

ROBERT E. LERNER, *Philip the Chancellor Greets the Early Dominicans in Paris*, in «Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum» (ISSN 0391-7320), 77, (2007), pp. 5-17.

Url: <https://heyjoe.fbk.eu/index.php/afp>

Questo articolo è stato digitalizzato della Biblioteca Fondazione Bruno Kessler, in collaborazione con l'Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum all'interno del portale [HeyJoe](#) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe è un progetto di digitalizzazione di riviste storiche, delle discipline filosofico-religiose e affini per le quali non esiste una versione elettronica.

This article was digitized by the Bruno Kessler Foundation Library in collaboration with the Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum as part of the [HeyJoe](#) portal - *History, Religion, and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe is a project dedicated to digitizing historical journals in the fields of philosophy, religion, and related disciplines for which no electronic version exists.



Nota copyright

Tutto il materiale contenuto nel sito [HeyJoe](#), compreso il presente PDF, è rilasciato sotto licenza [Creative Commons](#) [Attribuzione-Non commerciale-Non opere derivate 4.0 Internazionale](#). Pertanto è possibile liberamente scaricare, stampare, fotocopiare e distribuire questo articolo e gli altri presenti nel sito, purché si attribuisca in maniera corretta la paternità dell'opera, non la si utilizzi per fini commerciali e non la si trasformi o modifichi.

Copyright notice

All materials on the [HeyJoe](#) website, including the present PDF file, are made available under a [Creative Commons](#) [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](#). You are free to download, print, copy, and share this file and any other on this website, as long as you give appropriate credit. You may not use this material for commercial purposes. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you may not distribute the modified material.



PHILIP THE CHANCELLOR GREETES THE EARLY
DOMINICANS IN PARIS*

BY
ROBERT E. LERNER

Almost forty years ago I published an article presenting evidence to show that the prominent Parisian cleric and early Scholastic theologian, Philip the Chancellor (c. 1170-1236), was an enthusiastic admirer of the two new mendicant orders¹. As I maintained, the later canards of Thomas of Cantimpré portraying Philip as an enemy of the mendicants needed to be discarded as an anachronistic product of the secular-mendicant controversy that raged in Thomas's own day. My argument was accepted by Nicole Bériou and Niklaus Wicki, probably the two most authoritative students of Philip's thought and career². To my knowledge it has never been challenged. That might end the matter, but recently I have come to see in respect to the Chancellor's *Summa super Psalterium* that there is more to report. Rather than altering the tenor of my original article, the new evidence I present here enhances it³.

* I wish to express my deepest appreciation to Martin Morard, who controlled readings for me in the Vatican manuscript of Philip the Chancellor's work on the Psalms (see below), and to Sean Field and especially Elizabeth Casteen, who did the same in six manuscripts of the work in the Bibliothèque nationale de France. I offer my thanks as well to Alexandra Arney for her meticulous editorial labors and to Fr. Simon Tugwell OP, for catching mistakes and informing me of some evidence of which I was unaware.

¹ R. E. Lerner, "Weltklerus und religiöse Bewegung im 13. Jahrhundert. Das Beispiel Philipps des Kanzlers", *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 51(1969), 94-108.

² N. Bériou, "Philippe le Chancelier", *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique*, 11, Paris 1984, col. 1289-97; here 1290: "il est inexact de dire que Philippe fut l'adversaire des Mendiants. Les éloges qu'il leur décerne dans sa predication démontrent le contraire". (Bériou's encyclopedia entry is the most convenient expert overview of Philip's life and work.) N. Wicki, ed., *Philippi Cancellarii Parisiensis Summa de bono*, 2 vols., Bern 1985 [hereafter: Wicki] 1: pp. 26*-27*, adding additional data.

³ My repository of evidence is the work usually termed Philip's "sermons" on the Psalms, but really of a different genre (see n.5). It was published twice in the early-modern period: *Philippi de Greve, cancellarii Parisiensis, in Psalterium Davidicum CCXXX sermones*, 2 vols., Paris 1523 [according to E. Bettoni, the date 1523 is a

Despite the vigorous dismissive judgment of the first methodical student of Philip's oeuvre, Pierre Daunou, who deemed it pointless to read the Chancellor's homiletic work on the Psalms⁴, the collection surely contains nuggets of interest to religious and intellectual historians. (Given that Philip's work on the Psalms falls into no well-defined category I will call it a collection of "distinctions" for lack of a better term⁵.) In my article of 1969 I neglected to notice a statement in the collection regarding the early appearance of the Dominican Order in Paris. In treating Psalm 77 (inc. "Asculta, popule meus"), Philip considers "the multitude who follow the Lord and fast on the way" and arrives at those who "journey on the way for three days in the wilderness in order to sacrifice to the Lord our God" (Exod. 3:18). At this point he proposes that entering "the wilderness" refers to those who enter cloisters, for "the cloister is a place of asperity and discipline". There they live on dry bread and water, and wear rough clothing. Thus mundane observers suppose that those

