

301

THE ROLE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL  
IN THE  
PAPAL REVOLUTION OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

(A chapter in the posthumous life of the doctor gentium)

by

EUGEN ROSENSTOCK HÜSSY

12

THE ROLE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL IN THE PAPAL REVOLUTION  
OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

(A chapter in the posthumous life of the doctor gentium)

by

Eugen Rosenstock Hüssy

I.

In the latest book on the conflicts between <sup>✓</sup>Authority and Reason in the early middle ages <sup>✓</sup>the author says: <sup>✓</sup>In the pronouncements of Gregory VII <sup>✓</sup>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. <sup>✓</sup>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 <sup>✓</sup>would be strangely unoriginal in symbolism and thought.

<sup>tr</sup> The popes ~~in fact~~ have used the keys of St Peter to justify their claims <sup>✓</sup>Through all the ages of the church, for at least seventeen hundred years, <sup>✓</sup>Recently many scholars have tried to prove that Gregory VII <sup>✓</sup>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. <sup>✓</sup>M. Fliche, ~~or~~ moreover, <sup>✓</sup>the ~~other~~ <sup>acute</sup>hand, (in his <sup>✓</sup>book on the Gregorian <sup>✓</sup>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 <sup>✓</sup>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-

tury.

*run in*  
~~Thus~~ *Widius* we reach the rather startling conclusion that the greatest reform of the western world was started without any original vocabulary or <sup>new</sup> (sense of values, and that the new order was ~~only later~~ <sup>only later</sup> 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 ~~to~~ <sup>de</sup> the Concordat of Worms, was <sup>de</sup> 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~~ <sup>Psalm</sup>, and the moment, on his death-bed, when the words of this same psalm were on his own lips. <sup>62</sup> 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. <sup>7</sup> ~~and~~ The sees of the archbishops and bishops had been the equals of the prima sedes at Rome, to which the German bishops dared to address their letters as late as Gregory's first years. <sup>8</sup> This address was never used later. In a fight you try not only to exalt your own right but *also* to <sup>gain</sup> ~~get~~ the advantage ~~also~~ 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~~ <sup>Christian</sup> Roman Emperor's ecclesiastical function. The title Emperor of the

*✓ christianissimus*

Roman Empire<sup>2/</sup> 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:<sup>5/</sup> Quod hoc unicum est nomen in mundo,<sup>2/</sup> we must add: Imperator unicum nomen non est.<sup>2/</sup> 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 reges. To him<sup>5/</sup> the spiritual emperor, — the exorcist, the lowest grade in the church, — is more than the emperor.<sup>2/</sup> 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 secularizing 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 (~~and its~~). 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. <sup>✓</sup> Pensa che Pietro e Paolo.... ancor son vivi, <sup>✓</sup> sings Dante (Parad., XVIII, 131) and, I think, he is right <sup>✓</sup> 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 simonistic presumption~~ <sup>as a simonistic presumption.</sup>

## II.

The fact has often been cited that Nicholas the first (855-867) was already called "vicarius Christi" instead of simply "vicarius Petri." <sup>11</sup> But we must not forget that any contemporary Frankish king was flattered with the same expressions. <sup>12</sup> 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, <sup>13</sup> ~~in terms later used by Innocence III. for the pope!~~ This flattery ~~ceased~~ <sup>during</sup> 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. ~~(Hinc 139, 237)~~ 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 ~~(Hinc 139, 237) to looking down upon these successors of Christ?~~ <sup>is 1004</sup> A pious christian, Rodulphus Glaber, accused Pope John XVIII of flagrant breach of the canon law for money. <sup>14</sup> ~~Hinc 139, 237~~ 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. <sup>15</sup> When he was denounced, he protested that the office of the emperor was sacred under all circumstances. <sup>15</sup> Thus, about 1000 A. D. the vicars

Maïus of Cluny who tried to make him pope. 139 (Hinc, Patr. Lat., CXXXIX, 337) ①

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 <sup>by</sup> ~~on one side of~~ the indignant vicars of St

the church by passing ~~on the side of~~ the indignant vicars of St Peter. It could be done, perhaps, when Tapistolic was not limited to Rome, when many apostolic ways were open.

In this renovation of the church the emperors had a special and unique function. Constantine, the first Christian emperor, had already been called <sup>✓</sup> bishop of the external <sup>✓</sup> He had summoned councils. ~~(400 - 450)~~ (ἐκκλησιαστικός). He was compared to the apostles <sup>✓</sup> Alcuin made Charlemagne (468-814) the defender of the faith against unbelievers without, and against heretics within, ~~the~~ 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. as Godfather above the son, <sup>high</sup> ~~as~~ <sup>was</sup> Charles above the bishops. The Carolingian court introduced the credo in the mass against

the will of the pope. It altered the credo by adding the famous 'filioque' in the... procession of the Holy Ghost in 312 ✓ of angry protest by the bishop of Rome. ✓

The Ottonian emperors took up this religious function.  
(1002-1024),  
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. (18) The monks of Cluny looked upon the  
emperors as their patrons and supporters in all questions of re-  
form. Odilo, the great abbot of Cluny (996-1046) calls Otto I. (936-972)  
the great rhinoceros, expected in the Old Testament. (19) A hundred  
years later Peter Abailardus, <sup>an American in writing to Cluny, similar</sup> 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. (20) 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, <sup>(+984)</sup> in a rapid evolution even the mark set by <sup>N</sup>Carlemagne. On the sarcophagus of Otto II, <sup>(21)</sup>Paul and Peter flank Christ, all three protecting the dead emperor. A hundred years before, <sup>had already</sup> a pope recognized an emperor's Paulinian function. <sup>the emperor</sup> He ascribed to <sup>Sto</sup>him the 'legation' of God which <sup>to himself</sup>Paul vindicates. <sup>(32)</sup>And Otto III. <sup>(884-1002)</sup> is also so much a legate of God that he uses the famous formula of Paul's letters in his protocol: <sup>had</sup>Servus Jhesu Christi. <sup>(23)</sup>Whereas according to the legend of Sylvester, Peter and Paul <sup>had</sup>appeared to Constantine and told him to respect Pope Sylvester I. <sup>But</sup> Otto III. <sup>(24)</sup>had a dream in which St Paul told him to contradict his teacher, Pope Sylvester III. <sup>Paul was represented as</sup> ~~pope and like Peter not as apostle on the greatest piece of art we have of Otto III.~~

Later the court of Otto III. tried to regularize that monarch's religious function.)

P. Schramm, in his recent book, <sup>has shown</sup> on Kaiser, Rom, und Renovatio, showed ~~as~~ 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 <sup>more correct</sup> title Servus apostolorum. <sup>(25)</sup>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. <sup>(26)</sup>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-

gious and ecclesiastical function, <sup>but</sup> 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 <sup>servus apostolorum was</sup> ~~emperors were now~~, and installed and deposed ~~their~~ bishops in Rome as elsewhere.

The Augæan 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 grandmother 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 (bissenos) apostles, <sup>the</sup> judges of the whole world, <sup>✓</sup> would do a certain thing. <sup>82)</sup> This expression, given by Odilo, is an excellent illustration of the title 'servus apostolorum' chosen simultaneously by her grandson. The judge <sup>5</sup> ~~for the world~~ of the complete circle of the earth ~~who are~~ <sup>represented by the empress, are</sup> not one apostle, but all. And Paul is one of their two leaders.

The emperor Henry II. and Cunigund, <sup>his wife,</sup> were treated in the liturgy of their bishopric Bamberg like Peter and Paul. <sup>28)</sup> 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. <sup>29)</sup> <sup>an official</sup> The hymn ad sextam calls Henry 'apostolus'. <sup>30)</sup>

Of Henry II we possess a prayer book in which he is shown with Peter and Paul. <sup>31)</sup>

<sup>Finally (= successor of Charlemagne?)</sup>

When Stephen of Hungary, whose image is the famous horseman in Bamberg, established Christendom in his country, <sup>ad. the year 1000</sup> he too was called 'apostolus'. <sup>32)</sup> And as Hungary escaped the struggle of investiture, the king still keeps ~~kept~~ the title ~~to~~ today with all the privileges of it. Stephen for the appointment of bishops. Henry III. was hailed <sup>as</sup> '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 <sup>later</sup> ~~whole~~ discussion was thoroughly foreign to the period of the reforming emperors. <sup>(in this period)</sup> It gave deep <sup>schism as</sup> 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. (33) ✓

The best witness of this state of affairs is the great ascetic, <sup>er</sup> ~~true~~ Damiani, who paved the road for all the reforms of Gregory ~~III~~. He was the most fervent of fighters for complete reform. But, radical as he was, he remained sober enough to call Gregory ~~III~~, <sup>em</sup> ~~my~~ holy Satan <sup>(236)</sup> ~~it~~. It was to Hildebrand, however, that he wrote this letter <sup>18</sup> and to speak of Henry III in terms which we must quote explicitly to show an emperor's ecclesiastical function about the year 1060: ✓ 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 Simoniac heresy by treading upon greed. The former, propagator of the faith, <sup>prev</sup> ~~pre~~vented 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. <sup>run in</sup>

✓ 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, <sup>destituted</sup> ~~pulled out~~ by the ~~Kai-~~ <sup>Caesar</sup> ~~s~~ <sup>divine force</sup>, 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 ~~III~~. 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. <sup>34)</sup> The chancellor of the emperor also became the chancellor of the papal court. <sup>35)</sup> The emperors appointed popes and deposed them. Any fight against this situation was obviously not easy.

