archa verbi
Subsidia 24

Florian Wöller • Ueli Zahnd (eds.)

Dominican Culture, Dominican Theology

The Order of Preachers and Its Spheres of Action (1215 – ca. 1600)

Aschendorff Verlag

Archa Verbi
Subsidia, Vol. 24

Archa Verbi

Yearbook for the Study of
Medieval Theology

Subsidia
24

Florian Wöller • Ueli Zahnd (eds.)

Dominican Culture, Dominican Theology

The Order of Preachers and Its Spheres of Action (1215 – ca. 1600)

Aschendorff Verlag

Archa Verbi
Annuarium Societatis Internationalis
pro Studiis Theologiae Medii Aevi promovendis

Annuaire de la Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Théologie Médiévale
Annuario della Società Internazionale per lo Studio della Teologia Medievale
Anuario de la Sociedad Internacional para los Estudios de la Teología Medieval
Jahrbuch der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Theologische Mediävistik
Yearbook of the International Society for the Study of Medieval Theology

Subsidia

iussu Societatis edendum curaverunt
Jan C. Klok
Volker Leppin
Ulli Roth

curator
Jan C. Klok

Annemarie Pilarski
Ulrike Treusch
directorium Societatis

Krijn Pansters
praeses Societatis

Printed with support from
CARLSBERG FOUNDATION

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY), which means that the text may be used, provided credit is given to the author.
For details go to http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
Creative Commons license terms for re-use do not apply to any content (such as graphs, figures, photos, excerpts, etc.) not original to the Open Access publication and further permission may be required from the rights holder.



1. Auflage 2025

© 2025 The editors and authors. A publication by Aschendorff Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, Münster
This book is part of the Aschendorff Verlag Open Access program.

Aschendorff Verlag GmbH & Co. KG
Soester Straße 13
D-48155 Münster
buchverlag@aschendorff-buchverlag.de
www.aschendorff-buchverlag.de

ISSN 1865–2964
ISBN 978-3-402-10333-3 (Print)
ISBN 978-3-402-10334-0 (ePDF)
https://doi.org/10.17438/978-3-402-22688-9

Table of Contents

Preface 9

List of Figures 11

1. Florian Wöller/Ueli Zahnd
Dominican Culture, Dominican Theology: Introduction 13

I. Dominican Identities and Cultures of Expertise

2. Jan-Hendryk de Boer
Giving Advice to the Pope
Dominicans as Experts During the Pontificate of Pope John XXII 23

3. Marcel Bubert
Black Friars as Heresy Experts
Dominican Identities and Inquisitorial Expert Culture
in Late Medieval France and Aragon 43

4. Isabel Iribarren
The Monzón Affair (1387–1403) and the Construction
of a Dominican Thomist Identity 59

5. Ulrike Treusch
The Grabow Case
An Example of Dominican Identity at the Council of Constance 79

II. Preaching and Liturgy

6. Christian Troelsgård
Mnemonic Verse, Theology, and Pedagogy
in Augustinus de Dacia's († 1285) *Rotulus pugillaris* 93

7. Carol J. Williams
Guy of Saint-Denis and Jerome of Moravia
on the Modally Sequential Office 109

8. Alberto Ferreiro
In Vigilia Sancti Iohannis Babtiste
St Vicent Ferrer on the Vigil of John the Baptist in a Catalán Sermon 123

9. Kristin Hoefener
Liturgical Chant and Devotional Practices
in Late Medieval Dominican Nunneries 139

III. Memory and Material Cultures

10. Marika Räsänen
Rethinking Relic Devotion in Medieval Dominican Culture 161

11. Kirsten Schut
Lay Death and Burial in Dominican Habits 181

12. Christian Etheridge
The Iconography of Dominican Saints Found on the
Claus Berg Altarpiece Made for the Priory of St Nicholas
in Aarhus, Denmark 197

IV. Dionysian Theology

13. J. Cornelia Linde
Pseudo-Dionysian Thought in Early Dominican Theology
The Concept of *Ordo* in Guerric of St Quentin's *In Lamentationes* 225

14. Samuel Baudinette
Between Philosophical and Christian Contemplation
The Role of Dionysius in the Writings of Albert the Great 241

15. Constant J. Mews
Dionysius, *Theologia*, and Thomas's Final *Summa* 265

V. Albert the Great and the Plurality of Dominican Thought

16. Amalia Cerrito
Faith and Natural Philosophy in Albert the Great's Account
of the *generatio Christi* 283

17. Marco Vorcelli
The Book of Job Through the Lens of the *Nicomachean Ethics*
Aristotelian Fortitude and Virtuousness of Job's Lamentation
in Albert the Great's Commentary on Job 6:11–12 297

18. Paul D. Hellmeier
Neo-Platonic Ways and Levels of Knowledge in the Interpretation
of Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas and Berthold of Moosburg 311

VI. Dominicans on Prayer

19. Jonathan Reinert
Thomas Aquinas on Petitionary Prayer and Divine Providence 327

20. Anja Bork
Meister Eckhart on Petitionary Prayer and the Relationship between God and Human 345

21. Andreas Zecherle
Johannes Tauler on Petitionary Prayer
An Attempt at Bridging the Gap Between Ecclesiastical Tradition and Mystical Thought 359

VII. Dominicans and the 'Others'

22. Johnny Grandjean Gøgsig Jakobsen
The Dominicans and 'the Others'
The Friars Preachers as Vanguard Against Pagans, Orthodox, Jews, Muslims, and Heretics. The Case of the Baltic Sea Region 373

23. Cheryl Midson
The Dominican Order and Eastern Christianity in the Thirteenth Century 395

24. Volker Leppin
Just a Quarrel of Monks?
Dominicans, Augustinians and the Early Reformation 409

List of Contributors 425

Index of Names 427

Index of Places 432

Index of Subjects 435

Giving Advice to the Pope
Dominicans as Experts During the Pontificate of Pope John XXII

Jan-Hendryk de Boer

The Dominicans and John XXII, who reigned in Avignon from 1316 to 1334, shared a close relationship.[1] Studies have often underlined this connection.[2] The fact that the *lector* teaching theology at the Curia was usually a Dominican provides primary evidence for the order's noteworthy significance for the Avignon papacy. The office of *magister curiae*, which was called *magister sacri palatii* from 1343 onwards, was conferred by the pope himself. Under John XXII, it was held exclusively by Dominicans: Durandus of Saint-Pourçain (1313–1317), Guillaume de Laudun (1317–1321), Dominique Grima (1321–1326), Pierre de Piret (1326), and Armand de Belvézer (1326–1334).[3] The fact that the majority of those promoted by John XXII came from the southern part of France corresponds to his preference for southern Frenchmen in the granting of other offices as well.[4] Dominicans were also regularly called upon by John XXII as experts and advisors: as inquisitors, Dominicans like Bernard Gui collaborated with the pope in fighting heresies.[5] The pope often turned to Dominicans when expert opinions were needed on theological and legal disputes. He would turn to them when potentially erroneous theses taught by bachelors or masters at the universities needed to be inspected. Dominicans were also repeatedly called upon for diplomatic missions. The close relationship between John XXII and the Dominican Order culminated in the canonization of Thomas Aquinas in 1323, when the pope quickly embraced the order's desire to give their great theologian canonical status. Accordingly, the canonization process was carried out unswervingly and swiftly.[6]

1 I am very grateful to Katalin Morgan and Olav Heinemann for their linguistic advice.

2 Guillemain, Bernard: "Les Dominicains et la Papauté d'Avignon", in *L'ordre des Prêcheurs et son histoire en France méridionale* (Cahiers de Fanjeaux 36), Toulouse 2001, pp. 307–318; Piron, Sylvain: "Avignon sous Jean XXII, l'Eldorado des théologiens", in ed. Michelle Fournié: *Jean XXII et le Midi* (Cahiers de Fanjeaux 45), Toulouse 2012, pp. 357–391.

3 Guillemain, Bernard: *La cour pontificale d'Avignon (1309–1376). Étude d'une société*, Paris ²1966, pp. 382–391; *id.* 2001, p. 308.