misprint and really should be 1533; see my "Weltklerus und religiöse Bewegung", 99, n. 17], and with roughly the same title: Brescia 1600. (The Brescia edition follows the Parisian edition aside from different foliation.) An extensive list of manuscripts may be found in Fr. Stegmüller, *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi*, 11 vols., Madrid 1940-80, 4: pp. 429-30 (#6952). (But, as I have learned from Professor Michael Bailey, Munich Clm 3740 contains Philip's expositions on the Gospels.) In the following I provide folio references from the Brescia edition (hereafter: "ed. Brescia"), always mentioning the "sermon" in question for those who must consult the Paris edition. For the passages that are my cruces, I control the printed text by comparison with readings from nine thirteenth-century manuscripts, all of which appear to be of Parisian origin. I use the following abbreviations: Paris, BN de France, MS lat. 12416="BN 1", lat.14594="BN 2", lat. 16467="BN 3", lat. 16468="BN 4", 17515="BN 5", lat. 17981="BN 6"; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 214="M 1", 627="M 2"; BAV, MS Vat. lat. 9877="V".

⁴ "Philippe le Chancelier", *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 18(1835), 184-91, here 190. The statement is quoted by B. Hauréau, *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 6 vols., Paris 1890-93, 5: 285, who tempers it by saying that Philip's criticism of mores and abuses in this work is "d'une façon vive et plaisante". Afterwards the work was mined for information (but hardly exhaustively) by a twentieth-century pioneer of scholastic sermon studies: J. B. Schneyer, *Die Sittenkritik in den Predigten Philipps des Kanzlers*, Münster 1962.

⁵ The nature of the genre is difficult to categorize, "distinctions" being only a rough approximation. See G. Dahan, *L'exégèse chrétienne de la Bible en Occident médiéval*, Paris 1999, 149-50. Probably the best characterization is that of N. Wicki, *Die Philosophie Philipps des Kanzlers*, Fribourg 2005, 3: "Eine Art Materialbuch für Predigten über die Psalmen". While the work surely is not a collection of sermons, some evidence exists that it was at any rate mined for sermons. See the marginal notations in MS M 1 (Paris: Grands Augustins): f. 119^{va}: "sermo in nativitate Domini"; f. 119^{vb}: "sermo in epyphania"; f. 121^{vb}: "sermo in adventu"; etc.

who enter cloisters are beyond consolation. Specifically they suppose this about the "Order of Preachers":

"As I heard someone say, 'the Order of Preachers is unable to last long', as if to say, 'on what can they sustain themselves?' But these people err, for I have not seen the just abandoned by God (Ps. 36 [35]: 25) . . . and they know nothing of the bread on which the Lord pastures his own"⁶.

Although the distinctions on the Psalms have never yet been securely dated, on the face of it these words would seem to have been written quite soon after the Dominicans' arrival in Paris. Whereas in this collection Philip reports the view of "some" that the Preaching Order is "unable to last long", a sermon dating from roughly a decade later displays him praising the new "centurions" who "give goods to the new religious orders, the Preachers and Minors, building homes for them in which they live and churches in which they pray and serve God"⁷. The difference is striking and presumably explicable by the passage of time. Scholars know that the Dominican Order was remarkably successful in gaining a firm foothold in Paris in its earliest years. In 1219 the Order counted 30 Parisian friars; in 1223 it counted 120. Owing to substantial almsgiving, the Dominicans also rapidly gained material security and built out their cloister of St. Jacques. In view of Paris's central position, the third general chapter was held in the French metropolis in 1222, and thereafter general chapters alternated annually between Paris and Bologna⁸. In short, the allusion to doubts about Dominican survival would appear to date from between c. 1219 and c. 1223.

⁶ Ed. Brescia, f. 260r (Serm. CLXIV): "Claustum locus est asperitatis et discipline. Unde est aqua potius [V: potus] ibi, cibus aridus, aspera vestis. Credunt mundani eos extra omnem consolationem. Sicut audivi quendam dicentem quod Ordo Predicatorum non posset diu durare, quasi dicat, 'unde possent sustentari?' Sed hi errant, quia *non vidi iustum derelictum a domino*, etc. [Ps. 35:25] . . . Sed ignorant panes quibus Dominus pascit suos". The crucial sentence, "Sicut audivi. . .sustentari?" is lacking in seven of the nine manuscripts at my disposal, but is present in BN 5, f. 97^r and V, f. 96^{ra}. It seems evident that the sentence was deleted when it was no longer susceptible of being taken seriously, but its presence in three independent witnesses (the printed text does not depend on either BN 5 or V) firmly establishes its original place in the text.

