



HAL
open science

“The Victorine Pierre Leduc’s Collationes, Sermo finalis, and Principia on the Sentences, Paris 1382-1383,

Christopher Schabel

► To cite this version:

Christopher Schabel. “The Victorine Pierre Leduc’s Collationes, Sermo finalis, and Principia on the Sentences, Paris 1382-1383, . Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge, 2021. hal-03175623

HAL Id: hal-03175623

<https://hal.science/hal-03175623>

Submitted on 22 Mar 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ERC-DEBATE N° 771589

CHRIS SCHABEL

**THE VICTORINE PIERRE LEDUC'S *COLLATIONES*, *SERMO FINALIS*, AND
PRINCIPIA ON THE *SENTENCES*, PARIS 1382-1383**

This article presents an edition of the collationes, sermo finalis, and principia on the Sentences of Pierre Leduc, from his year as Victorine bachelor of the Sentences at Paris in 1382-1383. The texts survive in manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 14800, fully described, along with the contents, in the article in this issue of AHDLMMA by W. J. Courtenay. This brief introduction concentrates on what these texts tell us about the practice of reading the Sentences at Paris on the eve of the departure of the Dominicans as a result of the Monzon Affair over the Immaculate Conception.

William J. Courtenay has discovered that manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14800, contains texts by the Victorine theologian Pierre Leduc (abbot of Saint-Victor in 1383-1400), including works from his year as bachelor of the *Sentences* at Paris in 1382-1383. Courtenay describes and analyzes the manuscript and the rich materials it contains in his article in this issue of *AHDLMMA*, in support of which I here provide an edition of Pierre's *collationes*, *sermo finalis*, and *principia* on the *Sentences*¹. This brief introduction concentrates on what these texts tell us about lecturing on the *Sentences* at Paris at the time and concludes with a note on the prelude to the Monzon Affair, for while most of the doctrinal issues in Pierre's *principia* were prominent in that genre in the surrounding decades, his acrimonious exchange with his Dominican counterpart on the status of the Virgin Mary is specific to the immediate context.

In the fourteenth century, bachelors of the *Sentences* at Paris began the academic year in the second half of September by taking turns, on separate days and before an audience of the members of the Faculty of Theology, giving a sermon-like speech linked to the lectures they were about to give (on Peter Lombard, his text, and/or theology) and defending doctrinal theses against their fellow *sententiarum*, their *socii*, in their questions.

¹ I thank Professor Courtenay for carefully checking my edition and for sending me his initial transcription of sections of the text, Guy Guldentops for collecting the sermons, Bill Duba, Russ Friedman, Evelina Miteva, and Dominique Poirel for chasing references, and Monica Brînzei for providing improved photographs of the manuscript. This article was written at the IRHT in Paris under the aegis of Brînzei's ERC project DEBATE on *principia* on the *Sentences*, for which genre see the forthcoming collective volume on *principia* edited by Brînzei and Duba for Brepols' *Studia Sententiarum* series.

They then lectured on book I of the *Sentences* in October, November, and December, and repeated the speeches and questions process for the other three books in early January, March, and May, before finishing their lecture series in the second half of June with a final speech.

Pierre Leduc is valuable for his explanation and use of terminology². In the second, third, and fourth speeches, after invoking the aid of the Mother of God, Christ, and St Augustine, Pierre says he will have to do three things « in the present *principium* », although in the first speech he says « in the present *stadium* ». These three things are to open with a « *collatio recommendativa* », add a « *quaestio conclusiva* », and render a « *gratiarum actio recompensativa* ». Thus Pierre uses the term *principium* for all three parts, but the label *principium* is also employed for each of his four questions and, frequently, within these questions, when referring to his other questions and those of his *socii*, Pierre calls them *principia*. Thus *principium* has a wider meaning for the entire event and a narrower meaning for the question alone, and it is the latter sense I use here.

The speech is called a *collatio recommendativa*, which is why in many cases it is simply named a *collatio* or a *recommendatio*. Each of Pierre's speeches is labelled a *collatio* and ends with « *Explicit collatio* » followed by the book of the *Sentences*. Nevertheless, within the questions Pierre once uses the term *collatio* to mean a conference, exchange, or debate with his *socii*, such that in the second *principium* he says that he posits something « *causa collationis* » to encourage discussion, while in the first and fourth *principia* he holds or posits something only « *collative* », and in the second he mentions his « *articuli collativi* » and in fourth his four « *propositiones collativae* ». Likewise, in the fourth question he remarks that « *cum pluribus habeo conferre* », « *non habeo pro praesenti plus conferre* », and « *ut cum ipso conferam* », a phrase he employed in his second question as well, where we also find « *ut possim secum conferre* ». This dual meaning of *collatio*, for opening speech and for debate, is common, but here I use it for the speech.