~~III~~  
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 <sup>have been</sup> were very few saints among them, though he does not deny the holiness of Henry II. He emphasizes that all the popes were saints. <sup>36)</sup>

The second method of <sup>the</sup> reformers was what we may call <sup>c</sup> the geographical concept. <sup>37)</sup> 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: <sup>c</sup> sic credatis sicut s. Romana ecclesia ab ipso apostolorum principe, didicit tenuit et usque in finem saeculi tenebit, atque per totum mundum quotidie sancte fidei urba rectaeque praedicationis semina emittit et sicut antecessores nostros, sanctos videlicet sedis apostolicae praesules, parentes vestros ab initio docuisse cognoscimus. <sup>37)</sup> About space his words are less rich but emphatic enough: <sup>c</sup> ad s. matrem tuam Romanam ecclesiam... quae omnium gentium retinet principatum et ad quam totius mundi, quasi ad unam matrem et unum caput, conveniunt nationes. <sup>38)</sup>

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. <sup>39)</sup> <sup>er</sup> Petrus Damiani exclaims in fact: <sup>c</sup> All other bishoprics were founded by mortals, bishops, or princes. Rome alone ~~was~~ established by Christ himself. <sup>40)</sup> <sup>er</sup> Hincmar of Reims had pretended that the famous words of Christ to Peter should be understood to apply to <sup>ee</sup> bishops. <sup>40a)</sup> But <sup>er</sup> 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 <sup>about 1050</sup> ~~had~~ <sup>had</sup> already condemned the Bishop of Santiago in Spain for calling himself apostolic, because of St. James <sup>1419</sup> ~~1419~~. 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. <sup>It is noticeable that</sup> ~~this~~ letter made a deep impression on Gregory. He <sup>42</sup> ~~has~~ <sup>has</sup> quoted it again and again. This letter says 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 geometricians call the centre, the universe converges.' <sup>4742</sup> ~~4742~~ I, furthermore,

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.~~ The new papal world is emancipated from its identity with the Roman empire. <sup>(in the item quoted above)</sup> Damiani, ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> 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. It required efficient centralization. This simultaneousness ~~is~~ <sup>has been</sup> missing even in the powerful words of John VIII: 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, ~~vicious and hierarchical~~ <sup>is still dying</sup>. It is not 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 <sup>et</sup> odi iniquitatem (Psalm ~~44~~ <sup>xlv (xlv)</sup>, 8),  
 propterea <sup>e</sup> morior in exilio. <sup>2</sup> 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: <sup>c</sup> Thou  
 canst not die in exile, Holy Father, because, as vicar of Christ and the apostle  
 s, thou hast received the gentiles as thine inheritance; and as thy possession,  
 the borders of the earth. <sup>2</sup> 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? <sup>H</sup>

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: <sup>2</sup> as  
 vicar of Christ and of the apostles, the pope is at home in the whole world. <sup>2</sup>  
<sup>c</sup> The apostles <sup>2</sup> 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, <sup>rather</sup> 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 <sup>older</sup> 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. <sup>13</sup> <sup>But</sup> This unique document is a forgery, probably of the  
<sup>fourth</sup> <sup>15th</sup> century. <sup>2</sup> Indeed, we may say that, nowhere in the first 1000 years of  
 the church is there the slightest doubt <sup>but</sup> that the pope was never meant to be  
 the vicar of St Paul and of St Paul's spiritual powers, <sup>on the other hand</sup> 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 <sup>A</sup> draws 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 <sup>the city of</sup> Rome in the larger sense of this word. A monastery San Paolo fuori <sup>le</sup> mura was built above the relics of the saint. He and Peter are united on the ~~29~~ 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: *emendare compellas ex parte beatorum Petri and Pauli praecipiendo mandamus. Quod si sententiae nostrae ..... parere noluerit, virga magistratus tui, ex auctoritate s. Petri, ardentissime feriat.* 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 other saints~~ 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: <sup>(= Peter)</sup> 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 there 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 épîtres le préparaient mal à être un saint populaire. <sup>453</sup>

Though this <sup>is</sup> true for his individual and isolated appearance, together with Peter he is always welcome. In an old plaque of lead <sup>have by us</sup> (reproduced) <sup>see Nr. 1.</sup>

~~Cabrol~~ dict. d'arch. chrét. III (1914) fig. 3014. Paul and Peter flank

a cross on a staff. Peter has a key upon his chest. <sup>will be</sup> Paul's right <sup>for us</sup> stands a spear. These medals <sup>are</sup> still more interesting in connection with the movement of the 11th century. <sup>From the beginning, the office of</sup> Paul is <sup>of</sup> a different status (of aggregate) from Peter's. <sup>Paul</sup> He is the atmospheric, the merely spiritual leader of

Christianity. Peter has the status (of aggregate) which a governor <sup>requires</sup> needs.

The wonderful expression of <sup>Jerome</sup> Hieronymus for Paul's different status <sup>as</sup> aggregate <sup>is</sup> is: Paulus effusus est super faciem universae terrae (In Amos 5).

This reminds us of <sup>or</sup> Petrus 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. <sup>155</sup> The apostle is diffused like the church. His dash glistened from

'Jerusalem and its environments to Illyria, <sup>even</sup> 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'. <sup>56</sup>

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. (Migne 78, 44) <sup>(Migne, Patr. Lat., LXXVIII, 44).</sup>

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, <sup>or the Mundus</sup> <sup>are</sup> connected with Paul. <sup>56a</sup> The doctor of <sup>Requies</sup> <sup>was universal from the beginning</sup> the popes were not. <sup>The</sup>

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. <sup>568</sup> 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 <sup>enough shiny candles were not lighted to him</sup> he had not enough shining candles who, as a herald of the faith, filled the whole world <sup>5</sup> (totum mundum) with the light of his sermons <sup>572</sup>

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 <sup>or direction</sup>. 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 <sup>n</sup> Giesen and back to Rome again to frame his letters <sup>after the example</sup> according to St Paul's.

The fact that Paul's missionary work was charismatic, irregular, exceptional, <sup>more apostolic than</sup> 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 <sup>of</sup> the Greeks during the quarrels between the popes and the patriarchs of Constantinople. The acts of the seventh <sup>oecumenical</sup> council which met at Nicea in 787 give a quaint instance of this role of St Paul. The council met <sup>173</sup> in the times of Charlemagne and <sup>is</sup> 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.) <sup>on the part</sup> 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. <sup>However</sup> among these had 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 <sup>with respect to</sup> ~~among~~ St Paul.

Hadrian wrote: <sup>✓</sup> "si ecclesiae b. Petri apostolorum principis amplexi fueritis censuram et sicut antiquitus..... ita et vos ..... eius vicarium ex intrino dilexeritis corde .... Ipse princeps apostolorum <sup>(Petrus)</sup> 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." <sup>✓</sup> Peter, and Peter alone, gives victory against the pagans <sup>in the genuine letter of the pope.</sup> ~~587~~

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, <sup>ἐκ ἀποστόλων ἀδελφῶν,</sup> ~~vicar of the two~~, 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 <sup>(Councils)</sup> (Mansi XII, 1054 and 1058).

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: <sup>✓</sup> "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 <sup>✓</sup> (Mansi <sup>XII</sup> ~~12~~, 1085). 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, ~~and 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, says Odilo of Cluny, ✓ coelos dicimus. ✓ Non est Paulus inferior Petro, quamvis ille Ecclesiae fundamentum. Nam et hic sapiens architectus sciens vestigia credentium fundare populorum ... Cum primo (= Petro) quippe facile conferendus et nulli secundus. ✓ It was emphasized that Paul acknowledged Peter's authority.

Gregory IX, 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: ... omnibusque ..... 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 ecclesia, et B. Pauli (Petri et Pauli), quae propria-ipsius-eccl illorum corporibus per totum orbem refulgent et suo 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

(cf. Theiner I, 4, 7, 13 etc. etc.) / Peter is always the only saint addressed. Therefore the only important exception (Theiner, 1, 12) deserves a special attention which it has not received from <sup>the</sup> / historian <sup>s</sup> / of the war of investiture.