4 Guillemain ²1966, pp. 185, 187–188, 284–287, 315, 319, 329–330, 344.

5 Cf. Maier, Anneliese: "Eine Verfügung Johanns XXII. über die Zuständigkeit der Inquisition für Zauberprozesse", in *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 32 (1952), pp. 226–246; Boureau, Alain: "Satan hérétique. L'institution judiciaire de la démonologie sous Jean XXII", in *Médiévales* 44 (2003), pp. 17–46; *id.*: *Le pape et les sorciers. Une consultation de Jean XXII sur la magie en 1320 (manuscript B.A.V. Borghese 348)*, Rome 2004; Caldwell Ames, Christine: *Righteous Persecution. Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages*, Philadelphia 2009, pp. 124–133.

6 Cf. Torrell, Jean-Pierre: *Magister Thomas. Leben und Werk des Thomas von Aquin*, Fribourg

doi.org/10.17438/978-3-402-22690-2

Based on these facts, many researchers have drawn a picture of an intimate relationship between the first Avignon pope and the Dominican Order. By contrast, I shall show in this article that although the pope and the Order cooperated for a long time, their relationship should be understood as being ambivalent and variable. In order to structure the following reflections, it seems useful to take a look at a book—not a historical or theological one, however, but a novel.

Julian Barnes's novel *Talking It Over* was published in 1991.[7] It tells the story of a love triangle between Stuart, an unassuming banker, his best friend Oliver, an intellectual who earns his living as an English teacher, and Gillian, a restorer of paintings. Barnes does not use an authorial voice; instead, he lets his three protagonists each tell their part of the story, assisted by some minor characters. Thus, from three first-person perspectives, the story of how Gillian and Stuart come together and get married unfolds, and with this the problems start to become apparent. At the wedding, Oliver falls in love with Gillian, who is soon attracted to him in turn. The marriage with Stuart fails, and instead, Gillian and Oliver get married, which plunges Stuart into deep despair. As in many of Barnes's novels, *Talking It Over* addresses the unreliability of the narrators' accounts and their memories. Stuart, Gillian, and Oliver remember certain aspects of events that are relevant to them. In the course of the novel, the actions and motives of each character become increasingly puzzling to the others. When they speculate about the others' motives, they are quite often mistaken, as is revealed by every change of the narrative voice. Relationships prove difficult because those involved are continually talking to each other and to others and thereby gradually confuse the seemingly clear constellations. Communicating, while momentarily solving concrete problems, does not create lasting unambiguity for Barnes, but rather always generates new uncertainty.

According to these general observations, the novel allows for three ways of reading and interpreting it: it can be read in relation to the changing relations of the characters to each other; with regard to the limited and biased perspective of the actors on the events; or as a text about communication and how feelings are constructed in communicative processes. The following reflections analyze the relationship between the papacy and the Dominicans under John XXII on the basis of these three modes of understanding, borrowed from Barnes.

1. Relations

Barnes's novel is a story of relationships. First, we learn about the close friendship that Stuart and Oliver have had since their school days. We read their retrospective stories of how Stuart, the clumsy one, and Gillian, who is rather reserved, find their way to each other. Everything is complicated by Oliver, who unexpectedly falls in love with Gillian; his confession of love for her drives a wedge between Gillian and Stuart. At first and rather unwillingly, he soon exploits the

1995, pp. 330–337; Füllenbach, Elias H.: "Kanonisation", in ed. Volker Leppin: *Thomas Handbuch*, Tübingen 2016, pp. 426–430.

[7] Barnes, Julian: *Talking It Over*, London 1991.

estrangement between Stuart and Gillian for his own purposes. Gillian, for her part, begins to love Oliver, yet Stuart still loves Gillian, resulting in the break-up of the friendship between Oliver and Stuart. After a certain time, the characters do not even try to mend their relationships. In the end, it is Gillian who fakes a quarrel with Oliver and thus calms Stuart, who is secretly watching her. She thereby leads him to conclude that it is not he who failed, but rather that relationships are fundamentally difficult. How does this help to understand the history of the relationship between John XXII and the Dominicans?

Similar relationship processes can be seen in the close cooperation that developed quite quickly between the Avignon papacy and the Dominicans. The fact that the new pope was elected on August 7, 1316, in the Dominican monastery at Lyon can be interpreted as an omen of this happy phase of the relationship. In the first years of his pontificate, John XXII had fierce disputes with the Franciscans: at first, he supported the Order in its internal struggle against the Spirituals, but by the 1320s he had fallen out with his former allies.[8] Being a qualified jurist himself, the pope rejected the Franciscan understanding of poverty as it had been recognized by Nicholas III in the bull *Exiit qui seminat*. Likewise, he did not accept the thesis of the radical poverty of Christ and the disciples, nor did he find the doctrine of the *simplex usus facti* plausible. However, the Franciscans had tried to underpin their understanding of how to practice a life of poverty based precisely on this conception. The fact that the pope rejected his predecessor's solution in *Ad conditorem*, *Cum inter nonnullos* and *Quia quorundam mentes*[9] was therefore a fundamental threat to the way the Franciscan Order had understood itself and its function.

Not unexpectedly, Dominican friars supported the pope in his actions against their rivals, the Franciscans. In 1318, the inquisitor Michel Lemoine sought the opinion of theologians and jurists present in Avignon on how to proceed against 25 Franciscan Spirituals imprisoned in Marseille who had refused to accept the order's understanding of poverty.[10] Among those who drew up a statement were the Dominicans Bérenger de Landorre, the former Master General, Guillaume de Laudun, the *magister sacri palatii*, and the theologian Durandus of Saint-Pourçain. They agreed with their colleagues that the Spiritu-

[8] Cf. Brunner, Melanie: *Pope John XXII and the Franciscan Ideal of Absolute Poverty* (PhD dissertation), Leeds 2006; Miethke, Jürgen: "Der 'theoretische Armutstreit' im 14. Jahrhundert. Papst und Franziskanerorden im Konflikt um die Armut", in ed. Heinz-Dieter Heimann: *Gelobte Armut. Armutskonzepte der franziskanischen Ordensfamilie vom Mittelalter bis in die Gegenwart*, Paderborn 2012, pp. 241–283; Horst, Ulrich: *Evangelische Armut und päpstliches Lehramt. Minoritentheologen im Konflikt mit Papst Johannes XXII. (1316–34)* (Münchener Kirchenhistorische Studien 8), Stuttgart 1996.

[9] Cf. *Bullarium Franciscanum sive Romanorum Pontificum constitutiones, epistolae, diplomata tribus ordinibus Minorum, Clarissarum [...] concessa, vol. V: Benedicti XI, Clementis V, Ioannis XXII monumenta*, ed. Konrad Eubel, Rome 1898, no. 486, pp. 233–246; no. 518, pp. 256–259; no. 554, pp. 271–280.

[10] For the context, see Burr, David: *The Spiritual Franciscans. From Protest to Persecution in the Century after Saint Francis*, University Park PA 2003, pp. 181–212; Nold, Patrick: "Pope John XXII, the Franciscan Order and its 'Rule'", in ed. Michael J. P. Robson: *The Cambridge Companion to Francis of Assisi* (Cambridge Companions to Religion), Cambridge 2012, pp. 258–272.

als should not insist on their own interpretation of the prescriptions of the rule of St. Francis. Moreover, they argued that the pope was entitled to determine the proper understanding of the rule as he had done in *Quorundam exigit* in 1317.[11] John not only resented what he saw as a wrong practice, but even more so, he also rejected the legal and theological assumptions that were intended to justify it. Therefore, the pope ordered an examination of Peter John Olivi's commentary on the Apocalypse, a pivotal text for the Spirituals.[12] He first entrusted the task of examining the text to two men, the Dominican Pierre de la Palud, a Dominican and the Carmelite Guido Terreni, a Carmelite, with the task of examining the text. Cardinal Niccolò Alberti da Prato was responsible for further investigation. Based on this initiative, a commission comprising eight theologians was set up.[13] Among its members were two Dominicans, Guillaume de Laudun and Pierre de la Palud.[14] The theologians passed a negative judgment on the commentary in their *Littera magistrorum*.[15] Although this statement was read at a public consistory in 1319 and orally approved by the pope, John XXII refrained from officially condemning the work at this time, thus enabling the responsible inquisitors to set the criteria for charges of heresy. In 1322, he explicitly reserved the verdict on Olivi's commentary for himself, but without reaching a decision.[16] It was only after carefully studying the commentary anew that he decided to condemn it in 1326.[17]

After the victory over the Spirituals, the pope's focus shifted; now the Order, headed by general minister Michael of Cesena, found itself suddenly under attack. In 1322, the pope summoned numerous theologians to provide statements on the *usus pauper*. These statements were meant to be used during deliberations in the consistory in February and March of that year. After an intense but arguably biased discussion, the pope lifted Nicholas III's ban on discussing and

[11] *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, no. 760, ed. Heinrich Denifle, 4 vols., Paris 1889–1897, vol. 2, pp. 215–217.