⁷ Passage from Philip's *Expositiones in evangelia* cited by Hauréau, *Notices*, 6: 59.

⁸ On the rapid growth of the order in Paris, W. A. Hinnebusch, *The History of the Dominican Order*, 2 vols., New York 1966, 1972, 1: 61-63, 86; J. A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino*, Washington 1974, 57, 59.

Granted that a single dating index may be a slender reed, I now recognize to my embarrassment that I overlooked a second such index. In regard to Psalm 48 (inc. In finem ... Audite hec omnes gentes), Philip criticizes those who assume superfluous titles. In doing so he offers two examples, both of which allude implicitly to identifiable individuals. In the first case he specifies an archbishop of Reims who at the same time takes the titles of apostolic legate and cardinal of Santa Sabina⁹. This can only be the mighty Guillaume "aux Blanches Mains", who was archbishop of Reims, legate of the apostolic see, and titular cardinal of Santa Sabina from 1179 until his death in 1202¹⁰. Inasmuch as Philip all but certainly did not write his distinctions before becoming chancellor in 1217¹¹, Guillaume was no longer alive at the time of writing and the reference is hence not determinative for dating. Perhaps the mention of an ecclesiastical grandee who flourished in the later twelfth century would have been more vivid around 1220 than around 1230, but this inference is too impressionistic to be of much use.

The Chancellor's second example, however, is more rewarding. In this case he refers to a "count of Montfort", who also calls himself "marquis of Provence, duke of Narbonne, and count of Toulouse"¹².

⁹ Sermon 100, ed. Brescia, f. 164^v, BN 6, f. 34^{ra}: "alii dilatant nomen suum titulos multiplices dignitatum aggregando, sicut cum dicitur archiepiscopus Remensis, apostolice sedis legatus, titulo Sancte Sabine cardinalis". The reference to the archbishop of Reims appears identically in all nine manuscripts I have used.

¹⁰ On Guillaume and his offices, L. Falkenstein, "Guillaume aux Blanches Mains: archevêque de Reims et légat de siège apostolique (1176-1202)", *Revue d'histoire de l'Eglise de France*, 91(2005), 5-25, at 12: "A partir du III^e concile de Latran, son titre de cardinal de Sainte-Sabine se trouve même dans l'intitulation de ses actes, toujours après son titre d'archevêque de Reims, mais avant la mention de son office d'*apostolice sedis legatus*".

¹¹ An earlier assumption that Philip became chancellor of Notre Dame de Paris in 1218 is corrected by Wicki, p. 18. Philip's office would have lent him the authority to write his often censorious distinctions. (Here are two examples: ed. Brescia, f. 128^r: "pecus pingue artista, pecus pinguius decretista, pecus pinguissimum theologus"; ed. Brescia, f. 167^r: "Doctores et prelati se principes esse agnoscant . . . sicut enim iuxta verbum Tullii, 'indecens est grammatico barbare loqui', ita philosopho sive theologo turpiter vivere. Hodie ergo doctores qui deberent esse executores testamenti Christi, non erubescunt impugnare testamentum vel testatorem ipsum".) Moreover, the collection not only refers several times to Paris (before 1217 Philip was archdeacon in Noyon, although it is true that he may have been an absentee) but reveals a man who is issuing lofty pronouncements on Parisian academic affairs: see the passage given in n. 41.

¹² Ed. Brescia, f. 164^v: "Item comes Montisfortis, marchio illius loci, comes Tholosanus". But this passage in the printed edition is corrupt, albeit no fault of the

Here we have a rare gift to the scholarly inquirer that can be dated with gratifying precision. Innocent III conferred the county of Toulouse on the northern-French knight Simon de Montfort at the Fourth Lateran council in 1215, and Simon accepted the title of count after investiture by King Philip Augustus in the spring of 1216. Concurrently he took the title of duke of Narbonne, although not that of marquis of Provence¹³. Yet Simon was probably not Philip the Chancellor's target because he died in battle in June, 1218, and was succeeded by his son, Amaury, who assumed all of his father's recently acquired titles¹⁴. Not only was Philip more likely to have been thinking of the reigning Montfort (he could hardly have been writing the passage before June, 1218), but the person he criticizes took the title of marquis of Provence, as Simon had not¹⁵. The identification correlates with the reference to the early Parisian Dominicans because Amaury provisionally surrendered his Occitan claims and titles to Louis VIII of France early in 1224 and did so definitively in January of 1226¹⁶.