Of private documents I find but one old will of the ninth century mentioned as <sup>✓</sup> exemplar ipsius testamenti per quod Gerardus comes ... ipsas res principibus apostolorum Petro et Paulo tradidit. ~~But~~ <sup>✓</sup> of the same act it is said in older and later documents, <sup>✓</sup> Gerardus perfect ~~et~~ <sup>✓</sup> dotavit et Petro tradidit. <sup>✓</sup>

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 1088, was refounded later in the honor of Peter and Paul. <sup>✓</sup> But Peter is never mentioned in the documents even after the second foundation. <sup>✓</sup> In Cluny, Paul had not even any representation, either in sculpture or in painting, as far as we know. No wonder that writers of documents forgot him too. Because <sup>✓</sup> picturae literatura pauperum (sunt); <sup>✓</sup> without pictures no tradition <sup>62)</sup> was kept.

But this is not the case <sup>✓</sup> in Rome. In Rome, <sup>✓</sup> ad limina apostolorum, <sup>✓</sup> ~~at the thresholds of the apostles~~, every donor recalls both apostles always. It is therefore by purpose and not by indifference, <sup>✓</sup> that all the donations are given to Peter only. The popes themselves, as a matter of course, call their possessions always the "terrae St Petri". The flag is Peter's flag, even if where the merits of a victory are expressively ascribed to the apostles, <sup>✓</sup> the flag bears only Peter's name. <sup>✓</sup> It seems perhaps hopeless to expect any evolution or even any change in this well established balance between Peter and Paul. Most writers are despondent about St Paul's special role, if they mention him at all. <sup>✓</sup> Was not a total break with Rome necessary before Paul could become the sponsor of Lutheranism?

<sup>✓</sup> ~~# In the opinion of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, in the 16th century, of course, St Paul stood for free evangelization of the world against the rules of apostolic succession. Then, of~~

(Canon XXXII of his fifteenth book on the duties of laymen) (64a)

19

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 <sup>had been</sup> used freely in the eleventh century. <sup>65</sup> 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. <sup>66</sup> 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 <sup>after</sup> Luther, a Pauline christendom was set up against the Petrine 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 in his book on (addressed to the emperor)~~, 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 <sup>against</sup> ~~against~~ them and must show that they are their brothers and have one <sup>God/our</sup> Father, who is in heaven<sup>2.</sup>, to whom they pray; and one Mother, Holy Church, who nourishes them in ~~the~~ inviolated womb <sup>of her holy fountain.</sup> <sup>1.</sup>

Gregory VII, seventy years later, also writes a letter to all the laymen, 'ad omnes fideles', but he says: <sup>67</sup> 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. <sup>68</sup>

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, <sup>the</sup> vicar of Christ, Peter; 4. The vicar of Peter, the pope, — includes the free Spirit, the atmospherical and ~~mispio-~~ pioneering (~~not English, pioneering?~~) spirit in the geometrical circle with Rome as centre described by William of Metz. *Burchard had not known this interpretation. He <sup>now</sup> became obsolete.*

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, <sup>62</sup> and by the arrangement of his collection ~~shows~~ 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: <sup>62</sup> *non licere cujuslibet ecclesiae filium ad majorem ecclesiam proprii reatus episcopi, et quaeque sunt corrigenda, deferre.* <sup>12/59</sup>

The average Christian could not bring his case to Rome. The new fatherhood idea includes a chance for every Christian to <sup>obtain</sup> ~~get~~ a decision from the pope or at least from his court. Anselm of Lucca's second volume is therefore entitled: De libertate appellationis, ~~on the liberty to appeal~~. 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 <sup>tie</sup> ~~web~~ <sup>between</sup> thousands of individual Christians and the papacy. <sup>They became more identical.</sup> The primacy of St Peter was an old doctrine. <sup>free</sup> The new contribution of the new canonistic theory <sup>for</sup> this connection between primacy and appeal was to add a new title, and some new canons mentioning Paul's authority.

*Already* Under Leo IX (to whom Peter and Paul appeared on his death bed) <sup>71</sup>

*premier manuel*

the leading manual of the new order of things (in a collection of 74 titles) begins (title ~~first~~ <sup>2</sup> de primatu Romane ecclesie. 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 mobilize 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 ~~anyhow~~ <sup>in my case</sup>. 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 energizing him had a part in this logic of the legend.

*about* ~~Twenty five years~~ <sup>later</sup> of the two apostles, ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~problem of together~~ <sup>the association</sup> brought up by this ~~first~~ <sup>premier manuel</sup> ~~concerning~~ <sup>maintains</sup> the idea set forth by his fore-runners about the perfect union of Peter and Paul in martyrdom. Five (inscriptions (I, 66-

70) deal with Peter and Paul. Not 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 <sup>Pseudo</sup> Ambrosius: Petrus et Paulus doctores sunt ~~eximii, maxime maxime, principes sacerdotum~~ <sup>but nothing of any</sup> legal value can be deduced from this ~~germination~~ <sup>germination</sup>. The ~~canon~~ <sup>canon</sup> seems perfectly out of place: Quod nemo potest accedere ad beati Pauli corpus vel sudarium. It is a quotation <sup>from</sup> of Gregory I's letter in which he refuses to give away any of St. Paul's relics and threatens ~~that~~ anyone who approaches the body <sup>with</sup> ~~will incur~~ serious consequences. <sup>73</sup>

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: ~~the~~ 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~~ <sup>in</sup> Damiani wrote to Pope Alexander II proposing to introduce the ~~appellation~~ <sup>church</sup> from any inferior (to the superior) ~~church~~ <sup>see</sup>.   
 *appeal*

What is this reference to Italians?

22

He motivated the proposition with a reference to Peter's patience when Paul corrected him like a superior: <sup>✓</sup> Petrus <sup>m</sup> plane in faciem resistens Paulus ob-  
jurgat (Gal., c. 8). He supported the ~~important~~ 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 com-  
pared with Peter, whereas the Pope himself <sup>should</sup> assume the function ~~(X)~~ of Paul! <sup>✓</sup>

<sup>is was here.</sup> 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. <sup>er</sup> Petrus 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 blamed by his modern orthodox editor. The  
Roman Catholic abbot who prints this tract, <sup>Dr. Pichler</sup> ~~de Petri~~ Petri and Pauli, hastens to explain that  
Damiani is mistaken in giving too much honor to Paul. <sup>But modern</sup> (This abbot writes  
under anti-Protestant inhibitions unknown in the times of Damiani. <sup>45</sup> ~~Let us~~ <sup>this</sup> ~~low~~ <sup>the thought of Damiani in the eleventh century.</sup>

In considering paintings from an earlier period Damiani wondered  
why Paul has the better place, on the right side of Christ. Like Bruno  
of Würzburg, another writer of the eleventh century, <sup>459</sup> he explains it by the  
fact that Paul belongs to the tribe of Benjamin, which means <sup>✓</sup> the son of his  
right arm. <sup>✓</sup> Paul is this true son of God's right arm. He describes this  
function of St Paul in words of unmatched eloquence: <sup>✓</sup> Girded with the word  
of God, which is the sword of the spirit, today until the end of time, he  
fights against the fury of all the vices and iniquitous spirits, and ~~is~~  
brandishing the sword of heavenly eloquence, like the flashing hand of Christ,  
he <sup>cuts</sup> ~~cuts~~ the necks of God's opponents. <sup>✓</sup> ~~run in~~

Righteously Paul obtains the dignity of the right side of the Saviour who undoubtedly exercises the power of <sup>the Lord's</sup> ~~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 use 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 <sup>but splendidly profound</sup> on this point. <sup>he says</sup> Mere 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 <sup>consecrate</sup> ~~dedicate~~ 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. ✓ 23a

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. <sup>None</sup> These are exactly the qualities or functions which the Papacy developed simultaneously, <sup>putting Paul over Peter for correcting the bishops by the free appeal to the pope.</sup> The bulls of Alexander II, the pope contemporary with Damiani, have the inscription 'exaltavit me deus in virtute brachii sui'. <sup>747</sup> 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. <sup>747</sup> Fifty years

This is a resurrection. Light inundates the universe. Paul had been in ~~the~~ 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 master; ~~and~~ to look at the dust of his heart, of ~~a~~ ~~r~~ ~~e~~ ~~a~~ ~~l~~ ~~W~~ ~~o~~ ~~r~~ ~~d~~ - H ~~e~~ ~~a~~ ~~r~~ ~~t~~ which by being more sublime than heaven, more comprehensive than the universe, is 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 right arm over the whole breadth of the earth.