[12] Burr, David: *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom. A Reading of the Apocalypse Commentary* (Middle Ages series), Philadelphia 1993.

[13] This was mentioned in several chronicles; *Prima vita Joannis XXII auctore Joanne canonico Sancti Victoris Parisiensis*, eds. Guillaume Mollat/Etienne Baluze: *Vitae Paparum Avenionensium, hoc est historia pontificium romanorum qui in Gallia sederunt ab anno Christi MCCCV usque ad annum MCCCXIV*, 4 vols., Paris 1914–1927, vol. 1, p. 118; *Secunda vita Joannis XXII, ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 142; *Tertia vita Joannis XXII, ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 166.

[14] Koch, Josef: "Der Prozess gegen die Postille Olivis zur Apokalypse", in *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 5 (1933), pp. 302–315; Piron 2012, p. 345.

[15] Cf. *Miscellanea novo ordine digesta et non paucis ineditis monumentis opportunisque animadversionibus aucta*, eds. Etienne Baluze/Giovanni D. Mansi, 4 vols., Paris 1761–1764, vol. 2, pp. 258–270.

[16] *Bullarium Franciscanum*, ed. Eubel, no. 483, p. 233.

[17] During the trial, an unknown theologian wrote a second report on Olivi's *Lectura in Apocalipsim*. It was annotated by the pope himself (MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 3381A). Nold argues that these annotations were probably written in the last phase of the trial between 1324 and 1326; Nold, Patrick: "New Annotations of Pope John XXII and the Process against Peter of John Olivi's 'Lectura super Apocalipsim'. The Marginalia of MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A", in *Oliviana* 4 (2012), http://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/521.

commenting on the rule of St. Francis with *Quia nonnumquam*.[18] The way leading up to this decision, fatal from the Franciscans' point of view, had been paved by expert opinions, provided by no less than eight Dominicans: Augustin Kažotić, Bérenger de Landorre, Dominique Grima, Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, Giacomo da Fusignano, Giovanni di Napoli, Hervaeus Natalis and Raymond Béquin.[19] As was to be expected, they criticized the Franciscans' understanding of poverty and supported the pope's position.

Dominican friars were also involved in other investigations carried out in Avignon against men of learning. For example, the secular cleric Jean de Pouilly was summoned to Avignon in 1318 after criticizing the privileges to hear confessions granted by Benedict XI to the mendicants.[20] At issue was the eventuality of mendicants hearing confessions of the faithful without the consent of their respective parish priests. At the university of Paris, Jean de Pouilly had aroused great opposition among the mendicants by defending theses rejecting these privileges.[21] This had caused Pierre de la Palud to oppose him publicly on several occasions, for example in the fourth question of his Quodlibet. There, the Dominican discussed the question of whether a bishop might give permission for someone to hear confessions without the consent of their parish priest.[22] Dominican and Franciscan experts drew up a first list of errors in 1318, which included fifteen articles.[23] For the Dominicans, Pierre de la Palud, now a kind of expert in dealing with Jean's theses, and Hervaeus Natalis, the Master General, participated in the examination.[24] In 1319 the pope set up a commission in Avignon, headed by the cardinals Guillelmus de Testa and Giacomo

[18] Tarrant, Jacqueline ed.: *Extrauagantes Iohannis XXII* (Monumenta Iuris Canonici, Series B 6), Vatican City 1983, pp. 214–221 (nos. XXII and XXIV).

[19] MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3740; excerpts are edited in Duval-Arnould, Louis: "Les conseils remis à Jean XXII sur le problème de la pauvreté du Christ et des apôtres (ms. Vat. lat. 3740)", in *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae*, vol. III (Studi e testi 333), Vatican City 1989, pp. 121–201; for the statement of Durandus, see Miethke, Jürgen: "Das Votum *De paupertate Christi et apostolorum* des Durandus von Sancto Porciano im Theoretischen Armutsstreit. Eine dominikanische Position in der Diskussion um die franziskanische Armut (1322/3)", in eds. Stuart Jenks/Jürgen Sarnowsky/Marie-Luise Laudage: *Vera lex historiae. Studien zu mittelalterlichen Quellen. Festschrift für Dietrich Kurze zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 1. Januar 1993*, Cologne/Weimar/Vienna 1993, pp. 149–196.

[20] *Chartularium*, no. 764, ed. Denifle, vol. 2, pp. 220–221.

[21] Koch, Josef: "Der Prozess gegen den Magister Johannes de Polliaco und seine Vorgeschichte (1312–1321)", in *id.*: *Kleine Schriften* (Storia e letteratura 127/128), Rome 1973, pp. 387–422.

[22] MS Toulouse, Bibliothèque municipale, Ms. 744, ff. 84v–98v; cf. Dunbabin, Jean: *A Hound of God. Pierre de La Palud and the Fourteenth Century Church*, Oxford 1991, pp. 56–67; Miethke, Jürgen: *Politiktheorie im Mittelalter. Von Thomas von Aquin bis Wilhelm von Ockham* (UTB 3059), Tübingen 2008, pp. 139–146; Tierney, Brian: *Origins of Papal Infallibility, 1150–1350. A Study on the Concepts of Infallibility, Sovereignty and Tradition in the Middle Ages* (Studies in the History of Christian Thought 6), Leiden [2]1988, pp. 149–152.

[23] The list is edited in Koch 1973, pp. 391–393.

[24] MS Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 2168, ff. 1r–12r (*Iudicium contra Iohannem de Poliaco*).

Stefaneschi, which compiled a second list with nine erroneous articles.[25] Jean de Pouilly drafted two written responses to the allegations without success. Not least responsible for this was Pierre de la Palud, who wrote a rebuttal to Jean's answers.[26] Pierre thus acted as a prosecutor and as an expert witness in the proceedings, arguing less theologically than juridically.[27] Cardinal Guillaume de Pierre Godin was the second Dominican theologian appointed to examine the theses of Jean de Pouilly, which demonstrates how seriously the matter was taken at the Curia. All attempts by Jean de Pouilly to defend himself failed. On July 24, 1321, the pope finally condemned three of his theses in *Vas electionis*.[28] The theologian was no longer allowed to teach them, and he was also ordered to publicly recant his views in Paris. His Dominican and Franciscan opponents had achieved their goal.

In 1323, John Lutterell, the former chancellor of the university of Oxford, traveled to Avignon and denounced the Franciscan William of Ockham.[29] Apparently, he hoped to establish a career at the Curia, and attacking a well-known theologian guaranteed him the attention he needed and enhanced his reputation.[30] At the same time, Lutterell continued a dispute that had begun in Oxford and had initially brought him defeat.[31] John XXII entrusted the case to the Dominican Jacques de Concos, archbishop of Aix-en-Provence. After reducing Lutterell's list of errors from 56 to 29, the archbishop added 22 articles that he considered problematic. As usual, a commission was set up. Of the six theologians appointed to the case, no less than three belonged to the Dominican Order.[32] With Dominique Grima, Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, and Raymond Béquin, the choice fell on three theologians who had already been called upon several times as advisers and experts by John XXII. In addition, Raymond Béquin had been *magister sacri palatii* until 1325, with Dominique Grima being his successor in the office. While John Lutterell, who was a member of the commission as well,

25 Koch 1973, pp. 413–414.

26 MS Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 2168, ff. 12v–16v (*Responsio magistri Iohannis de Polliaco*), ff. 17r–31r (*Conclusio fratris Petri de Palude contra responsionem datam per magistrum Ioannem de Polliaco*); MS Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. lat. B VII 9, ff. 146v–164v (*Responsio [secunda] magistri Ioannis de Polliaco*).

27 Hödl, Ludwig: "Die doppelte Disputation der Irrtümer des Johannes de Polliaco an der Kurie in Avignon (1318–1321)", in *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* 120 (2003), pp. 338–362.

28 *Chartularium*, no. 798, ed. Denifle, vol. 2, pp. 243–244.

29 For Lutterell's list and his explanations before the commission, see *Die Schriften des Oxforder Kanzlers Iohannes Lutterell. Texte zur Theologie des 14. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Fritz Hoffmann (Erfurter theologische Studien 6), Leipzig 1959, pp. 3–102.

