, printed in Gallia Christiana XIV 1906, printed in Gallia Christiana XIV 1906, printed in Gallia Christiana XIV 1906, printed in Gallia Christiana XIV 1906, printed in Gallia Christiana XIV 1906,
Notes ad Rosenstock, Paul

Note 49
From the rich literature I mention Hartmann Grisar, Rom und die
Päpste I (1901), 155f. 257; English edition I, 329; The same, das
Missale Romanum im Lichte xiundiiéscher Stadtgeschichte
London 1930, 260 ff. E. Casper Geschichte des Papsttums I(1930),
56ff. 263.

Note 50
On item is taken from the immediate predecessor of Gregory, Ale­
xander II, Migne 144, 1790 The diplomatists seem to be silent on 
this point. Innumeral examples, however, show the intentional gra­
dation. Cf. Migne 126, 310 nr. 286; 641, nr. 229; 281, nr. 257;
Than Migne 142, 574 quoted near our note 50, Gregory VII 1076 nov.
19, Jaffe-Watt, post 5684.
The rule is observed by Leo the First as is stated in Migne 54, 423 
not a: Sic sanctos Petrum et Paulum patres 
Bomanae urbi Leo dixerit, paulo ante tamen sedem episcopalem uni 
Petro tribuit.

Note 51
Revue Bénédictine XIII (1896), 343ff.

Note 52
in England are
230 Churches of Peter and Paul
580 of Peter alone
70 of Paul alone
according to Rohault de Fleury, Les Saints de la Messe V.1 (1899)
77 and l.

In Kehr, Italia Sacra, I zimount
Vol. I-IV 50 Ch. of Peter, 5 of Paul
Vol. V-VII 71 Ch. of Peter, 7 of Paul.

Note 53
M. Simon, L' Apôtre Paul dans le Symbolisme funéraire Chrétien
École francaise de Rome, MX Études 50 (1899), 167.

Mége 54
Our representation is taken from Cabrol Dictionnaire d'archéol.
Christiene II, 2, Paris 1914 fig. 3014. The eper is not known to 
me as occurring anywhere else. It is worthwhile to pay attention to 
the fact that one key only is given to Peter. This dis­
appears in western Art. Our illustrations are apt to show the 
change.

Note 55
John VIII a. 579, nr m 2329 Migne 126, 650 or in the epistolae 
selectae of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica.

Note 56
From Gregor of Nyssa, quoted in Migne, Patrologia Latina 78, 297.

Note 56a
Mundi Magister (Paulus) atque coeli janitor(Peter) sings Elpis
who died 493; Béatrice the Hymns of the Breviary and the Missal.
Migne 151, 961. Remarkable the scene in Monreale (Photo Alina- 
ri 33285) of the 12. cent. "S. Paulus tradit epistolae Discipu­
lis suis THX Timotheo et Silee deferendos per universum orbem ".

Note 56 b
Nam si unus ut putat, universalis est, restat ut vos episcopi non 
estis. Si unus episcoopus vocatur universalis, universa Ecclesia 
cadit, si unus universus cadit. Ex Gregorio I. ( epp lxxiv, 16ep 
36) taken by Hincmar and the later canonists.

Note 57
a 604, Jan. 25 Monum. Germaniae Epistolae Gregorii I, 433 =Regxxx?
Note 56 Migne 142, 1021.
Note 59 Migne 142, 574

Note 61 see note 99

Note 62 Quotations in my Ostfalens Rechtsliteratur unter Friedrich II. Weimar 1912, 140ff.

Note 63 Johannes XIX ad annum 1031 Watterich, Vitae pontificum 731; Migne 149, 398.

Note 64 The scarcity is astounding. Half a phrase inidus is given to it by E. Bernheim, Mittelalterliche Zeitanschauungen I (1918), 129 or by Mirbt, Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII. Leipzig 1894, 176, nr. 2. All the others, like Carlyle, do not even mention the ASSERTION of illicit apostles and apostolic!

Note 64a The Council of Trient (1515-1563) in its struggle against Luther, the alleged Paul redivivus, declared, that what Paul called sin in several places the Catholic Church never had recognised as sin. Sessio V. de peccato originali, § 5.

Note 65 Mirbt, Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums 438ff nr. 228.

Note 66 Bellarmin Disputationum III, 27 de Comparatione Petri cum Paulo; Migne 148, 710, letter of 1084.

Note 67 Migne 145, 710, letter of 1084.

Note 68 Anselmi episcopi Lucensis Collectio Canonum ed. F. Thaner Innsbruck 1906, p. 36ff.

Note 69 Thus the rule is stated by Ambiani who turns against it. Migne 144, 214ff.

Note 70 As to the radical change wrought by the liberty of appeal see R. H. Heckel in Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle Roma 1924, 292.