What is Paul's <sup>eternal</sup> 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 ~~and~~ arm 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 papacy developed simultaneously, putting Paul over Peter for ~~the~~ being able to correct the bishops 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 brachii sui~~ <sup>exaltavit me deus in virtute brachii sui</sup>. It ~~seems~~ 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 wide circulation. Fifty years later

*Effectively wrong*



by whom?

careful disputation and a)

24

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 <sup>the popes over the rights of</sup> Paul was not immediately acknowledged. <sup>He con-</sup>clude from his method his opinion that <sup>could hope</sup> by favoring Paul, the English writer hoped 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 bishop 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~~ <sup>the emperor</sup> writes, too, that St Paul, who cursed the angels <sup>valia praedicantes</sup> would also curse Gregory <sup>valia praedicantes</sup>. In 1103 Sigebert of Gembloux quotes Paul's resistance <sup>face</sup> face to face with Peter, the first apostle. Why, therefore, cannot the bishops of Rome be criticised and set right? The abbot Goeffridus repeats this thought, and <sup>acutely</sup> says: If the pope wishes really to act like Peter he should look out for a Paul to set him right. <sup>81</sup> This ~~was not possible~~ had become impossible since the popes acted as vicars of Paul ~~as well~~ as well as.

What can be found in Rome's own utterances? The famous Hildebrand was prior, not the abbot, of San Paolo fuori di 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 ~~was~~ <sup>it was</sup> natural. But ~~not natural~~ <sup>it was</sup> for him to harangue St Paul. Addressing St. Paul ~~he says~~, the pope

He forbids ~~any~~ <sup>any</sup> infraction of his donation <sup>by the power of the last</sup> judgments <sup>and of ours</sup> which consists of St Peter's, thy co-apostle, <sup>and</sup> <sup>of</sup> <sup>there</sup> 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 <sup>en</sup> and on earth given to Peter and to thee, Paul! <sup>183</sup>

As far as I see, this <sup>is unique</sup> marks the climax 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. More 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. <sup>183a</sup> Later the monastery is still under the emperor's <sup>admonition</sup> ~~admonition~~ and the <sup>Guelph</sup> ~~Guelph~~ Lothair acts for San Paolo in a way which certainly shows the religious foundation <sup>will</sup> ~~as fully~~ independent <sup>on</sup> ~~of~~ the secular arm. <sup>184</sup> 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, <sup>ad</sup> ~~ad~~jured 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! <sup>run in</sup>

The whole world shall recognize, that if you, <sup>[Peter and Paul]</sup> ~~most~~ <sup>most</sup> 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. <sup>185</sup> Both apostles together <sup>strong enough</sup> ~~to administer both swords, spiritual and temporal: a complete society.~~

No wonder that this fervent admirer of the complete union between Peter and Paul interferes <sup>also</sup> with the papal mint <sup>in 1055</sup> ~~too~~. <sup>show</sup> Victor II had only Peter on his coins. <sup>860</sup> That was correct, <sup>1</sup> 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, <sup>eight hundred years</sup> where they remained (until Christ himself appears on the coins (after Mussolini's concordat). <sup>Gregory's</sup> The seals of his successors follow the coins.

This novelty was carefully imitated by his counterpope<sup>26</sup>. <sup>Counterpope</sup> ~~That~~ <sup>was</sup> baptized in a rather insipid way with a short-lived nickname 'Petripaul-entius' to show that his authority rested on the two apostles, also! <sup>84</sup>

A document of Henry <sup>IV</sup> which gave a monastery to Rome <sup>(vs. Roma-</sup>  
nae adscribi ecclesiae sanctorumque Petri et Pauli habere gubernationem<sup>84</sup>) <sup>seems</sup>  
<sup>except in Gregory's reign,</sup> obviously incorrect because Paul has no government, <sup>and now known as</sup> ~~it is, of course,~~ a  
worthless forgery. <sup>89</sup> But we find ~~in the~~ <sup>no wonder</sup> that a fervent admirer of Gregory, <sup>Pope II de Foix</sup> makes  
~~quote the pope in saying that Paul has the power of binding and~~  
~~Paul the predecessor of the pope~~  
~~looking.~~

Another writer in the north takes it for granted that Peter and Paul are buried in one tomb, and that Henry <sup>Vth</sup> took his oath over this common tomb. <sup>89</sup> ~~Another~~ <sup>author of the</sup> ~~author of the~~ <sup>Veights</sup> ~~calls~~ <sup>calls</sup> St. Paul with a <sup>expression</sup> ~~perfectly~~ <sup>unique</sup> - the predecessor of Gregory <sup>II</sup>. <sup>1907</sup>  
~~As in the days of Nicea II, Paul remains particularly useful for~~  
~~broadening the aspect of a question. Real cunning is used to make Peter~~  
~~and Paul seem to act simultaneously. One example: before Saul's con-~~  
~~version into Paulus, Peter and his apostolic colleagues 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 Simon. But Leo~~  
~~IX prays to Christ that the Simonists may be converted~~ <sup>even</sup> ~~like~~ <sup>as</sup> Thou  
~~hast prescribed, by thy~~ <sup>apostles</sup> Peter and Paul, <sup>the</sup> downfall of Simon. <sup>89</sup>

The same ~~ap~~ projection of Paul back into the lifetime of Jesus is found in art. ~~except in the representations of the cross~~ <sup>89</sup> Paul is present in many a scene of the life of Jesus in painting.  
As in the days of ~~Nicea II~~ <sup>the Second Nicæan Council</sup>, Paul is particularly useful for broadening the aspect of a question. Paul acts as a mediator, to make the claims of Rome less unpleasant.

In his famous speech in Milan, <sup>in</sup> ~~Petrus~~ Damiani 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-

sciples: Protasius and Gervasius. <sup>92</sup> ~~His~~ quodam modo uterque sanctus apostolus ex magisterio suo in hanc urbem praedicatores sanctae fidei geminos destinavit. <sup>92</sup>

Castile Gregory VII takes the same turn to introduce the ordo Romanus in Castilia and Navarra. 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. <sup>93</sup> ...the concord between Rome and Spain was always perfect. <sup>93</sup> 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. <sup>93</sup> Only twenty years <sup>before</sup> ~~ago~~, the archbishop of Santiago had claimed to be 'apostolic' and had been condemned for this boldness. <sup>94</sup>

~~Now at least Paul connected Spain personally with Rome. This is a coincidence. When the counterpope Gregory VIII celebrated mass in St Peter under the protection of Henry V, (the right pope, Gelasius II, celebrated mass in San Paolo fuori di mura. A German chronicler remarks: 'Thus the counterpope~~

~~by the power of the emperor obtained Rome, but Gelasius the universality of the church.~~ <sup>94</sup> After forty years of bloodshed and confusion, the first step towards a compromise was 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. Eleven years later, Pope Calixt II, when sending the last and final embassy to Germany

which succeeded in concluding 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. <sup>95</sup> This Church has the holy apostles Peter and Paul as its lords and patrons. <sup>95</sup>

Land in which Peter claim is not shesed

I think it remarkable that the only <sup>important</sup> letter in which Peter's name does not stand in isolation was the bridge <sup>for</sup> ~~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. Bucko 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 dispenser of His secrets, founded many institutions gently and spiritually, ✓ says Alexander II. ✓ 96

Bucko 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, during the reign of Henry IV. 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 (note 52) 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 seems true of Worms. But we may confront St Paul's 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 Paulus church in Worms was built by nobody else but the same Bard Burkard whose canons we have already appeared to the collected for Paul the end of the century. No wonder that this foundation, too, 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 <sup>✓</sup>signum libertatem civitatis. <sup>✓</sup> This symbol of the liberty of his city, he named after the apostle of Christian liberty, St Paul. <sup>✓</sup> <sup>197</sup>

No ~~Pauline~~ church <sup>1 St Paul</sup> 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 <sup>P</sup>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 ~~Pauline~~ mission and the <sup>P</sup>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. <sup>(98)</sup>

<sup>the apostle of the Germans</sup>  
<sup>of Bremen</sup> In Halberstadt, in 1030, Bonifatius <sup>local</sup> had received the honour of the altars. He whom Adam <sup>compares with Paul</sup> preceded Paul in the cult! But after Bucko was distinguished, Alexander II, <sup>in a bull</sup> whose ~~Pauline~~ character <sup>which</sup> we <sup>paid attention</sup> above, <sup>he</sup> dedicated a house of canons <sup>to</sup> in the name of the apostle Paul. <sup>(99)</sup>

The building of houses bearing the name of Paul leads us on to some iconographical problems <sup>related to</sup> Paul. We have already mentioned his <sup>appearance</sup> on <sup>coins</sup> of Gregory VII. Now 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 Fogg Museum, Cambridge, and of Professor Morey of Princeton, <sup>Connecticut</sup> New Jersey. 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 <sup>now</sup> not one but two or three keys. Durandus, writing in the early thirteenth century, <sup>already</sup> requires

a normal attribute (101) / Sometimes Paul has both the sword for Paul as the normal thing ~~al ready~~ / the old roll and the new sword. ~~roll~~ (102) / What happened to bring the sword into the hands of St. Paul, the sword with which he was beheaded by Nero's executioner, (103) but which reminds us simultaneously of the sword of the faith?