30 As early as 1321, Stephen of Kettleburgh had enthusiastically described to him by letter the opportunities that Avignon offered; cf. *Snappe's Formulary and Other Records*, ed. Herbert E. Salter (Oxford Historical Society 80), Oxford 1924, pp. 302–305; see also Piron 2012, pp. 358–360.

31 Cf. Larsen, Andrew E.: *The School of Heretics. Academic Condemnation at the University of Oxford, 1277–1409* (Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 40), Leiden/Boston 2011, pp. 78–91.

32 Brampton, Charles Kenneth: "Personalities at the Process against Ockham at Avignon, 1324–26", in *Franciscan Studies* 26 (1966), pp. 4–25.

took exception to Ockham's philosophical theses, the Dominican friars were particularly interested in the Franciscan's theological teachings.[33] In the course of the investigation, the committee rearranged the list of 51 errors and added appropriate explanations.[34] Despite a clear vote of the commission, the pope refrained from condemning the Englishman.[35] At the last, given Ockham's secret departure from Avignon in 1328, the dispute over the offending theses from his commentary on the *Sentences* faded at any rate into the background; instead, the Franciscan now emerged as a sharp critic of the papal understanding of poverty and ministry.[36]

After years of close cooperation between the Dominican Order and the pope during the 1310s and 1320s, culminating in the canonization of Thomas Aquinas, the two sides found themselves in opposing camps towards the end of John XXII's pontificate. At first glance, the trial of Meister Eckhart in Avignon appears to indicate that the relationship between John XXII and the Order of Preachers began to cool down in the late 1320s. However, it has since become clear that the trial had its origins in disputes within the Dominican Order in Germany.[37] The trial in Avignon was not based on any active intervention by the pope, but was rather a reaction to an appeal by Eckhart himself.[38] Eckhart had been exonerated in a first investigation by Nicholas of Strasbourg, whom John XXII had sent as a *visitator* to the Dominican province of Teutonia. Yet, his opponents within the Order were not satisfied with this outcome. He was subsequently denounced by his confreres Hermann de Summo and Wilhelm of Nidecke.[39] As a result, the Archbishop of Cologne initiated an inquisitorial trial.

[33] Brampton 1966, pp. 14–15; Burr, David: "Ockham, Scotus and the Censure at Avignon", in *Church History* 37 (1968), pp. 144–159.

[34] For a synoptic comparison of both lists of errors, see Koch, Josef: "Neue Aktenstücke zu dem gegen Wilhelm von Ockham in Avignon geführten Prozess", in *id.* 1973, pp. 275–365.

[35] George Knysh has claimed that John XXII set up a second commission in 1327, thereby starting a formal inquisition against the Franciscan. The majority of research continues to assume that there was only one commission and one trial; Knysh, George: "Biographical Rectifications Concerning Ockham's Avignon Period", in *Franciscan Studies* 46 (1986), pp. 61–91; Leppin, Volker: *Wilhelm von Ockham. Gelehrter, Streiter, Bettelmönch* (Gestalten des Mittelalters und der Renaissance), Darmstadt 2003, pp. 133–139.

[36] Cf. Iribarren, Isabel: "Ockham and the Avignon Papacy. The Controversy with John XXII, Benedict XII and Clement VI", in ed. Christian Rode: *A Companion to Responses to Ockham* (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 65), Leiden 2016, pp. 334–364; Miethke, Jürgen: *Ockhams Weg zur Sozialphilosophie*, Berlin 1969.

[37] Beccarisi, Alessandra: "Nicholas of Strasburg and Meister Eckhart", in ed. Pasquale Arfé: *Adorare caelestia, gubernare terrena. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale in Onore di Paolo Lucentini (Napoli, 6–7 novembre 2007)* (Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia 58), Turnhout 2011, pp. 361–368; Miethke, Jürgen: "Der Eckhartprozess in Köln und Avignon", in ed. Antonio Rigon: *L'età dei processi. Inchieste e condanne tra politica e ideologia nel '300. Atti del convegno di studio svoltosi in occasione della XIX edizione del Premio Internazionale Ascoli Piceno (Ascoli Piceno, Palazzo dei Capitani, 30 novembre–1 dicembre 2007)*, Rome 2009, pp. 121–143.

[38] Trusen, Winfried: *Der Prozeß gegen Meister Eckhart. Vorgeschichte, Verlauf und Folgen* (Rechts- und staatswissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Görres-Gesellschaft N.F. 54), Paderborn 1988.

[39] The list of errors they compiled is printed in Echardus de Hochheim: *Opera parisiensia, Tractatus super oratione dominica, Responsio ad articulos sibi impositos de scriptis et dictis suis, Acta*

The two also attacked Nicholas of Strasbourg for favoring Eckhart's heresies. The well-versed Dominican appealed to the pope before Eckhart decided to use the same strategy. On 13 February 1327, Eckhart publicly protested against the process and appealed to the apostolic see.[40] Obviously, he hoped for more understanding from the pope than from his opponents in Cologne and the local archbishop. The pope ordered the Cistercian Jacques Fournier who later succeeded John XXII as Benedict XII, among others, to write an expert opinion on Eckhart's theses. Although this report has not been preserved, a few quotations show that the Cistercian did not know what to make of Eckhart's speculative reasoning.[41] The investigation ended with a posthumous condemnation of 26 of Eckhart's theses in the bull *In agro dominico* on 27 March 1329.[42] On the one hand, this outcome was far less dramatic than the heresy charge that had been brought against the Dominican theologian in Cologne; on the other hand, John XXII ensured that the proceedings continued after Eckhart's death in 1328 and ended with a formal verdict. From the censors' point of view, the German professor wanted to know more than was appropriate. The fear that his curiosity could lead the common people into error was apparently so great that the pope and his advisors wanted to exclude the offending theses from the realm of the sayable.[43] A conflict with the Order did not arise from this affair.

The situation was different in the last years of John's pontificate. In the period of Advent in 1331, the pope had begun to preach about the *visio beatifica*.[44] In a series of sermons, he argued that souls separated from the body after death could only see God's essence after the Last Judgment.[45] He claimed that even the saints' vision was limited and imperfect until then. The pope caused a scandal with this theory. Soon, the French court and the university of Paris became involved in the controversy and took a firm stand against John XXII. The Dominican theologians were mostly opposed to the papal theses. Giovanni of Naples, one of the censors of Durandus of Saint-Pourçain and an important figure in the canonization process of Thomas Aquinas, openly criticized John XXII because he saw in his teachings an attack on Aquinas.[46] Even Armand de Belvézer, who had been closely associated with the pope for many years as *magis-*

Echardiana, ed. Loris Sturlese (Die lateinischen Werke 5), Stuttgart 2006, pp. 197–226.

40 Echardus de Hochheim *Opera parisiensia*, pp. 547–549.

41 Echardus de Hochheim *Opera parisiensia*, pp. 560–567.

42 Echardus de Hochheim *Opera parisiensia*, pp. 596–600.

43 Echardus de Hochheim *Opera parisiensia*, p. 597, ll. 7–17.

44 For the problem of the beatific vision, see Trottmann, Christian: *La vision béatifique. Des disputes scolastiques à sa définition par Benoît XII* (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 289), Rome 1995.

45 The sermons are edited by Marc Dykmans: *Les sermons de Jean XXII sur la vision béatifique. Texte précédé d'une introduction et suivi d'une chronologie de la controverse avec la liste des écrits pour et contre le Pape*, Rome 1973.

46 Trottmann 1995, pp. 574–581; Stella, Propero Tommaso: "Giovanni Regina di Napoli, O.P., e la tesi di Giovanni XXII circa la visione beatifica", in *Salesianum* 35 (1973), pp. 53–99; Maier, Anneliese: "Zur Textüberlieferung einiger Gutachten des Johannes de Neapoli", in *ead.*: *Ausgehendes Mittelalter*, vol. 3 (Storia e letteratura 138), Rome 1977, pp. 481–504.

ter sacri palatii, spoke out very critically on several occasions,[47] which possibly led to his removal from office.