If Philip reached back to the past for his example of the archbishop of Reims, could he not have reached back for this example too, thereby calling into question the terminus of early 1224? I think not because the reference to Amaury was obviously hostile, and such would have been highly impolitic after 1224. Amaury's purpose in surrendering his Occitan titles was to make common cause with

printer, since the same reading appears in six of my nine thirteenth-century MSS—that is, all but BN 6, M 1 and M 2. M 2, f.88^{va} also has the corruption “marchio illius loci” but properly adds “dux Narbonie [sic]”. The correct full passage in BN 6, f. 34^{ra} and M 2, f. 60^{ra} reads: “Item comes Montisfortis, marchio Provincie, dux Narbone, comes Tolosanus”. Apparently “marchio illius loci” – roughly “such and such a place” – was supplied for “marchio Provincie” by someone who was baffled by the latter title, perhaps recognizing that it involved an illegitimate claim.

¹³ M. Roquebert, *L'épopée Cathare, 1213-1216: Muret ou la dépossession*, Toulouse 1977, 395, citing a document of April 1216. See also, with further examples, W. Kienast, *Der Herzogstitel in Frankreich und Deutschland (9. bis 12. Jahrhundert)*, München 1968, 310, n. 202. (I am grateful to Professor Fredric Cheyette for informing me of this bibliography).

¹⁴ Roquebert, *L'épopée Cathar, 1216-1229; Le lys et la croix*, Toulouse 1986, 138.

¹⁵ See note 13. Although I can find no record of Amaury taking the title of marquis of Provence, it seems improbable that this was the Chancellor's invention: given that Amaury's rivals, successively Raymond VI and Raymond VII of Toulouse, used “marquis of Provence”, Amaury must have done so in imitation. For the usages of Raymond VI and Raymond VII, Kienast, *Herzogstitel*, 310, n. 200.

¹⁶ For the surrender of early 1224 (made final in January 1226), see *Layettes de Trésor des chartes*, Paris 1863-1909, 2: 24 (#1631); Ch. Petit-Dutaillis, *Etude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII*, Paris 1894, 460 (#82), 491 (#313); and Roquebert, *L'épopée Cathar, 1216-1229*, 255.

Louis VIII in opposition to the hereditary count, Raymond of Toulouse. Indeed in 1226 Amaury joined King Louis in a formally authorized Crusade against Raymond¹⁷. And not only that, so did Philip! Specifically, during the time between 6 January and 2 February 1226, while the king was taking the Cross, Philip delivered three sermons in Paris in support of the royal Crusade¹⁸. Because Amaury and Philip were fighting for the cause of God against the heretics, it is inconceivable that Philip would have dredged up an insult against Amaury after it became irrelevant.

I think too there is a third dating index, albeit less conclusive because it is based on a silence. Although Philip refers to Dominicans in five passages in the work in question (I will presently consider the other four), he makes no mention of Franciscans. This might not be remarkable were it not for the fact that he refers to Franciscans in his other homiletic works. In a sermon of roughly 1227/28 he refers favorably to "religiones nuper orte", implicitly the two new mendicant orders, and in sermons written between c. 1230 and 1236 he compares Dominicans and Franciscans to John the Baptist, praises those who support both new orders, and compares Dominicans to Peter and Franciscans to John the Evangelist¹⁹. Then too, in his *Summa de bono*, written between c. 1225 and 1228 Philip names "Saint Francis" as a model of obedience²⁰.

The silence about Franciscans in the work on the Psalms would thus seem best explained by assuming that the work was composed before their Order became prominent. The Friars Minor trailed by a few years behind the Friars Preacher in establishing themselves in Paris. In 1218 or 1219 a few settled in Saint-Denis, but not yet in Paris itself; the Franciscan convent in Paris was only in the process of construction in 1223. In that same year thirty Franciscans had settled in Paris, but then there were already one hundred and twenty Dominicans²¹. If we take the silence as telling, we then would have

¹⁷ Roquebert, *L'épopée Cathar, 1216-1229*, 303.

¹⁸ One of the sermons, "De cruce signatione contra Albigenses", which refers internally to delivery between Epiphany and Purification, is printed by Wicki, *Die Philosophie*, (as n. 5) 181-83. For the other two, J. B. Schneyer, *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150-1350*, 11 vols., Münster 1969-80, 4:837, #270, 271.

¹⁹ Lerner, "Weltklerus und religiöse Bewegung", 101, 103.

²⁰ Wicki, *Summa de Bono*, 1001. For the dating of the work, *ibid.*, 63*-66*.

²¹ J. Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order*, Oxford 1968, 66; L. Pellegrini, "I quadri e i tempi dell'espansione dell'Ordine", in *Francesco d'Assisi e il primo secolo di storia francescana*, Turin 1997, 165-201, here 176.

a third reason to date the composition of Philip's distinctions on the Psalms to the early 1220s.