as if The oldest sculpture of Paul with a sword is dated by Dobschütz in 1178. But Porter, whom he quotes, thinks this sculpture in Mauguelonne may be of somewhat older origin than the building it is in now (104) Then there is an isolated tradition: In Ferentillo, an Umbrian monastery, so-called Langobardic sculptures may be seen, <sup>expressing</sup> Peter and Paul. Paul, who is much bigger than Peter, carries a colossal sword. The traditional date of these sculptures - 724 - seems impossible, <sup>you - and what is more to Prof. Henry as well</sup> I suspect the times of That it <sup>longs to</sup> 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 which adorns Paul with a sword. <sup>monument</sup> The second is equally undated. On a fan of ivory, made in France in the ninth century and now in the collection Carrand in Florence, the figure of St Agnes was replaced in early times by a St Paul with a sword. The experts have not <sup>expressed</sup> voted <sup>in</sup> the period of this supplementary work, but they seem to think that it is not very recent. (106)

In classical times the spear is shown on Paul's side on the medal <sup>about 107</sup> described before. <sup>this being irregular</sup> <sup>is also</sup> we now enter the period of Gregory <sup>VII</sup> and his immediate successors. Now we know <sup>nothing direct about a trial</sup> only that He 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 <sup>feels</sup> <sup>more definite</sup> 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 <sup>have been</sup> were excavated by A. de Waal. He <sup>has</sup> shown <sup>as early as</sup> that already 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 pilgrim, 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 Waal <sup>himself</sup> ~~already~~ thought that the indulgences, the powers of loosing bestowed upon a pilgrimage, were expressed by the keys in Paul's and in Peter's hand. (108) ✓

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. (109) ✓ 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. <sup>(109)</sup> It was an abuse on the Papal side which may be compared with the bowl 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 remarkable plaques and in the two great innovations of Paul by Gregory in 1074 and in 1080. <sup>(109)</sup> ~~and happened in 1085~~ The dying Gregory promised to pardon everybody who believes un-

doubtedly that "I own this special power in vice apostolorum <sup>Petri</sup> et Pauli." ✓

The vicarius Petri, the vicarius Christi - both expressions are familiar to us; ~~vicarius Petri et Pauli~~ <sup>but</sup> the great pope of the papal revolution

at the end of his reign wishes to be <sup>also</sup> ~~vicarius~~ <sup>vicarius Petri et Pauli</sup> ✓ The ~~other~~ <sup>gifts</sup> connected with the only document where an emperor does not present his gift to S. Peter. ✓ And the Concordat of Worms, signed in 1122, after Callixtus had written his reconciliatory letter to Henry V. <sup>(119)</sup> ✓ uses the doctrines, the

ideas, the <sup>points of view</sup> viewpoints which had been developed in the last seventy years, ~~Gregory~~ <sup>but without the Cromwellian cruelty of Gregory.</sup> 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 possessions. The church of Peter and Paul is the worldwide catholic church,



967  
 diffusa per fines imperii Romani (Damiani), extended like St. Paul over the breadth of the whole earth (Damiani, too). You could say of this universal Church that she was urbs and orbis, Roman and not Roman. Now that is exactly <sup>used the expression of pope in 1087 by a pope in 1087</sup> used the expression of pope in 1087 used for St. Paul. Victor III, (Migne 149, 937) 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 dioceses ceased to be <sup>scattered</sup> local bishoprics. The pope was made, by the concordat, the trustee of all of them. The old universal claim of the ~~emperor~~ <sup>emperor</sup> over the whole Roman world, debased by Gregory into a mere kingdom, used once more ~~its~~ its old universality, but only to abandon one of ~~its~~ <sup>his</sup> 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 <sup>addressed</sup> ~~harangued~~. Each bishop and each elector 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 ~~fore~~ <sup>runner</sup> runner of the established church by his travelling office, became now the deliverer of this established church to its original freedom.

The Concordate 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, <sup>who said</sup> seeing the one and united homestead of the pope extended over the whole breadth of the earth, <sup>both</sup> ~~were~~ <sup>(113)</sup> ~~right~~ <sup>both</sup>. The Concordate of Worms respects the new role of the pope as well as his old <sup>(113a)</sup>.

1. Dimitto deo et sanctis Dei apostolis Petro et Paulo sanctaeque catholicae ecclesiae omnem investituram... et concedo in omnibus ecclesiis quae in regno vel imperio meo sunt, canonicam fieri electionem.

But two and three run as follows :

2. Possessiones et regalia beati Petri quae ablata sunt ... eidem sanctae Romanae ecclesiae restituo.  
3. Possessiones etiam aliarum ecclesiarum reddam.

The <sup>✓</sup>most beautiful distribution between the members of Christ, <sup>quoted</sup> ~~founded~~ 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 <sup>universal</sup> liberty of the church against arbitrary <sup>local</sup> power. The nonsense of the Roman : *'One Ruler of Church'* had been made evident. But Paul, who had been Roman and ~~Non-Roman~~ for thousand years, became now with Rome herself Roman and Non - Roman, a dependancy of the Roman See for the next four hundred years exclusively. He disappears <sup>from</sup> ~~out of~~ discussion immediately after 1122. All the queer <sup>references to</sup> ~~expressions~~ of Paul ~~is~~ <sup>as</sup> the predecessor of a pope, of the pope as Petripaula, of <sup>a</sup> ~~vicarius~~ Pauli which we had observed in the heat of the battle, <sup>now</sup> ~~vanish~~. After 1122, the documents are perfectly correct again. But something has happened. <sup>Before</sup> ~~in~~ 1144, the decretum Gratiani, in Distinction XX, 1, gives secular power to the pope. In 1147 the same claim is expressed by Eugen ~~III~~. <sup>In both instances,</sup> ~~Both times~~, it is based on the quality of the pope as vicar of Christ. We have seen in the beginning that this is of ~~no~~ <sup>as well</sup> importance because kings were vicars of God ~~too~~. The new formulas are translations of a Gregory's prayer to Peter and Paul in 1080 : *'Show ~~us~~ 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 omit the main link in the evolution, i. e., the innovation of Gregory. He, and no <sup>118</sup> body else has first claimed secular power to the same extent as spiritual. <sup>✓</sup> 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 ~~ninth~~ twelfth, Paul has reinforced Peter's primacy into a real government of the world.

Before summarizing the ~~maxima~~ stations of the road we have <sup>traveled</sup> ~~paved~~, in ~~form of a survey~~, we ~~in~~ may perhaps take a look into the <sup>period</sup> ~~times~~ after 1122. What was the role of St Paul? The answer must be: honorable but not independent. He is compared to the moon now like the emperors, by Hugo of St Victor, Peter being the Sun. <sup>now</sup> Paul has served his turn and is more or less dismissed ~~now~~. Even the great ~~founder~~ 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. (116)

Joachim de Fiore, the prophet of the twelfth century- and that is always overlooked- <sup>distinguished</sup> ~~discriminated~~ but two significances or 'significates' in the life of the church: the significatus Petri and the significatus Joannis. <sup>Joachim's</sup> John'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 <sup>p/</sup> ~~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 <sup>p</sup> ~~Paulinian~~ function was inconceivable for the rest of the <sup>M</sup> ~~Middle~~ Ages.

But Paul came back. Paul, the man of the missions, the doctor of the gentiles, became the master of the <sup>(in Wittenberg)</sup> ~~new learning~~. His preaching gave rise to a form of the church based merely on preaching. This <sup>as will</sup> ~~Paulinian~~ heresy of Luther influenced the popes, <sup>whose</sup> ~~too~~. Eager to surpass the heretics the paulinism of which was condemned in Trident without sparing the apostle himself, Paul IV. made the apostle Paul the successor of the Roman Emperor Marcus

<sup>upon the</sup>  
Aurelius ~~on the top of the big~~ column in Rome.

The church of Christ will always know the functions of Peter the priest, Paul the <sup>Levite</sup>, and John the Samaritan .

The emperors had made Paul a priest- as Paul is shown on the most beautiful <sup>ivory</sup> 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 ~~stone-~~<sup>still</sup>ment of this troubled harmony. The newest piece of official papal art presents the the two apostles in a gemination ~~still~~. Yet it draws a line between Peter and Paul as though one was a public person, wearing the mitre, the other, <sup>and</sup> Paul no official at all but a private character, talking confidentially in a room of his house to a friend. A wise solution ! <sup>178)</sup>

<sup>on</sup> I think, this <sup>glance</sup> ~~outlook~~ into the troubles of a fight between Visible and Invisible church elucidates the importance of the events ~~at~~ 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 ~~stirring~~ refreshed Peter. But he himself was buried. ~~Per~~ Perhaps this ~~this~~ is Paul's permanent experience. Today he is the great scandal for the grandsons of the German Lutherans.)