The English Dominican Thomas Waleys was one of the first to criticize the papal theses. He publicly preached in Avignon on 3 January 1331 on the beatific vision.[48] Although he did not explicitly attack the pope, but only the latter's supporters, it was nevertheless clear against whom his criticism was directed. A remarkable shift in the fronts followed. Now it was the Franciscans who took the side of the pope. The Franciscan inquisitor Guillaume de Montrond initiated an investigation against Thomas Waleys.[49] The latter got himself into more trouble by defending his views in detail in a treatise.[50] A commission of theologians was given the task of examining Waley's teachings. Besides several Franciscans, its members included Pierre Roger, the future pope Clement VI, and even one Dominican, the pope's trusted penitentiary Arnaud de Saint-Michel who became *magister sacri palatii* in 1334. The theological experts objected to seven theses from the Dominican's sermon and treatise.[51] When Waleys saw that the inquisitorial trial would be decided against him, he hoped to save himself by appealing to the pope. The pope used the unfortunate Dominican in his letters to the French royal couple, Philip VI and Joan of Burgundy, to demonstrate how dangerous and presumptuous his opponents were.[52] The Franciscan Minister General Guiral Ot and Arnaud de Saint-Michel stopped in Paris on their way to Scotland, where the pope had sent them as legates to negotiate a peace treaty. They tried to promote the papal doctrine on the *visio beatifica* at the French court.[53] However, the pope's tactic did not work; instead, the king followed the opinion of the Parisian theologians, who decisively rejected the papal thesis at the beginning of 1334.[54] In February 1334, John XXII ordered an interrogation of Thomas Waleys before a commission of cardinals that included Jacques Fournier who—as pope Benedict XII—was to end the controversy by issuing the bull *Benedictus Deus* in 1336.[55] Yet not all the cardinals were convinced

47 Maier, Anneliese: "Eine unbeachtete Quaestio aus dem Visio-Streit unter Johann XXII", in *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 63 (1970), pp. 280–318; *ead.*: "Schriften, Daten und Personen aus dem Visio-Streit unter Johannes", in *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 9 (1971), pp. 143–186.

48 See *Le procès contre Thomas Waleys O. P. Étude et documents*, ed. Thomas Kaeppeli, Rome 1936, pp. 93–108.

49 The relevant material from this trial is in *Le procès contre Thomas Waleys*, ed. Kaeppeli, pp. 109–156.

50 *Le procès contre Thomas Waleys*, ed. Kaeppeli, pp. 157–183.

51 *Chartularium*, no. 975, ed. Denifle, vol. 2, pp. 421–423.

52 Iohannes XXII: *Lettres secrètes et curiales relatives à la France*, ed. Auguste Coulon, 10 vols., Paris 1906–1972, vol. 7, no. 5091, pp. 40–41, and no. 5272, pp. 110–111.

53 Guillelmus de Nangiaco: *Chronique de Guillaume de Nangis de 1113 à 1300. Avec les continuations de cette chronique de 1300 à 1368*, Paris 1843, pp. 136–137; Geraldus Odonis: *La vision de Dieu aux multiples formes. Quodlibet tenu á Paris en décembre 1333*, ed. Christian Trottmann (Sic et non), Paris 2001.

54 *Chartularium*, nos. 981 and 982, ed. Denifle, vol. 2, pp. 429–434.

55 *Acta Benedicti XII (1334–1342) e regestis Vaticanis aliisque fontibus*, no. 7, ed. Aloysius L. Tăutu, Rome 1958, pp. 10–13; cf. Trottmann 1995, pp. 779–811; *id.*: "Benedict XII and the Beatific Vision", in ed. Irene Bueno: *Pope Benedict XII (1334–1342). The Guardian of*

that the pope was right; accordingly, this trial ended without a formal verdict. In the summer of 1334, Waleys was released from prison.[56] As in the case of Ockham, John XXII lost interest in condemning the theologian or his theses when he realized that he could not gain anything from it. He had lost the battle for the opinion of the men of learning and the public. The death of the pope on 4 December 1334 prevented the Dominican Order from suffering any negative consequences from their stance. Nevertheless, the conflict illustrates that the relationship between the pope and the Order of Preachers was more volatile than it had first appeared. Doctrinal differences could easily lead to personal rifts, especially if no common strategic interests balanced out such differences.

2. Perspectives

The narrative technique used by Julian Barnes allows the depicted events to be presented from different perspectives. The three main characters and some secondary ones take turns telling their stories. This sometimes results in striking contradictions, situations that were perceived quite differently by those involved. In addition, blurred memories, gaps, and inaccuracies—but also different emphases—are revealed. What is of enormous significance for one character and is promoted to the rank of a key experience may seem rather peripheral to another. Moreover, while the characters strive for honesty, their shame and self-love sometimes compromise their sincerity. Only if the different perspectives are combined does a somewhat reliable picture emerge for the reader. But even this new picture, although providing multiple perspectives, still shows lacunae and inconsistencies that leave room for different (and conflicting) interpretations of the stories told. The narrative technique used by Barnes results from the insight that it is not only the events that are significant in themselves, but also—and perhaps even more so—the perception and interpretation of those events by the characters who are involved in them. In this respect, his approach can be adapted to historical analysis. Therefore, following his example, in the following section I will also recount the story of the relationship between the Dominicans and John XXII from multiple perspectives.

A variety of motives that prompted the pope to draw people to the Curia can be identified. The Curia needed specialists to deal with certain scientific, administrative, legal and political problems as expert witnesses, diplomats, preachers, inquisitors, teachers, procurators or notaries. Those who had done the pope a service and had proven themselves to be reliable, obedient and competent could count on his gratitude. For many Dominican friars who served as advisors and experts for John XXII, this activity paid off. The promotion of Dominican theologians such as Armand de Belvézer or Dominique Grima, whom

Orthodoxy (Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West), London 2016, pp. 81–106; Ballweg, Jan: *Konziliare oder päpstliche Ordensreform. Benedikt XII. und die Reformdiskussion im frühen 14. Jahrhundert* (Spätmittelalter und Reformation, N.R. 17), Tübingen 2001, pp. 185–203.

[56] Dykmans, Marc: "À propos de Jean XXII et Benoît XII. La libération de Thomas Waleys", in *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 7 (1969), pp. 115–130.

John appointed as lecturers at the Curia,[57] can be explained not only by his confidence in the Order, but also by the abovementioned tendency to draw southern Frenchmen to Avignon and to give them important offices. This is not only true for the Dominicans, but can also serve as prime examples of a more general pattern, which has been described by Bernard Guillemain or Sylvain Piron.[58]

Raymond Béquin, an expert witness in the poverty dispute and a member of the theological commission that examined Ockham's theses, was appointed Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1324. The Croatian Augustin Kažotić came to Avignon in 1318 to seek support in a long-running dispute with King Charles Robert of Hungary and Croatia. He acted twice as an expert witness for the pope.[59] In 1320, he was among the ten theologians to whom John XXII submitted five questions on magical practices.[60] In spring 1322, Augustin Kažotić also wrote a statement on the Franciscan understanding of poverty. Even though he had cut himself short with the argument that he did not want to repeat anything that had been said already,[61] the pope seems to have been convinced of the Dominican's abilities, because in the same year he appointed him bishop of the diocese of Lucera after Giacomo da Fusignano, another Dominican, had been transferred to the see of Modon. The town had been rebuilt by Frederick II to house Saracens who had been resettled from Sicily. In 1300, the Muslim inhabitants were massacred. The Dominican was to assert the dominance of Christianity in the wake of this atrocity. In a similar vein, it proved advantageous for the Dominican Jacques de Concos, then the pope's confessor, that it was he who answered the five papal questions on magic.[62] As a reward, he was appointed archbishop of Aix-en-Provence in 1322. As we have seen, he was later involved in the trial against Ockham.

The career of Guillaume de Pierre Godin, in turn, had already been advanced by Clement V, who had appointed him *lector curiae* in 1306[63] and elevated him to the cardinalate in 1312. The fact that John XXII made him bishop of Sabina in 1317 meant, at least at first glance, merely a continuation of the latter's then-current career path. But an even closer cooperation soon developed between the Dominican theologian and the pope. The trust that John XXII placed in the highly experienced cardinal is shown, among other things, by the fact that in 1318, together with Hervaeus Natalis, then Dominican minister general,

[57] Cf. Kaeppeli, Thomas: *Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum medii aevi*, 4 vols., Rome 1970–1993, vol. 1, pp. 120–125; Morard, Martin: "Sacrée Parole! Exégèse, Écriture sainte et Parole de Dieu d'après Dominique Grima et Armand de Belvézer, O.P.", in *La parole sacrée. Formes, fonctions, sens (XIe–XVe siècle)* (Cahiers de Fanjeaux 47), Toulouse 2013, pp. 403–456; Bonino, Serge-Thomas: "Autour d'Armand de Belvézer. Le thomisme en France au XIVe siècle", in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 96 (2012), pp. 233–267.