In my earlier article on Philip and the mendicants, I despaired of dating the work under consideration because of a presumed lack of internal evidence²². Now, however, I find that my pessimism was unwarranted. At least two – and I am inclined to say three – dating indices show that the distinctions must have been written between the time of the Dominicans' arrival in Paris in 1219 and Amaury of Montfort's surrender of his extra titles early in 1224. (I assume that the work was composed as a unit because it is a coherent tool for the use of preachers rather than a collection of sermons for various occasions.) Accordingly it is clear that we now have an instance of a very prominent Parisian secular cleric heartily welcoming the new Order of Preachers at the time of their arrival and that we can put into chronological context a variety of other interesting remarks.

To proceed to Philip's other references to Dominicans in the distinctions on the Psalms, one of them greets the new Order as enthusiastically as the citation with which I began. Here Philip declares that "today" the prophecy of Joel that "the pastures of the wilderness sprout forth" (Joel 2:22) is being fulfilled, then asking rhetorically, "Who are the animals of the wilderness other than the simple populace? And what are the pastures that sprout forth other than the "Order of Preachers"? To answer his questions, he continues: "just as the pastures of the wilderness are meant to nourish the animals, so the teaching and life of the Dominicans serve for feeding the Lord's people"²³. Here we can see that Philip is aware of the calling of the Preachers to serve the spiritual needs of the laity by teaching and example. Himself a secular cleric, his sympathetic recognition of this calling as early as the time of the Dominicans' first appearance in Paris must be deemed impressive²⁴.

Additionally he recognized and lauded the Dominicans' principle of despising property. A third mention of the Order of Preachers in

²² Lerner, "Weltklerus", 99-100.

²³ Ed. Brescia, f. 209^v (serm 130): "Qui sunt animalia deserti nisi simplices populi? Qui sunt speciosa deserti nisi Predicatorum Ordo? Sicut ergo speciosa deserti cedunt [sic MSS; ed. Brescia: cadunt] ad animalium nutrimentum, ita eorum doctrina et vita ad pascendum Dei populum". The passage was previously noticed by Schneyer, *Sittenkritik*, 67.

²⁴ For an enthusiastic response to the Dominicans in Spain by the canon of León, Lucas of Tuy, datable to 1234, see R. E. Lerner and Chr. Morerod, "The Vision of 'John, Hermit of the Asturias'", *Traditio*, 61(2006), 196-225.

his distinctions complements the one with which I began inasmuch as it refers to the question of how the Dominicans will sustain themselves. Moreover it firms up a *terminus post quem*, for Philip tells here of how the friars resist goods that are pressed upon them, and the Dominicans of Paris first formally renounced *possessiones* late in 1219²⁵. Expressing the view that temporal goods resemble glue because they "glue up the wings of contemplation and prevent flight", he turns to the Dominican case: "whence if someone were to say to the brothers of the Preaching Order 'it would be good for you to have lands, and vineyards, and suchlike for sustenance', one of them answers: 'do not place among us glue and snares by which we are caught'"²⁶.

Initially it seems unexpected for Philip to offer "contemplation" as a special Dominican attribute since he had already considered the Dominicans as a preaching order in practice as well as in name. And indeed, as I have noted, he would later compare the Dominicans to Peter and the Franciscans to John the Evangelist, evidently taking the former to be the "actives" and the latter the "contemplatives"²⁷. Yet his meaning becomes clearer in a passage which perhaps goes the furthest in singling out the Dominican Order for praise. At a point where he cites Numbers 24: 5, "How goodly are thy tabernacles, O Jacob, and thy tents, O Israel", he reads "tabernacles" as "all the cloistered", and "tents" as "castles of the Order of Preachers". Implicitly the comparison makes the Dominicans superior to all the older orders because "Jacob" was renamed "Israel" in Genesis (35:9) as a special grace. (Philip's criticism elsewhere of "white monks", canons regular, and "black monks" reaffirms the sense that he prefers the Dominicans over all the other orders²⁸.) He then goes on to propose that the

²⁵ I owe this information to Fr. Simon Tugwell. See further, Tugwell, "Notes on the Life of St Dominic", AFP, 65(1995) 5-169, here 48-53.

²⁶ Ed. Brescia, f. 245^r (serm. 152): "Adherere mundo non est bonum, quia bona temporalia sunt quasi viscus et glutinum, quibus penne contemplativorum et spiritualium inviscantur et volare non possunt. Unde cum quidam diceret fratribus de Ordine Predicatorum: 'bonum esset vos habere terras et vineas et homini, ad sustentationem', respondit quidam ex eis: 'Nolite coram nobis ponere viscum et laqueos quibus capiamur'". It is worth noting that the praise here of the Preaching Order was not invariably gratifying to readers, for although it is present in all of the manuscripts I have used, except one (BN 5) that does not contain the sermon, in M 1 (provenance: Grands Augustins, Paris) the words "fratribus Ordinis Predicatorum" are cancelled by a horizontal line.

²⁷ See n. 19.

²⁸ Ed. Brescia, f. 203^r (serm. 127).