<sup>e</sup> Das Paulus Schicksal im Lauf der Geschichte ist seine Verschüttung gewesen. Doch ab und zu in den Jahrhunderten hört man gerade die Stimme des Verschütteten. <sup>119)</sup>

~~The fate of Paul in the course of history was his being buried. But some times through the centuries you listen particularly to the voice of the buried.~~

Appendix.  
Survey:

Before 1050 Peter represents the unity Paul the Universality 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~~ 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.

1047-1074 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 diffused 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 Paul.

Gregory VII. His Church is bigger than the Fines imperii  
1074-1085 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.

1144 The popes claim secular power as vicars of Christ. Feudal law regulates their relations to secular powers

# Notes

A

Note 1: A. I. Macdonald, Authority and Reason in the early Middle Ages. Helsean Lectures University of Cambridge, Oxford 1933, P. 114.

Note 2.: The expression Revolution is frequently used for the struggle of investiture, see f. i. P. Fournier, Mélanges Archéol. 14(1894) p. 196. A special justification for it may be found in my book on ~~Die~~ Die europäischen Revolutionen, Volkscharaktere und Staatenbildung, Jena 1931.

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

Note 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 ~~la~~ terre', mais cette fusion ~~statistique~~ ~~anné~~ ne s'est opéré qu' après ~~la~~ pontificat de Grégoire VII.

Note 5. Registrum Gregorii VII, lib. IX, 3 ed. Casper Berolini 1922, p. 576.

Note 6 This coincidence seems not to be mentioned by any biographer. But we know that the letter of congratulation send 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 44(45), 3Nunc ergo accingere gladium super femur tuum. ( Mabillon, Analecta Vetera Paris 1723, p. 455).- And Gregorys last sigh quotes vers 8 of the same psalm ( Dilexisti iustitiam et odisti iniquitatem. The scene at his deathbed is treated note 46.

Note 7 The emperor in the Church in Rosenstock and Wittig Das Alter der Kirche, Kapitel und Akten I( Berlin 1927 ), 539 ff.

Note 8: Watterich, Vitae Pontificum 373ff.

Note 9 : Reg. II, 55a. ed Casper p. 204, §/XX/ § X and § VIII.

Note 10: Reg. VIII, 21 ed Casper p. 555. Rosenstock Europ. Revolut. 132 ff Gregory created the word spirituales for the whole clergy E. Ache-  
lis 'heologische Studien und Kritiken 1889, p. 18  
Gregory's war is echoed in Honorius of Autun Gemma Animae: Quod episcopus spiritualiter gerit vicem imperatoris Migne 172, 566 ff.

Note 11: Jarfé- Wattenbach Regesta Pontificum 2716; Mon. Germaniae Epistolae VI, 220 nr. 8 a. 864.

Note 12 Abbot Lupus writes to king Charles a. 843-44 MG. Epistolae XVI, 64nr. 64: Vicem vos gerere dei quis ignorat ?

Note 13: H. X. Arquillière (in Mélanges Ferdinand Lot Paris 1925), Sur la ~~th~~ ~~formation~~ Formation de la théocratie pontificale.

## Notes

for Rosenstock-Hüssy St. Paul

- Notes 13a. Ego et Romani minime convenimus moribus see L. M Smith, Cluny 1930p. ~~XXV~~ XVIII.
- Note 14 Lib. II, cap. 4 Mon. Germaniae Scriptores III, 686 = Migne 142, 633f.
- Note 15 L. M. Smith, Clunyp. 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 apostolici nominentur Migne 144, 550.
- Note 16 : 775 an admirer of Charles writes : You are in relations to the bishops what God father is in relation ~~of the~~ to God Son . The bishop is vicar of Christ, you therefore are there where the creator stays, on the first place. Mon Germ. Epist. IV, 503, Lilienfein, Die Anschauungen ~~der~~ Karolinger von Staat und Kirche im Reich der Karolinger 1902 p. 40 The letter of Alcuin dates from 796. Mon. Germ. Epist. Karol. aevi II, 137 Nr. 93.
- Note 17 : Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale I (Louvain 1929), 7-20: L' Origine antiaégyptianiste de notre texte du Symbol de la Messe; Rosenstock, Die Furt der Franken und das Schisma in Rosenstock and Wittig Das Alter der Kirche, 1927, 533ff.
- Note 18 Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands III , 523; I<sup>3</sup>, 269.
- Note 19 ~~ix~~ Job 39, 8. Migne 142 Versus in Ottonem Imperatorem Gdilonis Clun. ~~xxxxxxxiard~~
- Note 20 Dobschütz( Note 100) p. 21, ~~xxxxxxxiard~~
- Note 21: Marble Development of the schools of Italian painting I ( Hague 1923 ), 152
- Note 22: Quia et vos christianissimi-imperatores-augusti-qui  
mi imperatores qui sanc- I  
tae reipublicae clement- I  
issimo affectu gubernatis  
imperium, pro Christo  
fungi legatione videmini pro Christo ergo  
dum pro pace rogatis I legatione fungimur tanquam deo exhor-  
ecclesiae. I tante per nos  
John VIIIa. 879 nr 243 I Paulus ad Corinthios II, 5, 20  
~~xxxxxxxiard~~
- 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 Christ and a tank of oil for the catechumenes . Witte, Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst 32 ( 1919), 58 Anm. 7.
- Note 24 : Migne 142, 622 C. ( Rodolphus 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 his ~~the~~ dei gratia is stressed: Dei gratia sum id quod sum. It is reproduced in Goldschmidt, Elfenbeinskulpturen II( Berlin 1918), ~~nr 36. Though from Eichengraben it is now in the M~~  
(the parallel to the imperial claim)

## Notes ad Rosenstock, Paul

- 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. ~~Roman~~ ha ult de Fleury, La Messe V, 190
- Note 27 Me meosque dominos bisseos apostolos, totius videlicet iudices orbis Miracula Adelheidis Migne 142, 986.
- Note 28: Migne 140, 31 and 53. Acta Bollandorum III Martii, 266 E.
- Note 29 VI, 8 ad annum 100% : 'Vicarium suimet in terris (=Imperatorem) Deus pater ingenitus liberaturus erat ~~XXX~~ e coelis '
- Note 30 Migne 141, 183: Augustus atque Apostolus  
Quam rara iungis nomina.
- 31  
Note 31 4453 Clm. in G. Leidinger Miniaturen I( 1912 ) and V( 1913) see Dohschütz( Note 100) p. 75n. 67
- Note 32 Monumenta Germaniae hist. Scriptores XI, 235.  
XIII?
- Note 33 e. g. Vita Lietberti Mon Germ. ~~XIII~~, 1450: Triumphabat Christianus orbis pacifici regis sustentatus brachio. p. 1456 : Mater ecclesia plaudebat domni Lieberti electione praesertim ad praerogativam co-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 : Sans gloriam deo qui Romanum imperium ( sic ) electo iustissimo praesule et catholice reipublicae principe voluerit. Vita Odilonis in Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde XV, 119.
- Note 34 : ' sicut sedes dei filii prestantior est apostolorum sede, ita sedes regis prestantior est sacerdotum sede' Tractatus Eboracensis Mon Germ. Libelli de Lite & III, 669.
- Note 35 Reginald Pole, Imperial Influence on Papal Documents, passim  
Kehr, Vier Kapitel p. 36, 51 und 56.
- Note 36 Rosenstock, Die Europ. Revolutionen p. 136
- Note 37 : Migne 126, 849 Nr. 238.
- Note 38 Migne 126, 848 Nr. 236.
- 39 39 Fiat una provincia in spatio ecclesiae ~~totius orbis~~ totus orbis !  
Mon. Germaniae Libelli de Lite I, 11. It is characteristic of the glect 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 ecclesiastical matters are concerned-- ~~axxx~~ into a lukewarm 'in the space of the church of the whole orbit ' which is even 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 40 Migne 145, 91