Note 71 Libuini vita in Watterich Vitae pontificum I, 174.


The interest of the era of the early century may be seen in a form ula of sanction in a French document about Nero qui dei aposto- lo, Petrum quidem pedibus sursum positis cruci afflavit, Paulo vero caput truncavit; (A. de Rouard, Manuel de Diplomatie texte 1892 p. 260 nr. 3). This formula occurs enlarged in Hugo de Fleury, M. Germaniae, Libelli II, 466.

The martyrdom of Paul is painted in a manuscript of the Biblioth. de l'archéol which might deserve study : Rohault de Fleury, Les S. Saints de la Mesre VII(1899) planche 49.
Note 72 Continued

About Paul as healing power: Erzengel Wessarianum s. v. Paulini- nianus; Dornseiff in Bibliothek derburg 21-25 Leipzig 1927, 212; Locus Classicus Ebr. XII rendered by Damioli epist. At Migne 144, 179: Animerum Medicus Paulus.

Note 73 The story of Paul's Sudarium is analysed by E. Casar Beschichte des Papstturns II (1933), 397 n. 1.

Note 74 Petrus Damioli ep. XII ad papam Alex. Migne 144, 217

Note 75 The words of this frightened editor, Cajetan, are: In haco episto- la beatus Petrus Damioli plus nimio videtur tribuere Paulo. Migne 145, 594.

Note 76 a Bruno Herbipoleus in Psalms 67, 23 Migne 142, 254

Note 76 b Here again, the anonymous of York takes his arguments, forty years later, from Damioli and in order to prove the opposite. The statement how completely this English writer depends on Damioli can be backed as one of the philological byproducts of our study.

Quandam ergo sic ict i licet, cum Christo similitudinem Paulus te- nit, dum non uni dumtaxat ecclesiae sed omnibus presidet Migne 144, 593. In 144, 511 n. remarks: subventus Paulus ad Gal. 1: 'veni Hierolymam videre Petrum: video non discere!'

Note 77 Migne 146, 1277

Note 78 Watterich, Vitae Pontificum 373 sqq.

Note 79 Watterich Migne 143, 795

Note 80 Jaffé, Monumenta Bambergensia 217 n. 113

Note 81 Goffridus in Mon. Germaniae Libelli de Liber, 686 and 696.

Note 81 How far were the times when a pope himself, Pelagius, had ad- mitted to be Peter 'corrupted by Paul.' Seppelt, Geschichte des Papstturns (Leipzig 1921), 811.

Note 82 Lichte in Lo Moyer, GesXXI (1019), 94 The apparition of Paul in a dream of Gregory VII is told by Paul Bernried c. 12

Note 83 Migne 143, 722 n. 78

Note 83 a Registrum VII, 7 and 8, Bertholdus ad an. 1079 Mon. Germ. Scri- tores V, 324

Note 84 Diplomata Lotharii, Monumenta Germaniae VIII, 210 n. 123

Note 85 Jaffé Monumenta Gregoriana 404

Note 86 A hand presents (ey( one only ) to Peter.' Suscipe Clavemis in the text. C. et C. Rohault de Fleury, Les Saints de la Messe Vol. I planche XXIX 29
Note 67. Petripaullentius Mon. Germaniae Script. XI, 527, Domus Petripaul- 
ta II, 626.

I mention it because it is used as genuine by Fabre, Etudes sur le 
livre Censuum Paris 1894, p. 31.

Note 69. Sigeberti Chronicon I1111 Scriptores VI, 374, confer 464. The 
same misunderstanding appears in 1338 is stated by F. M. Baum-
garten Beiträg zur Geschichte des Palleum, Miscellanea Fr. Ehr-
le Roma 1924, 348.

Note 70. Monumenta Germaniae historica Libelli I, 308. servus Gregorius...
cum predecessore suo beato Paulo.

Note 71. Watterich Vitae Pontificum I, 174.

Note 71 a. X. Barbier de Montault, Traité d' Iconographie II (Paris 1890, 
249 ff. Dobschütz (note 100) 48 n 25.

Note 72. Migne 145, 91 f.

Note 73. Cum beatus Paulus Hispaniam, et adisse significat ac 
postea septem episcopos ab urbe Romae... a Petro et Paulo apostolis directos fa-
isse... Romanae ecclesiae quae a Petro et Paulo supra firmam 
petram per Christum fundata est. March 1674 Reg. I, 64 ed. Cas-
per p. 95.

Note 74. Note 41 a.

Note 95. Migne 163, 1232 T. 1122 February 19.

Note 96 a. 1063 Migne 146, 1286.

Note 97. Mon Germ. Scriptores IV, 422, 637.