Dominicans “are always in contemplation”, and makes his meaning clear when he states that they thus are like wooded valleys and watered gardens near rivers, the “rivers” being Holy Scripture. In other words, he is not referring here to visionary contemplatives in the mode of John the Evangelist, but rather scriptural contemplatives, presumably thinking of the Dominicans’ commitment to scriptural study²⁹.

A final mention of Dominicans³⁰ appears at the end of a passage concerning “dogs”. After pursuing the possibility of expositing dogs *in malo* (they urinate and defecate unashamedly in public, as do sinners), Philip turns to interpretation *in bono* and states in reference to Psalm 58:7: “Of the Order of Preachers it may be said: *they will be converted in the evening*, for now is the evening of the world; and *they will be reputed as dogs* [Ps. 58:7], namely, converting some; and *they go around the city* [Ps. 58:7], that is, preaching in the world”³¹. Assuming that Philip wrote this in the early 1220s he may have been the first to employ the implicit word play, *Domini canes*³². Of greater interest is the relationship between the passage and one in the *postills* on Scripture composed by the Parisian Dominican team under the direction of Hugh of St. Cher in the 1230s. Although it has been

²⁹ Ed. Brescia, f. 193^v (serm. 121): “Tabernacula Iacob videntur omnium claustralium, Tentoria Israel videntur castra Ordinis Predicatorum. Ipsi enim sunt Israel, quia semper in contemplatione. Sunt valles nemorose et irrigui horti iuxta fluentia, *iuxta fluentia*, scilicet sacre scripture”. In MS M 1, f. 101^{ra} the meaning is clearer since “sicut valles. . .” appears in place of “Sunt valles. . .”. (Unfortunately I do not have other manuscript readings of this passage at my disposal). I am grateful to Martin Morard for bringing the passage to my attention.

³⁰ I exclude the reference (ed. Brescia, f. 203^r) to “canonici regulares habentes simul indumentum partim album et partim nigrum” as applying to the Dominicans because of the author’s custom of referring to the new order as *Ordo Predicatorum*. Instead one can identify the “regular canons” in question as those of the congregation of Saint Victor. On the black and white habits of the Victorines, see G. Rocca, ed., *La sostanza dell’effimero: Gli abiti degli Ordini religiosi in Occidente*, Rome 2000, 238-39.

³¹ Ed. Brescia, f. 190^r (serm. 119): “De Ordine Predicatorum potest legi [sic MSS; ed. Brescia: dici]: *Convertentur ad vesperam*, quia modo est vespera mundi; *et famem patientur ut canes*, famem, scilicet convertendi aliquos; *et circuibunt civitatem*, id est mundum predicando”. The Vulgate text Philip uses is: *Convertentur ad vesperam, et famem patientur ut canes, et circuibunt civitatem*. (The Vulgate issued by Pope Sixtus V has a very different reading.)

³² Substantial evidence has accumulated to show that Pierre Mandonnet was mistaken in arguing that the hounds in the refectory fresco of Santa Maria Novella, Florence, were not intended as a visual pun on the Dominicans (*Domini canes*). See my “Ornithological Propaganda: The Fourteenth-Century Denigration of Dominicans”, in M. Kaufhold, ed., *Politische Reflexion in der Welt des späten Mittelalters, Essays in Honour of Jürgen Miethke*, Leiden 2004, 171-92, here 171, n. 1.

maintained that this team did not draw on Philip's work on the Psalms³³, a "Hugh" passage in fact identifies the dogs of Ps. 58:7 as the Order of Preachers preaching at the end of the world, exactly as does Philip³⁴. Without knowing the early dating for Philip's distinctions, it would have been difficult to have been certain which of the two passages came first. Now, however, it is sufficiently clear that the Dominicans of St. Jacques possessed a copy of Philip's distinctions on the Psalms as a reference work and were happy to employ its flattering reference to their own order.

The borrowing interrelates with other evidence. For one, it has never been noticed in this regard that Philip was present in person in the convent of St. Jacques at least once: namely on a Christmas of uncertain date when he delivered a University sermon to the assembled scholars³⁵. Moreover, Jean-Pierre Torrell already observed in 1977 that Hugh of St. Cher's question, *De prophetia*, borrows from Philip the Chancellor's *Summa de bono*, and recently it has been noticed that Hugh's question *De anima* draws from the same source³⁶. In both cases Hugh was drawing on Philip's *Summa* while the author was alive: the *Summa* is roughly datable to shortly before 1226 and Hugh's questions to 1230. It is not clear whether the Dominican exegetical team at St. Jacques was drawing on Philip's treatment of the Psalms while he was alive, for the dating of "Hugh of St. Cher's" postill on the Psalms cannot be limited with confidence to narrower termini than between 1233 and 1239³⁷. (Philip died in 1236.) Yet even if the Dominican work came shortly after Philip's death, we still have evidence of mutual respect in contrast to Thomas of Cantimpré's later libel that the Chancellor and the Dominicans were bitterly at odds before the death of the former. Above all, in terms of the larger picture, the data support Riccardo Quinto's proposal that we should

³³ M. Morard, "Hugues de Saint-Cher, commentateur des Psaumes", in L.-J. Bataillon et. al., ed., *Hugues de Saint-Cher (†1263): Bibliste et théologien*, Turnhout 2004, 101-51, at 125.