- Note 40 a. Hincmar, Migne 126, 362, quoted pope Leo I in favour of this interpretation: Quod dicitur ... Petro, transivit in alio apostolos et ad omnes ecclesiae principes.
- Note 41: This is well understood by the writer of 1034 in Libelli de vita I, 455 who excludes the East. On the other hand the anonymous of York (H. Boehmer, Staat und Kirche in England 1899, 455) defends the petrinian privileges of the East fiercely like an anglican of 1840 when the anglicans and Lutherans founded their bishopric in Jerusalem. The anonymous refuses to believe that the canons 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.
- Note 41a. Excommunicatus est etiam sancti Jacobi archiepiscopus G. quia contra fas sibi vindicaret culmen apostolici nominis. Anselmus monachus Remensis Migne 142, 1436.
- Note 42. Mabillon Analecta Vetera Paris 1723 (Misprint 456 instead of page 455): 'te ... illius nunc cathedrae fecit esse sessorem, a qua per orbem terrarum ~~omnium~~ omnium virtutum lumina diffunduntur, et ad quam velut in circulo lineae ad illud medium quod centrum geometrici vocant, universa convergunt. 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). ~~Gregory~~ Gregory himself writes (II? 49): Cum mentis intuitu partes occidentis sive meridiei aut septentriones video, vix legales episcopos ... invenio. Princeps totius orbis terre, Gregory is called in 1082 Registrum IX, 29 a.
- Note 43 Meyer von Knonau, Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV. und Heinrich V. Vol VIII, 74n. 35
- Note 44 Gregory VII never mentions the imperium. The ~~Germans~~ Germans 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.
- Note 45 Registrum Gregorii II, 75: Plus enim terrarum lex Romanorum pontificum quam imperatorum obtinuit. This repeats a remark of a poem on Charlemagne who subdued nations of which the Romans did not even know the names. Mon Germ. Poetae IV, 70 versus 651/2. Alphanus of Salerno sings de s. Petro apostolo: Ecce tibi cunctus servit sub sidere mundus.
- Note 46 Non potes, Domine, mori in exilio qui in vice Christi et apostolorum eius divinitus accepisti gentes haereditatem et possessionem terminos terrae (= Psalm 2, 8) Paulus Bernried cap. 13, 102 Migne ~~148, 20f.~~ 48, 20f.
- Note 47. Jaffé 3962, printed in Gallia Christiana XIV éd. Hauréau Paris 1856 p. 279f. and by L. Archambault in Revue de l'Anjou IV. Série vol. 12 (1897), 224. Ch. Pfister, Études sur le Règne de Robert le Pieux Paris 1885 p. 319 and F. Lot, Les derniers Carolingiens Paris 1891 p. 368, believed in the authenticity.
- Note 48. Halphen, Le Comté d'Anjou au XI. s. (Paris 1906), 83 ff., 219 ff. 351. H. K. Mann Lives of Popes in the Early Middle Ages V (1910), ~~xix~~ 134.

- 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 ~~stadtrömischer~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Stadtgeschichte Freiburg, 1925, 109. Ildefons Schuster The Sacramentary Vol. IV. London 1930, 280 ff. E. Casper Geschichte des Papsttums I(1930), 562f. 200.
- Note 50 Our item is taken from the immediate predecessor of Gregory, Alexander II, Migne 146, 1320 The diplomatists seem to be silent on this point. Innumeral examples, however, show the intentional gradation. Cf. Migne 126, 910 nr. 296; 841, nr. 229; 881, nr. 257, Than Migne 142, 574, quoted near our note 60, Gregory VII lo70 nov. 19, Jaffé- Watt. post 5084.  
The rule is observed by Leo the First as is stated in Migne 54, 423 note a. ' Hic sanctos Petrum et Paulum patres et veros pastores Romanae urbis 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 VII( 1899) 77 and 1.  
  
In Kehr , Italia Sacra, I ~~fix~~ount  
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 Ecole française de Rome , ~~IX~~ Mélanges 50 ( 1899), 157.
- Note 54 Our representation is taken from Cabrol Dictionnaire d' Archéol. Chrétienne III, 2, Paris 1914 fig. 3014. The spear is not known to me as occurring anywhere else. It is worthwhile to pay attention to ~~them~~ fact that one key only is given to Peter. This disappears in western Art . Our illustrations are apt to show the change.
- Note 55 John VIII a. 879, nr ~~232x~~239 Migne 126, 850 or in the epistolae selectae of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica.
- Note 56 From Gregor of Nyssa, quoted in Migne, Patrologia Latina 78, 297.  
cf. Hieronymus ad Galat. I, 2 (ed. Vallart) ~~VII~~, 403
- Note 56a Mundi Magister ( Paulus) atque coeli janitor (Peter) sings Elpis ~~xx~~ who died 493; Britto the Hymns of the Breviary and the Missal, New York, Benziger 1924, 262 nr. 116. Hymnus ex Codice Fontavell. Migne 151, 961. Remarkable the scene in Monreale ( Photo Alinari 33285 ) of the 12. cent." S. Paulus tradit epistolas Discipulis suis ~~xxx~~ Timotheo et Sileo deferendos per universum orbem ".  
  
Note 56 b Mam si unus ut putat, universalis est, restat ut vos episcopi non estis. Si unus episcopus vocatur universalis, universa Ecclesia cadit, si unus universus cadit. Ex Gregorio I. ( epp ~~xxxx~~IV, 13ep 38 ) taken by Hincmar and the later canonists.
- Note 57 a. 604, Jan. 25 Monum. Germaniae Epistolae Gregorii I, 433 = Reg ~~xxx~~ <sup>xxv, 47</sup>?

Notes

F

Note 58 Migne 142, 1021.

Note 59 Migne 142, 574

Note 60 John VIII nr. 254, 256, 257, Migne 126, 859ff. P. Fabre. Etudes sur le livre Censuum, Paris 1894, p. 40 ff.

61 see note 99

62 Quotations in my Ostfalens Rechtsliteratur unter Friedrich II. Weimar 1912, 145ff.

Note 63 Johannes XIX ad annum 1031 Watterich, Vitae pontificum 731; Migne 149, 358

Note 64 The scarcity is astounding. Half a phrase ~~ixxiix~~ is given to it by E. Bernheim, Mittelalterliche Zeitanschauungen I (1918), 129 or by Mirbt, Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregor's VII. Leipzig 1894, 178, nr. 2 All the others, like Carlyle, do not even mention the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ of ~~xxx~~ apostles and apostolic ! terms

Note 64a The Council of Trient ( 1545-1563 ) in its struggle against Luther, the alleged Paul redivivus, declared, that what Paul called sin in ~~xxxx~~ several places the catholic Church never had recognised as sin. Sessio V. de peccato originali, § 5.

65. Mirbt, Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums 4 381ff n. 528.

Note 66 Bellarmin Disputationum III, 27 de Comparatione Petri cum Paulo ; Mutantius, de sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli imaginibus, Romae 1573.

Note 67 Migne 146, 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 Damiani who turns against it, Migne 144, 214ff.

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

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

Note 72 Paul Fournier, Mélanges Archéol. 14 ( 1894 ), 147ff. Doubt of the simultaneous ~~xxxxx~~ martyrdom entered the Sic et Non of Abailardus : Quod Petrus and Paulus eodem prorsus die, non revoluto auri tempore, passi sunt ( ed. Henke-Lindenköhl, Marburg 1851, cap. 97 p. 34 ff.

The interest of the end of the elev. century may be seen in a formula of sanction in a French document about Nero' qui dei apostolorum, Petrum quidem pedibus sursum positus cruci afflixit, Paulove ro caput truncavit, ( A. de Bouard, Manuel de Diplomatique texte 1929 p. 280 nr. 3. ) This formula occurs enlarged in Hugo de Fleury, M. Germaniae, Libelli II, 486.

The martyrdom of Paul is painted in a manuscript of the Biblioth. de l'arsenal which might deserve study : Rohault de Fleury, Les Saints de la Messe VII ( 1899 ) planche 29

## Note ad Rosenstock Paul

## Note 72 Continued

About Paul as healing power. Ducange Glossarium s. v. Paulianus; Dornseiff in Bibliothek Warburg 24-25 Leipzig 1927, 212 locus classicus Hebr. XII rendered by Damiani epist. XV Migne 144, 179: Animarum Medicus Paulus.

Note 73 The story of Paul's Sudarium is analysed by E. Caspar Geschichte des Papsttums II (1933), 397 n. 1.

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

Note 75 The words of this frightened editor, Cajetan, are: In hac epistola beatus Petrus Damiani plus nimio videtur tribuere Paulo. Migne 145, 594.

Note 75 a Bruno Herbipolensis in Psalmos 67, 29 Migne 142, 254

Note 75 b Here again, the Anonymous of York takes his arguments, fourtyyy years later, from Damiani but in order to prove the opposite. The statement how competely this english writer depends on Damiani can be booked as one of the philological byproducts of our study.

Note 76 → caput: Cur b. Paulus propriam non habet cathedram...  
Quandam ergo si dici liceat, cum Christo similitudinem Paulus tenet, dum non uni dumtaxat ecclesiae sed omnibus praesidet Migne 145, 593. In 144, 801 D. remarks: Subjungit Paulus ad Gal. 1: 'veni Hierosolymam videre Petrum': videri non discere?!!  
see, too, the Collectaneum XXVIII Migne 145, 1006f. <sup>the</sup> ~~Christianus~~ <sup>Christianus</sup>  
et b. imperatoris susceptoris brachio in note 33. ~~to compare~~

Note 77 Migne 146, 1277

Note 78 Watterich, Vitae Pontificum 373 ff.

Note 79 ~~Watterich~~ Migne 148, 795

Note 80 Jaffé, Monumenta Bambergensia 217 n. 113

Note 81 Coiffidus in Mon. Germaniae Libelli de Lite II, 686 and 696.