Note 98. Adam Brunensis I, 20; III, 4; I, 11. (Winifredus = Bonfratius... 
-nes alios ut Paulus Apostolus... antevenerit.) III, 9.

Note 99. Gustav Schmidt Urkundenbuch des Stiftes S. Pauli Geschichts-
quellen der Provinz Sachsen 1881, p. 393 nr. 2.

Note 100. I mention Johannes Ficker, Darstellung der Apostel in der Alt-
christlichen Kunst Lpzg. 1887. And especially E. Dobschütz 
Der Apostel Paulus II Sine Stellung in der Kunst Halle 1928 
Later Material in Emile Mâne, L' Art Religieuse du XIII s. en 
Crowe and Cavalcaselle History of Painting in Italy I London 
1903 p. 53 remark: 'The absence of a. Petros key and S. Pauls 
sword point to Byzantine influence.'

Note 101. Durandus Rationale divinorum officiorum I, 3, 16; VI, 16, 10. 
for the conclusion that the sword of Paul was really MM not used 
can be quoted 
für christliche Kunst 17 and 22 
E. Urn the bowl of the baptisteric 

7549
Notes ad Rosenstock

Paul

Note 102 Continuation

Because in all these three works of art of the twelfth cent. swords and knives are used in a scene together with Paul (a knight or an angel or an other saint bearing it) without giving it to Paul but in the work of another artist.


Note 103 See note 72

Note 104 are incorporated earlier fragments of sculpture: says Porter Romanesques Sculptures of the pilgrimage Roads 1925 p. 266. This against Dobschütz (Note 100) note 70. S. Paul with a drawn sword is on the seal of Richard Fitzneal 1184 - 1198 R. de Fleury Les Saints VII (1899) pl. 39.

Note 105 We give a photo of the statues as Nr. 3 of our plate. It is taken from Lefrak, Die langobardischen Fragmente i u. d. Abtei S. Pietro in Parentillo (in Umbria) Röm. Quartalschrift LVI (1906) 77 fig. 7.

Note 106 Adolf Goldschmidt Elfenbeinskulturen I (Berlin 1914) Tafel 155 e as given in late.

Note 107 Illustration One on our plate

Note 108 The medal of about 1100 is Nr. 12 2 on our plate. See Anton de Waal, Andenken an die Romanische, Tüüm. Quartalschr. XIV, 1900, 63 ff. The younger form which we give from the work of Wulff, because his specimens are clearer, is given by de Wulff too.

Note 109 Our example of this correct form is taken from O. Wulff Altkristliche Bildwerke II (1911) Tafel VI nr 1899, see for text page 72. It looks not like correct only but like corrected too. The plurality of keys is a remedy which occurs in the secular symbolism of the twelfth century also. There the flags of the feudum vexillarium were multiplied to distinguish the dukedom from the simple fiefs. Möscher, Königreich und Staat in Frankreich zwischen 911 und 1250, 1914 A, 44-5 ff.

Note 109 a See above note 10 The relation of scholasticism is treated by Degire, die abendländischen Schriftauslegern bis Luther 1805; §. Frat La Théologie de saint Paul Paris 1908; H. Grabmann, Gesch. d. krischr. Methode I (1909), 80.

Note 110 absolvo et benedico quicumque me hanc habere speciallem potestatem in vice apostolorum Petri et Pauli credunt indubitanter. Migne 145, 94 D; Paulus Bernried § 102

111 See above p. 13

112 see at note 95
Notes ad Rosenstock Paulus

Note 113 Combine the texts of note 46 and of Damianis pamphlet 22


Note 114 !See below!!!


Note 116

Damiani

Paule doctor egregie
Tuba clangens ecclesiae
Nubes volans ac tonitrum
Per ampli mundi circulum

Abailard

Tuba domini, Paulus, maxima
De caelestibus da tonitrum
Hostes dissipans, olves, aggrag


Note 118 It is on the Porta della basilica di San Paolo, reproduced in the Dedalo Vol XI, 6'1 May 31. compare our plate or the ivory of note 25


Note 114.) It is incredible that a great scholar like Hauck, Kirchengechichte Deutschlands III, 382 could speak with the same pessimism which was expressed by Carley the n.t. of Gregory's deathbed: ' Ganz vergeblich fragt man , wo der Gewinn liegt den Rom von dorn Regiment Gregors VII. gehabt hat '. A contemporary, Liiem archbishop of Hamburg, has answered Mr. Hauck's question in advance: 'Pericolousus omo ! vult liber qua vult episcopis ut villicis suis '. The triumph of the papacy in 1122 was exactly in that direction: The emperor acknowledged the pope as the person adressed for his intercourse with the episcopate. The pope in order to get rid of the emperor's majordomate, had made the bishops his, the pope's, stewards (=villici).
Our sociology textbooks are full of 'the cultural lag' from which society suffers because old ideas stay on in new times. Paul is the physician of the cultural lag. He is the man who knows that because the world-clock has advanced the eternal truth must be proclaimed anew. This role of articulating anew the good news is an eternal function of any living community. Paul is an eternal figure of human society. Optimists call this function progress; sceptics may call it: not-lagging. Three times, Paul has been institutionalized. Each time, a part of his function has been saved, another has been buried. 