³⁴ For the passage in "Hugh", see R. E. Lerner, "The Vocation of the Friars Preacher: Hugh of St. Cher between Peter the Chanter and Albert the Great", in Bataillon et. al., *Hugues*, 215-31, here 230-31.

³⁵ Schneyer, *Repertorium*, (as n.18) 4: 826: "Scholaribus in latino apud S. Jacobum".

³⁶ J.-P. Torrell, *Théorie de la prophétie et philosophie de la connaissance aux environs de 1230: la contribution d'Hugues de Saint-Cher*, Louvain 1977, 73-87; M. Bienak, "Filippo il Cancelliere e Ugo di Saint-Cher sull'anima umana", in G. Bertuzzi, ed., *L'origine dell'Ordine dei Predicatori e l'Università di Bologna*, Bologna 2006, 105-17.

³⁷ Morard, "Hugues de Saint-Cher", 150.

recognize a continuity between the Parisian secular theological masters and the early Dominican school³⁸.

The early dating of Philip's distinctions to c. 1220 is of value for scholars in other areas. Given this dating, it is now apparent that it contains the earliest known French use of the term *beghuini*, that is, male beguines. According to Philip, these suspicious persons are said to come together in "conclaves" (behind locked doors) and conventicles with the "little women, laden with sin", excoriated by Paul in his second epistle to Timothy³⁹. Inasmuch as another roughly contemporary use of the same term appears in a chronicle of Cologne to apply to the Amaurian heretics who were apprehended in Paris in 1210⁴⁰, Philip's passage offers resonance for the early association of supposed antinomian heresy with illicit sexuality.

Noteworthy for intellectual historians is a passage in which Philip criticizes the use of "sophismatic questions" in the Parisian arts school. As he complains, "nowadays disputing on questions is tantamount to disputing on sophisms". Worse, the artists "mix in natural philosophy with logic although such is neither pure logic nor even less theology"⁴¹. Here, on the one hand is a traditional conservative criticism of logic-chopping (sophismatic questions) comparable to Stephen of Tournai's invective against the new Parisian school techniques of roughly twenty years earlier⁴², but on the other a recognition of the emergent role of natural philosophy in the arts

³⁸ R. Quinto, "La teologia dei maestri secolari di Parigi e la primitiva scuola Domenicana" in Bertuzzi, *L'origine*, 81-104.

³⁹ Ed. Brescia, f. 244^v (serm. 151): "Unde periculosa est quorundam religio qui in conclave cum mulierculis conveniunt et colloquuntur, sicut dicuntur facere Beghuini et Bagarbi". The term "bargarbi" also appears in the Parisian edition of 1523 (or 1533?), but, as I already noted in "Weltklerus und religiöse Bewegung" (as n.1), 105, n. 30, it appears to have been added arbitrarily by the early-modern printer.

⁴⁰ H. Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages*, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1995; originally *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, Berlin 1935, 161.

⁴¹ Ed. Brescia, f. 50^v (serm. XXVIII): "In tantum enim miscent sophismatibus questiones artiste quod iam disputare de questione est disputare de sophismate. Ita miscetur logica naturalibus quod iam nulla pure logica est disputatio nec etiam theologica". The criticism of the sophisms among the artists bears comparison to Philip's poetic satire *De artium conditione*, and hence is perhaps further evidence of the fact that the poet and the preacher were one and the same. For *De artium conditione*, see G. M. Dreves, *Analecta hymnica medii aevi: 21 Lieder und Motetten*, Leipzig 1895, 161, #230. On Philip the Chancellor's genuine authorship of similar poems that went under his name, H. Schüppert, *Kirchenkritik in der lateinischen Lyrik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, München 1972, 44-45.

⁴² See C. St. Jaeger, "Pessimism in the Twelfth Century 'Renaissance'", *Speculum*, 78(2003), 1151-83, at 1172.

school and its threat of impinging on theology that would become a major issue in the second half of the thirteenth century.