[58] Piron 2012; Guillemain ²1966, p. 384.

[59] Kaeppeli 1970–1993, vol. 1, p. 136.

[60] For this consultation, see Iribarren, Isabel: "From Black Magic to Heresy. A Doctrinal Leap in the Pontificate of John XXII", in *Church History* 76 (2007), pp. 32–60; Boureau 2003; for an edition of his expert opinion, see *id.* 2004, pp. 3–7.

[61] Duval-Arnould 1989, p. 161.

[62] Boureau 2004, pp. 34–43.

[63] For his career, see Fournier, Paul: "Le cardinal Guillaume de Peyre de Godin", in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 86 (1925), pp. 100–121.

Guillaume de Pierre Godin received a delicate commission.[64] In the previous year, Pierre de la Palud, together with two Franciscans, had been commissioned to promote a rapprochement with France in Flanders. This mission had failed.[65] The two respected Dominican theologians were now to investigate the cause of this failure. This choice was obviously very favorable for Pierre de la Palud, as he could expect to be treated leniently by his brothers.[66] From 1320 to 1324, Guillaume de Pierre Godin stayed in Castile. The pope had entrusted him with the task of controlling the political turmoil caused by the struggle for the regency of the infant king Alfonso XI.[67] After his return to Avignon, John XXII entrusted the cardinal with the investigation against Ubertino da Casale.

Earlier, Guillaume de Pierre Godin had been one of the experts, along with Pierre de la Palud, in the trial of Jean de Pouilly. To defend his opinion that the mendicants were not allowed to hear confessions without the consent of the parish priest, Jean de Pouilly affirmed that the priests were the successors of Christ's disciples. All the powers that Christ had conferred on the disciples had passed to the priests, including the right to hear confessions.[68] His Dominican opponents considered this view as an unfounded limitation of papal power. But in refuting Jean's ideas, the two friars were by no means always in agreement; rather, differences in their understanding of papal authority came to light.[69] In his treatise *De causa immediata ecclesiasticae potestatis*, Godin criticized Pierre de la Palud's view that the pope was without doubt the supreme shepherd, but that bishops and presbyters still had relative autonomy.[70] Godin, in contrast, was convinced that Peter and his successors had received pastoral authority directly from Christ. All other pastoral authority, such as that of the bishops and the presbyters, was thus derived from papal authority.[71] Besides Pierre de la Palud and Guillaume de Pierre Godin, the conflict over the theses of Jean de Pouilly also prompted a third Dominican theologian to reflect in greater detail on pa-

64 Fournier 1925, pp. 107–108.

65 The French king had complained about the Dominican's behaviour, whereupon the pope tried to smooth the waters; Iohannes XXII *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, no. 706, ed. Coulon, vol. 1, pp. 605–606.

66 The report of Pierre's interrogation in Avignon is printed in *Miscellanea novo ordine digesta*, ed. Baluze/Mansi, pp. 251–257.

67 For the legate's extensive powers and authorizations, see MS Vatican City, Archivio Apostolico Vaticano, Registra Avenionensia XIV, ff. 467r–468r; cf. Fournier 1925, pp. 109–113.

68 Johannes de Polliaco: *Responsio secunda*, MS Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, B VII 9, f. 146v; cf. Hödl, Ludwig: "Der unfehlbare Lehrentscheid des Papstes im Prozess gegen Johannes de Polliaco (1318–1321)", in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 47 (2000), pp. 52–76.

69 Hödl 2003.

70 Petrus de Palude: *Tractatus de potestate papae (Toulouse, Bibl. de la Ville, 744)*, ed. P T. Stella (Textus et studia in historiam scholasticae 2), Zurich 1966, p. 182.

71 Guillelmus Petri de Godino: *Tractatus de causa immediata ecclesiastice potestatis*, a. 6, cap. 1 and 2, ed. William David McCready: *The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Fourteenth Century* (Studies and Texts / Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies 56), Toronto 1982, pp. 248–256. Several manuscripts name Pierre de la Palud as the author of *De causa immediata ecclesiasticae potestatis*. If this attribution were correct, the Dominican would have corrected himself in the tract. In sum, it seems more likely that Godin was the author, see *ibid.*, pp. 7–33; cf., by contrast, Miethke 2008, pp. 146–147.

pal power in a treatise.[72] According to Hervaeus Natalis, someone must preside over a community, and it is the pope who presides over the Christian community; therefore, he is entitled to make provisions that are beneficial to Christianity. This gives the pope comprehensive legal power, encompassing the *forum iudicale exterius* as well as the *forum conscientiae*. For Hervaeus Natalis, only the papal power was directly instituted by Christ.[73] All other ecclesiastical legal authority—that of the archbishops, the bishops, and the prelates—was delegated to them by the pope. In his responsibility for the welfare of Christendom, the pope was entitled to correct abuses by any believer—among whom the theologian explicitly counted secular rulers as well.[74]

More moderate in comparison with Augustinians such as Aegidius Romanus, all Dominicans emphasized the pope's power in decision-making and attributed to him a high degree of authority. Regardless of any differences in the details, John XXII may have approved the picture of papal power they had sketched out, not least because the friars cited legal arguments as well as theological ones. This shared interest in conceiving papal power in the church in a wide-ranging and comprehensive manner is one of the main reasons why John XXII trusted the Dominican advisors. Hervaeus Natalis in particular defined papal power as a legal one, which was well in line with John XXII's ideas. In addition to the high offices Natalis held, his ideas of papal power may have made him a sought-after advisor for the pope.

Although the pope repeatedly trusted various Dominican friars as experts, promoting their careers in return for such aid, this does not necessarily indicate a close relationship with the Order per se. For example, John XXII promoted Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, who was highly controversial among the Dominicans because of his criticism of Thomas Aquinas.[75] However, such critique did not prevent him from responding positively to the order's desire to have Aquinas canonized. Nevertheless, the pope resolutely protected Durandus against his enemies in the Dominican Order. After his election to the papacy in 1316, John XXII left the theologian in office as *magister curiae*. In 1317, he then made Durandus bishop of Limoux and transferred him to the see of Puy-en-Velay the following year. The theologian's relationship with Avignon remained a close one. There, he acted as an expert witness in the examination of Olivi's commen-

[72] For a detailed discussion of these treatises, see also Turley, Thomas: "History and Legitimacy in the Dominican Responses to John of Pouilly", in eds. Bettina Koch/Cary J. Nedermann: *Inventing Modernity in Medieval European Thought ca. 1100–ca. 1550* (Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Culture), Kalamazoo, MI 2019, pp. 53–70.

[73] Hervaeus Natalis: *Tractatus de potestate Papae*, in *id.*: *In quattuor libros sententiarum commentaria quibus adiectus est eiusdem auctoris Tractatus de potestate Papae*, Reprint of the edition Paris 1647, Farnborough Hants 1966, pp. 365–366; cf. Hödl, Ludwig: "Der Jurisdiktionsprimat des Papstes in der Auseinandersetzung des Herveus Natalis O. P. mit den errores des Johannes de Polliaco (1312–1315)", in *Jahrbuch für internationale Germanistik* 31.2 (1999), pp. 87–111.

[74] Hervaeus Natalis: *Tractatus de potestate Papae*, pp. 373–374.

[75] Iribarren, Isabel: *Durandus of St. Pourçain. A Dominican Theologian in the Shadow of Aquinas* (Oxford Theological Monographs), Oxford/New York 2005; Lowe, Elizabeth: *The Contested Theological Authority of Thomas Aquinas. The Controversies between Hervaeus Natalis and Durandus of St. Pourçain* (Studies in Medieval History and Culture 17), New York 2003.

tary on the Apocalypse, in the poverty controversy, and in the question of the dissolution of marriage.[76] He was also involved in the examination of Ockham's theses.[77] In 1326, the grateful pope appointed him bishop of Meaux. Yet despite this promotion, Durandus wrote a tract against the theses of John XXII in the context of the beatific vision controversy.[78] The pope retaliated by initiating an investigation against his former advisor in 1333. On behalf of the pope, Jacques Fournier, among others, wrote a refutation of the treatise.[79] John XXII entrusted cardinal Annibaldo de Ceccano with the task of leading the commission to examine the bishop's ideas.[80] In the end, its members found eleven theses to be erroneous.[81] The case of Durandus may exemplify that common interests and loyalty could end abruptly in the case of serious doctrinal differences. As the pope learned in the beatific vision controversy of the 1330s, the opposing camp could suddenly include actors with whom he had long been closely associated.