The first institution in which Paul (which is basic for a reform of dignity as reforming the Church from 950 to 1200 and as transfigured in Dante’s writing a century later still. The apostolic majesty of the kings of Hungary as preserved in 'the Crown of St. Stephen' goes back to the age in which kings and emperors followed Paul lest the abuse of the see of St. Peter destroy the Church. Many of you will have seen the famous horseman in Bamberg, a royal figure, seated on a horse, riding into the Church. Legend has it that this is king Stephen of Hungary who was baptised in 1000 A.D. In a larger sense, the sculpture is the quintessence, also, of the ambition of royalty, of that time to conquer the Church on horseback, knights of Christian mission. / And for this role, the traveller Paul is the model of the princes. King Stephen took to himself the name apostolic because he, too, converted Gentiles. His contemporary Otto III toured vast and South and North shifting back and forth between monastic retreat and conversion of the Slavs. His grandmother and guardian, the empress Adelheid claimed to have the twelve apostles as her patrons. Otto used the famous phrase of Paulus, a slave of Christ, in his documents. Paul was his model, his vision. It was the time when Rome was utterly corrupt, when the abbot of Cluny declined the papal crown because Rome seemed too hopeless. When the bishops of France rebelled against the pornocracy in Rome. The very name Peter no longer conveyed that authority that had terrified the Franks / two hundred years before. Then, Peter himself had addressed letters to the Northern tribes that they should rescue him. Now, under Otto, a Roman poet invites the emperor to come to the city as a second Paul and to clean the augean stable. If we wish to understand the new role of Paul between 950 and 1050, we must familiarize ourselves with the fact that the see of St. Peter was lacking authority. Any reform of the Church had to be promoted against, not with the Roman papacy. The apostolic character of the emperors came to rescue and to reform the papacy itself against its will. For this purpose, the emperors vindicated a personal relation to Peter and Paul. The legends of the time are eloquent explosions of this problem. For instance, it was generally known that before the first baptism of an emperor of Constantine, the emperor had a dream in which the apostles Peter and Paul pointed the pope Sylvester out to him. Now, in 998, Otto III again saw the apostle Paul in a dream.
This time, however, the apostle told him how to contradict the pope! This is the clearest illustration of the change. A famous ivory of Paul the apostle was manufactored for the emperor. Paul holds a scroll with the proud words: Gratia dei sum quod sum. This 'By the grace of God' serves to connect apostle and emperor in the greatest intimacy. The emperor has an apostolic calling. Otto's successor Henry became the only official Saint in the series of Roman emperors. He as well as Otto were shown surrounded by Peter and Paul. The service for Henry and the empress, his wife Kunigund, as still celebrated in Bamberg, transferred the rules observed in Rome for celebrating Peter and Paul to the imperial couple, in every detail. The conscientiousness of the party of reform at court is shown by the fact that the emperor ceased to call himself a second Paul in his letters. He now was satisfied to become the High Stewart of the apostles. However, all the forces of reform united in the liberal use of the word apostolic. And Burckard, the bishop of Worms who was foremost in the councils of the emperor and who wrote a famous book on canon law for the church of the Empire, founded a church in honor of Paul, the apostle of liberty and reform.

By Paul's power, liberty, zeal, the party of reform was moved who started the treuga dei, the reform of the clergy. Paul was not doubted in his Roman capacity. But as a pope said: Paulus Romanus et non Romanus est. Whereas Peter was wholey wound up with Rome, Paul seemed a free lance, besides his tomb in Rome. He belonged to Rome and to the whole world.

When we analyze the papal documents of previous centuries, we are struck with the scarcity of references to Paul. We have even proof that this scarcity, in certain cases, led to disaster because the outer world cared more for the great doctor of the whole orb than for the pillar of unity in the center of Rome. The example that I wish to produce in full will I hope convey to you the discrepancy between Peter the Roman and Paul who is Roman and More than Roman simultaneously.

1. The sentence is altered and therefore distorted. First it read: The first institution which puts up Paul against Peter and basic for a reform etc. puts up and against are crossed out. Added are the words: in and Paul is put before. Now it reads: The first institution in which Paul Paul is put before Peter and basic for a reform etc. My guess is that the second Paul is belongs to basic. The given reading is the simplest.