Nevertheless, Philip was still an intellectual pathfinder, especially in his fondness for Aristotle and in his accomplishments in his treatise on moral theology, the *Summa de bono*, which had "a profound impact" on Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas⁴³. It has long been recognized that Philip made heavy use of Aristotle (including the natural works banned for teaching in Paris 1210 and 1215), as well as even Arabic philosophers including Averroës, in his *Summa de Bono*⁴⁴. But now we can observe his fondness for Aristotle in the earlier distinctions on the Psalms. Perhaps not surprisingly, since this is a homiletic work, the vast bulk of his citations here (I count at least fourteen instances) come from what he calls Aristotle's *Liber de natura animalium*. (The generic term could mean one of several parts of the larger work.) His use of Aristotle's natural history is to aid him draw moralities regarding a wide variety of animals. Although this use is sententious, Philip was yet a pathfinder in drawing on books of the natural history, and may indeed have been the earliest Parisian to have done so, for according to a standard reference work they only became available in Latin in a translation by Michael Scot "by 1220"⁴⁵.

More intriguing still are four citations from Aristotle's *Ethics*⁴⁶. A comparison here with the work of the exegetical team of Hugh of St. Cher is illuminating, for those Dominicans seem never to have

⁴³ On the latter point I quote R. E. Houser, *The Cardinal Virtues: Aquinas, Albert, and Philip the Chancellor*, Toronto 2004, 42-43.

⁴⁴ See e.g., E. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, New York 1955, 251: "The use he [Philip] makes of Aristotle and the Arabian philosophers clearly shows that, from that moment, a theologian could no longer ignore their writings". See further now for Philip's use of Aristotle, whom he calls "*summus philosophus*", in the *Summa de bono*, ed. Wicki, 45*-47*.

⁴⁵ B. G. Dod, "Aristoteles latinus", in N. Kretzman et al., edd., *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1982, at 48.

⁴⁶ Three of the four passages are: ed. Brescia, f. 70^r (serm. 41): "Et in Ethicis narrat Aristo. leccatorem quendam dixisse, utinam haberem collum gruis etc." (= III, 10: 1118^a34-1118^b1); ed. Brescia, f. 278^r (serm. 178): "Sunt enim secundum Aristotelem connaturales et contemporanee nobis passiones"; ed. Brescia, f. 361^r (serm. 247): "Primus exercitus motus carnales, qui bene gentes dicuntur, quia nobiscum genti sicut in Ethicis dicitur; quoniam connaturales et contemporanee vite sunt he passiones" (cf. II, 3: 1104^b35-1105^a2). These citations follow the so-called *Ethica Vetus*, but do not quote from them exactly. See *Aristoteles latinus*, (XXVI, 1-3): *Ethica Nicomachea*, fasc. 2: *Translatio antiquissima libr. II-III sive 'Ethica Vetus'*, ed. R. A. Gauthier, Leiden 1972, 45-46 (18a30-18b1); 9 (o5a2). (Philip was so smitten with the quotation on the

cited Aristotle in their vast set of *postills* on Scripture, even though they worked in the very convent of St. Jacques that would be a home for Aristotelian studies immediately afterwards. Although Philip appropriated from the *Ethics* only anodyne moralistic passages that were fitting for Christian homiletics, it remains striking that he deemed the pagan moral treatise, of which he was among the earliest of Parisians to cite, suitable for mentioning by name in such a context, especially since he was writing within a few years of Robert of Courson's ban on the public reading of Aristotle's metaphysics and works of natural philosophy in the Parisian arts school⁴⁷. Noteworthy too is the fact that while three of his four citations are from the second and third books of the *Ethics*, and hence must derive from the *Ethica vetus*, the early version containing only books two and three, the fourth is from book four. That last citation is remarkable because whereas the *Ethica vetus* is known to have been available as of the later twelfth century, the citation of book four appears to make it one of the earliest known examples in the Latin West⁴⁸.

In short, it appears to me that the homiletic work of Philip the Chancellor remains a wide-open field of study, or perhaps one might say a "wooded valley". In this piece I hope to have provided a useful chronological basis for ordering as well as examples that display why this work repays close attention.

"passions" from *Ethics* II, 3, that he cited it twice again in his *Summa de Bono*: see ed. Wicki, 796, 934.) The fourth citation from the *Ethics* is ed. Brescia, f. 299^v (serm. 195): "iuxta verbum Aristotelis: 'omnis ambitiosus liberalis'", which Fr. Simon Tugwell has pointed out to me must come from *Ethics* IV, 2: 1122a28-29).

⁴⁷ H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, edd., *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*, 1, Paris 1889, #20, pp. 78-79.

⁴⁸ Cf. Dod, "Aristoteles latinus", 49: "[E]arly in the thirteenth century the whole of the *Ethics* was translated. Of this translation, however, only Book I, known as the '*Ethica nova*', became known and circulated, and the existence of a complete translation has been assumed from a few surviving fragments from the other books". Philip's *Summa de bono* contains a substantial number of quotations from Books II and III, as well as a few from Book I and two from Book VI, but none from Book IV.