All these cases indicate that the promotion of churchmen by the pope cannot be explained by their affiliation to a specific religious order—at least not exclusively. It was more important that they had rendered some service to John XXII and thus had proven their worth. Being a member of the Order of Preachers, however, entailed an institutionalized leap of faith in the first years of the pontificate. This can be seen in the frequency with which Dominican friars were given advisory, pastoral, doctrinal, or diplomatic tasks. But not every friar was able to satisfy the pope's expectations: in the consistory meeting of 6 March 1322, the Dominican Gui Cattaneo, archbishop of Arborea, sharply attacked the Franciscan Jerome of Caffa after the latter had defended the Franciscan ideal of poverty at length, albeit with weak arguments.[82] The Dominican was particularly angered by the Franciscan's assertion that his Order was crucial to the mission to the infidels. Gui Cattaneo, on the other hand, pointed out that his Order had first reached Mongolia. Moreover, the two fought about who had earned greater merit as a preacher in Constantinople. The ensuing dispute was interrupted by an increasingly impatient pope, who obviously had little interest in the ongoing competition between the mendicant orders. Whoever wanted to win the pope's favor had to play by the pope's rules.

[76] Nold, Patrick: *Marriage Advice for a Pope. John XXII and the Power to Dissolve* (Medieval Law and its Practice 3), Leiden 2009, pp. 104–109.

[77] Brampton 1966, pp. 9 and 19–21.

[78] Cremascoli, Giuseppe: "Il 'Libellus de visione Dei' di Durando di S. Porziano", in *Studi medievali*, Ser. 3 25 (1984), pp. 393–442; Trottmann 1995, pp. 592–601.

[79] Maier, Anneliese: "Zwei Prooemien Benedikts XII.", in *Archivium Historiae Pontificiae* 7 (1969), pp. 131–161.

[80] The cardinal was one of John's most important supporters during the affair; cf. Dykmans, Marc: "Le cardinal Annibal de Ceccano et la Vision Béatifique (1331–1336)", in *Gregorianum* 50 (1969), pp. 343–382.

[81] *Chartularium*, no. 975, ed. Denifle, vol. 2, pp. 420–421.

[82] Zambrini, Francesco, ed.: *Storia di fra Michele Minorita come fu arso in Firenze nel 1389 con documenti riguardanti i fraticelli della povera vita*, Bologna 1864, pp. 69–75.

3. Talking It Over

As the title of Julian Barnes's novel suggests, the defining feature of the book is speech: the characters act as narrators and report on what has happened. In doing so, they often tell how they once spoke to each other and how this determined their respective relationships. While the conversations between Oliver and Stuart were initially friendly and impartial, they later come to be dominated by dislike, contempt, and even hatred after Stuart learns that his friend has fallen in love with his wife. Even as they live together, Stuart and Gillian talk to each other cautiously and reservedly. After their estrangement, there is no longer any common ground for understanding. Oliver and Gillian, on the other hand, talk very little to each other at first, only to become all the more intimate later. Oliver plunges into euphoric love semantics, which at first touches Gillian, but also makes her recoil. Eventually they find a way of talking to each other that preserves their respective personal ways of speaking. In the novel, it is only through the speaking that it becomes clear to the readers—but also to the characters themselves—what is happening. One could even say that the fluctuating feelings of the characters are constituted only by talking about them. Love is communication—among those present and in relation to those absent.

To return to the Middle Ages: as has been shown, the relationship between John XXII and the Dominican friars was more ambivalent than first appeared. The pope took advantage of the order's readily granted support in the conflict with the Franciscans. He drew on the well-trained Dominican theologians as experts, inquisitors, and preachers. Dominican cardinals were entrusted with important diplomatic missions. With the canonization of Thomas Aquinas, the pope officially recognized the importance of this theologian and thus of his Order for the church and for Christianity. And yet Dominicans were never more than experts and advisors among others. Franciscans, secular clerics, and laymen were also consulted if they happened to be in Avignon or had knowledge that seemed useful to the pope. The mendicants did not dominate among the cardinals either in terms of numbers nor influence. John XXII created 27 cardinals, among whom was only a single Dominican, the Italian Matteo Orsini.[83] Even if one were to assume that the pope avoided further escalation in the trial of Meister Eckhart out of respect for the Order, the final result was still a condemnation of many of the latter's theses. In the conflict about the beatific vision, most Dominicans opposed the pope, who did not hesitate to let himself be defended by Franciscans, even though he had given their Order a hard time in the poverty controversy. If Durandus of Saint-Pourçain had acted repeatedly as a theological expert, this probably expressed more of a sense of personal esteem rather than honor for the Dominican Order as a whole. The situation was similar to the commissions given to Guillaume de Pierre Godin or Pierre de la Palud, who proved themselves reliable and thereby justified the trust placed in them.

John XXII frequently intervened in theological disputes and initiated trials against several theologians. What is striking, however, is that the pope, though

[83] Guillemain 2001, pp. 310–311.

a trained lawyer, consistently seemed to stand aloof from the theological culture of discussion. He had little sympathy for its conceptual subtleties. In his sermons, he frequently spoke on theological topics, but then often deliberately ignored the current debates in the discipline. In his sermon *Deus autem rex noster*, for example, he only cited the theological distinction between *potentia Dei absoluta* and *potentia Dei ordinata* to declare it meaningless.[84] He was avowedly concerned with action and effect. He considered the semantic and logical subtleties of philosophical or theological debates to be futile, as they remained ineffective in reality. Accordingly, he did not pursue the investigations against theologians such as William of Ockham or Thomas Waleys after the state of the conflict had changed. There is some evidence that he was not particularly familiar with the works of Thomas Aquinas at the beginning of the canonization process. Giovanni Dominici de Montepessulano prepared *tabulae* of the *Summa theologiae* for him, which allowed a quick overview of Aquinas's teachings.[85] As the pope's preserved annotations indicate, he also studied the works of Thomas Aquinas himself during the canonization process.[86]

John XXII always attached great importance to maintaining direct control over the proceedings at the Curia. It is characteristic for this pope to have wanted to form his own opinion during the canonization process. However, this also implies that he had insufficient knowledge of Thomas beforehand. Therefore, a formative influence of Thomistic thought on his own ideas should not be assumed. The pope lent his ear to those scholars who were able to promote the interests of the papacy or to argue in a way that corresponded to John's worldview. Thus, his annotations of the theological opinions in the poverty controversy reveal that he studied only a few votes with increased intensity. The arguments of the Dominican theologians Hervaeus Natalis, Jacopo de Fusignano and Durandus of Saint-Pourçain obviously caught his attention.[87] From the experts' point of view, this result was contingent. They could never be sure that the pope would actually listen to them and follow their advice.

What were the advantages of using the services of Dominicans? To consult Dominican friars as experts and advisors, to send them on diplomatic missions, to receive information from Dominican inquisitors like Bernard Gui, was valuable to the pope not only because of the undoubted skills and services rendered by the theologians, inquisitors and cardinals. If the Dominicans acted as advisors, experts and envoys, John XXII could then talk about them and their services. By talking about the Dominicans, a close relationship between the pope

[84] Randi, Eugenio: "Il rasoio contro Ockham? Un sermone inedito di Giovanni XXII", in *Medioevo. Rivista di Storia della Filosofia Medievale* 9 (1983), pp. 179–198.

[85] Kaeppeli 1970–1993, vol. 2, pp. 413–414.

[86] Dondaine, Antoine: "La collection des œuvres de saint Thomas dite de Jean XXII et Jacquet Maci", in *Scriptorium* 29 (1975), pp. 127–152; Maier, Anneliese: "Annotazioni autografe di Giovanni XXII in Codici vaticani", in *ead.*: *Ausgehendes Mittelalter*, vol. 2 (Storia e letteratura 105), Rome 1967, pp. 81–96.