Note 81 How far were the times when a pope himself, Pelagius, had admitted to be Peter corrected by Paul. Seppelt, Geschichte des Papsttums (Leipzig 1931) I, 311f.

Note 82 Pliche in Le Moyen Âge XII (1919), 94 The apparition of Paul in a dream of Gregory VII is told by Paul Bernried c. 12

Note 83 Migne 148, 722 n. 78

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

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

Note 85 Jaffé Monumenta Gregoriana 404

Note 86 A hand presents ~~key~~ (one only) to Peter. 'Suscipe Clavem' is the text. C. et G. Rohault de Fleury, Les Saints de la Messe Vol. ~~II~~ <sup>1</sup>  
~~planche XXXIX~~ 29

- Note 87 Petripaulentius Mon, Germaniae Script. XI 627; Domnus Petripaula XI, 625.
- Note 88 Dobenecker, Regesta hist. Thuringiae Jena 1896 I, 203 f. n. 961.  
I mention it because it is used as genuine by Fabre, Etudes sur le livre Censuum Paris 1894, p. 31.
- Note 89 Sigeberti Chronicon llll Scriptores VI, 374, confer 404. The same misunderstanding ~~happened~~ in 1338 is stated by P. M. Baumgarten Beiträg zur Geschichte des Palleum, Miscellanea Fr. Ehrle Roma 1924, 345
- Note 90 Monumenta Germaniae historica Libelli I, 308 'servus Gregorius... cum predecessore suo beato Paulo...'
- Note 91 Watterich Vitae Pontificum I, 174
- Note 91 a X. Barbier de Montault, Traité d'Iconographie II( Paris 1890, 249 ff. Dobschütz ( note 100 ) 48 n 26
- Note 92 Migne 145, 91 f.
- Note 93 Cum beatus Paulus Hispaniam se adiisset significet ac <sup>post</sup>ea septem episcopos ab urbe Roma... a Petro et Paulo apostolis directos fuisse... - Romanae ecclesiae quae a Petro et Paulo supra firmam petram per Christum fundata est. March 1074 Reg. I, 64 ed. Casper p.93
- Note 94 Note 41 a
- 95 Migne 163, 1232 f. 1122 February 19.
- 96 a. 1063 Migne 146, 1286.
- Note 97 Mon Germ. Scriptores ~~IV~~<sup>IX</sup> XIV, 637
- Note 98 Adam Bremensis I, 20; III, 4; I, 11. ( Winifredus = Bonifatius... omnes alios ut Paulus apostolus .. antevenit.) III, 9
- Note 99 Gustav Schmidt Urkundenbuch des Stiftes S, Pauli Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen 1881, p. 393 nr. 2
- Note 100 I mention Johannes Ficker, Darstellung der Apostel in der Altchristlichen Kunst Ipzg. 1867. And especially E. Dobschütz Der Apostel Paulus II Sine Stellung in der Kunst Halle 1928 Later Material in Emile Mâle, L' Art Religieuse du XIII s. en France 6. éd. Paris 1925, p. 298ff, esp. the list on p. 318 Crowe and Cavalcaselle History of Painting in Italy I London 1903 p. 53 remark 'The absence of s. Peters key and S. Pauls sword point to Byzantine influence.'
- Note 101 Durandus Rationale divinatorum officiorum I, 3, 16; VI, 16, 10.  
For the conclusion that the sword of Paul was really ~~not~~ not used can be quoted  
1. Altar of Rogerus in Paderborn dated 1113 Kleinschmidt Dts. Zts. für christliche Kunst 17 and 22  
2. Parma the bowl of the baptisterio XII c.

Note 102 Continuation

~~Exemplum~~ 3. Köln Dom man . folio 59 Hieron. P. 1 recto  
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 ) with-  
out giving it to Paul who has ~~other~~ mostly no attribute.  
*being given*

Note 102 Sword and book : Xeres de la Frontera , Foggia San Michele, Mimizan.  
Fleury, Les Saints de la Messe VII ( 1899 ), 79 quotes Birch,  
Catalogue of Seals for the Seal of S. Paul in Nereham with book  
and sword.

Note 103 See note 72

Note 104

' are incorporated earlier fragments of sculpture' says Porter Romanesques  
Sculptures of the pilgrimage Roads 1923 p. 268. 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 Herzog, Die langobardischen Fragmente in der Abtei S.  
Pietro in Perentillo ( in Umbria ) Röm. Quartalsschrift XX ( 1906 )  
77 fig. 7.

Note 106 Adolf Goldschmidt Elfenbeinskulturen I ( Berlin 1914 ) Tafel 155 e  
He gives no date.

Note 107 Illustration One on our plate

Note 108 The medal of about 1100 is nr. 22 2 on our plate See Anton de  
Waal, Andenken an die Romfahrt im Mittelalter, Röm. Quartalsschr.  
XIV, 1900, 63 ff. The younger form which we give from the work  
of Wulff, because his specimens are clearer, is given by dexWulff  
Waal too.

Note 109 Our example of this correct form is taken from O. Wulff Altchrist-  
liche Bildwerke II ( 1911 ) ~~XXXXXX~~ Tafel VI nr 1829, see for  
text page 72. It looks not like correct only but like correct  
-ted too. The plurality of keys is a remedy which occurs in the  
secular symbolism of the twelfth century also. There the flags of  
the Caedum vexillarium were multiplied to distinguish the duke-  
doms from the simple fiefs. *Rosenstock, Königshaus und Stämme in  
Deutschland zwischen 911 und 1250 hgg. 1914 p. 175 ff.*

Note 109 a see above note 10 The relation of scholasticism is treated  
By Denifle, die abendländischen Schriftausleger bis Luther 1905;  
Prat La Théologie de Saint Paul Paris 1908; H. Grabmann, Gesh.  
der scholastischen Methode I ( 1909 ), 60.

Note 110 absolvo et benedico quicumque me hanc habere specialem potestatem  
tem in vice apostolorum Petri et Pauli credunt indubitanter. Migne  
148, 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 113 a C. Mirbt Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums 4. Aufl. Nr. 305, p. 161.

Note 114 !!See below!!!

Note 115 Dies itaque Judaea~~am~~ nox gentilitas. Luminare maius Petrus, minus Paulus Migne 177, sermo 64. Yet even he adds : Uter tamen utri praeponatur, non est certum. An example of the average literature on Paul is the sermon of Guerricus in natalibus Petri at Pauli, printed in S. Bernardi Opera omnia ed. Mabillon, 4 ed. Paris 1839 II, 2, 2019 f. ~~xxxxxxx~~ See Grabmann, Geschichte der Scholastischen Methode I (~~1901~~ 1909), p. 60.

Note 116

D a m i a n i

Abailard

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

Tuba domini, Paule, maxima  
De caelestibus da tonitrua  
Hostes dissipans, cives ~~aggrea~~  
aggrega.

Note 117 Joachimo di Fiore Super quatuor Evangelia ed. Buonaiuti 1930 p. LX. nr 3.

Note 118 It is on the Porta della basilica di San Paolo, reproduced in the journal <sup>?</sup> Dedalo Vol XI, 871 May 31. compare our plate or the ivory of note 25

Note 119 Karl Ludwig Schmidt Der Apostel Paulus und die Antike Welt Bibliothek Warburg 1924/25 Lpzg. 1927 p. 41.

Note 114.) It is incredible that a great scholar like Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands III, 382 could speak with the same pessimism which was expressed by Carlyle (our note 3) of Gregory's deathbed: 'Ganz vergeblich fragt man, wo der Gewinn liegt den Rom von dem Regiment Gregors VII. gehabt hat'. A contemporary, Liemar archbishop of Hamburg, has answered Mr. Hauck's question in advance: 'Periculosus homo! vult iuber quae vult episcopis ut villicis suis'. ~~The~~ Sudendorf, Registrum I, 8 n.5 The triumph of the papacy in 1122 was exactly in that direction: The emperor acknowledged the pope as the person addressed 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).

### Model of Emperors.

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. / -2-

The first institution in which Paul is put before Peter and (which is<sup>1</sup>) basic for a reform of the Church, is the imperial 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 -3- 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 -4- 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 -5- 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 manufactured 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 -6- 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 -7- 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 wholly 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 -8- 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.

o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o

The manuscript is without pagenumbers. The numbers are added here and given at the end of the lines whereas the end of the pages is indicated with the sign /. There are 8 pages in the manuscript, a lecture which is not finished. It was found in Four Wells June 5 1993 together with the paper read before the Mediaeval Academy of America April 28 1934: The Role of the Apostle Paul in the Papal Revolution of the Eleventh Century (A chapter in the posthumous life of the doctor gentium). The date of the manuscript can be stated as of about that year 1934. The transcription was made on July 3, 1993 by Lise van der Molen, Winsum, The Netherlands.