[87] As the pope's annotations in MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3740 demonstrate, he was especially interested in the expert opinions of the three Dominicans, the Franciscans Vital du Four and Bertrand de la Tour, as well as Ubertino de Casale whose name is not mentioned in the manuscript; Duval-Arnould 1989, pp. 192–193.

and the Order was staged. The suggestion was that John had been in agreement with the Dominicans in his decisions. At the same time, he sought to use their reputation to ensure the success of his policies. Therefore, papal letters and charters mentioned that a negotiator in a delicate matter was a Dominican, that Dominican friars had advised the pope to undertake a specific measure, that the information came from a Dominican witness and thus was trustworthy. In the autumn of 1318, for example, John XXII sent the Dominican Bernard Gui and the Franciscan Bertrand de la Tour[88] as *nuntii* to Flanders to negotiate a peace treaty with France. In his cover letter, he wanted to motivate count Robert's procurators to trust the nuncios. For this purpose, he highlighted their rank and offices, as well as their religious affiliation.[89] He used the same strategy in a letter to the count himself, which he concluded with a detailed commendation of the nuncios.[90] The pope urged the French king to make peace as well. He began his corresponding letter with a presentation of the nuncios, whose personal qualities he described in conjunction with mentioning their offices and religious affiliation.[91] In June 1322, the pope congratulated the French king Charles V on his willingness to go on a crusade. However, for the welfare of the Church and Christianity, John XXII added that it was equally important to take decisive action against heretics in his kingdom. For further oral consultations, he sent Dominique Grima, Dominican, theologian, and *lector* at the Curia to the king.[92]

As the other letters sent by the pope to the French king about the crusade show, part of the curial protocol was to mention the religious order and offices of the envoys. If the papal letters presented Dominique Grima as a Dominican, a theologian and *lector curiae* to facilitate his mission in France,[93] this must primarily be seen as a formalism of the chancery. However, as was shown above, it is no coincidence that John XXII repeatedly appointed Dominique Grima and

88 On Bertrand, see below, note 97.

89 Iohannes XXII *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, no. 711, ed. Coulon, vol. 1, pp. 611–612.

90 Iohannes XXII *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, no. 713, ed. Coulon, vol. 1, pp. 613–614: "Hec autem tibi pro parte nostra plenius explicanda dilectis filiis fratribus Bernardo Guidonis, inquisitori heretice pravitatis in regno Francie per Sedem apostolicam deputato, Predicatorum, et Bertrando de Turre, sacre theologie magistro, ministro provinciali Aquitanie, Minorum fratrum ordinum, apostolice Sedis nuntiis vel eorum alteri, de quibus plenam in Domino fiduciam obtinemus, duximus committenda, quibus circa ea que in predictis retulerint, fidem petimus credulam adhiberi."

91 Iohannes XXII *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, no. 719, ed. Coulon, vol. 1, p. 618.

92 Iohannes XXII *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, no. 1445, ed. Coulon, vol. 2, p. 126: "Et quia vox viva efficacius quam mortua imprimere consuevit, ecce dilectum filium Dominicum, ordinis Predicatorum, sacre theologie magistrum, et in curia Romana lectorem, virum utique providum et discretum, de cujus circumspectione provida pleniorem fiduciam obtinemus, ad regalem presentiam cum hiis et nonnullis aliis nostris litteris duximus destinandum, cui circa contenta in illis certa commissimus serenitati regie vive vocis oraculo exponenda, illam attentius deprecantes quatinus super illis et ea tangentibus eidem magistro dignetur fidem credulam adhibere."

93 Iohannes XXII *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, nos. 1426–1428, ed. Coulon, vol. 2, pp. 111–113; no. 1430, *ibid.*, p. 114; no. 1433, *ibid.*, p. 116; no. 1435, *ibid.*, p. 117; no. 1439, *ibid.*, p. 121; no. 1446, *ibid.*, p. 127; no. 1679, *ibid.*, p. 249; no. 1682, *ibid.*, pp. 251–252; nos. 1850–1852, *ibid.*, pp. 409–411.

his confreres to important missions or called on them as advisors. The pope held the Order of Preachers in high esteem and generally trusted its members, whom he considered competent and loyal. He regularly communicated this appraisal to the addressees of his letters. This can be interpreted as a communicative strategy: the pope expected that the leap of faith he took in trusting the Order and individual Dominicans would be replicated by others. John XXII valued individual Dominicans, trusted their judgment and their theological or diplomatic skills—facts he did not keep secret, as is evident from his letters and charters. The praise given to the Dominicans was meant to inspire imitation on the part of the addressees and bring about corresponding actions.

A final example is the letter the pope wrote on 31 March 1326 to king Philip VI to excuse the Dominican Benedict de Cumis (Benedetto da Asnago) for staying longer at the papal court.[94] At first, the friar had been sent to Avignon by the French king. Benedict, a theologian who had been involved in the canonization process of Thomas Aquinas, seems to have quickly succeeded in attracting attention there. The pope and the cardinals acknowledged him as an expert with whom they could discuss crusade plans. John XXII grasped the opportunity that presented itself. In 1325, he planned to send Benedict to Germany together with Nicholas of Strasbourg to settle the unrest in the Dominican province of Teutonia, but in the end Nicholas went alone. The following year he dispatched the Italian to Constantinople to negotiate the church union with emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos.[95] The pope made him bishop of Como after his return to Avignon. In the following years, Benedict tried to gain control over his diocese, which he could not enter because a follower of Louis IV was officiating as bishop there. In this way he supported the papal policy of regaining control over northern Italy.[96]

4. Conclusion

The pope's dealings with Benedict de Cumis were so typical that they may serve as a conclusion to this article. John XXII always sought to take advantage of opportunities that came his way. If scholars were at the Curia, he liked to submit theological and legal questions to them and ask them for a written opinion. He drew scholars to Avignon so that they could act as experts if necessary. If by chance, as in the case of Benedict de Cumis, someone happened to come to the Rhône who had specific knowledge—on the crusade, for example—the pope intended to profit from it. While the relationship with many of his occasional advisors remained instrumental, the pope seems to have held some in high esteem. In addition to specialized knowledge, personal sympathy may also have played an important role. This was the case with the Dominican Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, but also with the Carmelite Guido Terreni, the Cistercian

[94] *Ibid.*, no. 2744, ed. Coulon, vol. 3, pp. 117–118.

[95] *Ibid.*, no. 2745, ed. Coulon, vol. 3, p. 118; no. 3354, ed. Coulon, vol. 4, p. 60.

[96] For Benedict de Cumis, see "Benedetto da Asnago", in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 8 (1966).

Jacques Fournier (the future Pope Benedict XII), or the Franciscan Bertrand de la Tour who played an important role during the poverty controversy as Patrick Nold has demonstrated.[97] John XXII showed particular trust in the Dominicans in the first years of his pontificate. He often consulted those Dominicans who held the office of *magister sacri palatii* or appointed them to commissions. In order to be able to bring the various heretical currents in southern France under control, he was dependent on cooperation with the Dominican inquisitors, as he was very well aware. To honor Thomas Aquinas's theology, he made him a saint, which was a strategy manifesting the wish to gain a yardstick for doctrinal disputes in the field of theology. However, in the beatific vision controversy, he did not see himself bound to follow the reasoning of the new saint.

John XXII was always looking for ways to impose his claim to rule. For him, ruling meant making decisions and enforcing them. In making decisions, he regularly relied on what he considered competent and trustworthy agents, including many Dominicans. If they were able to ensure the success of his decisions, he gladly resorted to members of the Order of Preachers. In these cases, we find him explicitly mentioning in his letters that his decisions and actions had been made in accordance with the views of Dominican friars. These statements were made in the hope of turning his claim to rule into reality. He wanted to profit from the reputation of the Order and its members and trusted that the addressees of his letters would be inclined to follow his wishes if he could call on Dominican expertise. However, if the Dominicans refused his requests or had different opinions, John XXII did not attach particular importance to reaching an agreement with them. Rather, he sought and found other supporters and advisors. With a few individual exceptions, the close relationship between the pope and the Dominicans remained an alliance of convenience from which both sides profited for a long time. In the end, he could talk and write about the fact that this close relationship existed, even if it was less profound than it might have appeared at first.

[97] Nold, Patrick: *Pope John XXII and his Franciscan Cardinal. Bertrand de la Tour and the Apostolic Poverty Controversy* (Oxford Historical Monographs), Oxford/New York 2003.