Finally, the *gratiarum actio recompensativa*, which Pierre gives for the « *honor impensus* », does not survive for any of the four books, but it does in the speech given at the end of the academic year, for which reason it is sometimes identified as a *Sermo*

² For a discussion of the ambiguous terms, see W. J. COURTENAY, *Adam Wodeham. An Introduction to His Life and Writings*, Leiden 1978, p. 172-177.

finalis, which also helps distinguish the genre from the thanksgiving remarks linked to the four *principia* taken in the broad sense. Until recently, very few *sermones finales* had been identified and it appeared to be a genre with an extremely low survival rate. It seems that we were simply not looking, however, for such sermons have now been published for the long fourteenth-century from Remigio dei Girolami, Giovanni di Napoli, Robert Holcot, Ralph Friseby, Pierre Ceffons, and, below, Pierre Leduc, and no doubt many more will follow³. Specimens of the genre thank the audience or introduce the school's bachelor for the next academic year, often injecting humor and historical details. They have been employed to destroy the myth of the two-year *Sentences* lecture at Paris and Oxford in the fourteenth century and to provide support for the possibility of Dante's attending lectures in theology at Paris in the 1309-1310 academic year⁴.

Pierre Leduc's *sermo finalis* informs us that his reading the *Sentences* lasted 34 weeks and consisted of 122 individual lectures (*lectiones*), slightly fewer lectures than the other three fourteenth-century series for which we have fairly solid information, which ranged from 126 to ca. 134 lectures⁵. Pierre also remarks humbly that he merely followed « approved holy doctors », focused on what was useful for his audience and avoided « difficult speculative and philosophical topics », and tried to be brief in giving his positions and explaining Peter Lombard's text, so he would not bore his audience or disrupt the divine office. Whether this is an indication of the decline of the University of Paris (see below) or of the low level of the listeners at the Victorines, one cannot say.

³ ROBERTUS HOLCOT, *Sermo finalis*, ed. J. C. WEY, « The *Sermo Finalis* of Robert Holcot », *Mediaeval Studies*, 11 (1949), p. 219–223 ; REMIGIUS DE GIROLAMI, *Prologus in fine Sententiarum*, ed. E. PANELLA, *Il 'De subiecto theologie' [1297-1299] di Remigio dei Girolami O.P.*, Milano 1982, p. 73-75 ; RADULPHUS FRISBY, *Final Lecture*, trans. S. WENZEL, *Preaching in the Age of Chaucer : Selected Sermons in Translation*, Washington, DC, p. 300-315 (the Latin text remains unpublished) ; PETRUS DE CEFFONS, *Sermo finalis*, ed. A. CORBINI, « Pierre de Ceffons et l'instruction dans l'Ordre cistercien : quelques remarques », in K. EMERY, Jr. – W. J. COURTENAY – S. M. METZGER (ed.), *Philosophy and Theology in the Studia of the Religious Orders and at Papal and Royal Courts*, Turnhout 2012, p. 549-574, at p. 568-574 ; IOHANNES REGINA DE NEAPOLI, *Sermo pro gratiarum actione*, ed. and trans. W. DUBA, « Dante, Paris, and the Benefactor of Saint-Jacques », *Vivarium*, 58 (2020), p. 65-88, at p. 80-84 (trans. p. 85-88).

⁴ W. DUBA and C. SCHABEL, « Remigio, Scotus, Auriol, and the Myth of the Two-Year *Sentences* Lecture at Paris », *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales*, 84 (2017), p. 143-179 ; DUBA, « Dante, Paris, and the Benefactor of Saint-Jacques » ; C. SCHABEL, « Ockham, the *Principia* of Holcot and Wodeham, and the Myth of the Two-Year *Sentences* Lecture at Oxford », *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales*, 87 (2020), forthcoming.

⁵ The statistics are for Landolfo Caracciolo OFM (1319-20), Guillaume de Brienne OFM (1330-31), and Pierre Plaoul (1391-92), with ca. 131, 126, and 134 *lectiones* respectively, based on the research of SCHABEL, DUBA, and P. GLORIEUX and J. C. WITT respectively ; see DUBA and SCHABEL, « Remigio, Scotus, Auriol, and the Myth », p. 175-176.

Pierre Leduc's *collationes*, *sermo finalis*, and *principia* are published below in the order in which they occur in the manuscript, first the *collationes* on the four books, I-II-III-IV, then the *sermo finalis*, and finally the *principia* on the four books, I-II-III-IV. The reason they have not been rearranged in chronological sequence (*collatio* I, *principium* I, etc.) is that this sequence is unclear. In the manuscript, the *principia* are followed by Pierre's *conclusiones* from his normal lectures on the *Sentences*, arranged in the sequence I-IV-II-III (book I : ff. 80r-88v ; book IV : 89r-102r ; book II : 102v-113r ; book III : 113r-121r), which is the order in which bachelors of theology had lectured on the *Sentences* in the first third of the fourteenth century, although we are unsure about what happened later⁶. It is unlikely that Pierre would have had his *conclusiones* recorded in the sequence I-IV-II-III by chance, and yet internal references in the *principia* suggest that they are in the original sequence, I-II-III-IV, and both the *collationes* and the *principia* titles are linked to the themes of the four books. Nor is the text of the *principia* polished enough to indicate that they have been radically revised for publication in a different sequence than they were delivered : the fourth and final article of the fourth *principium* is missing, as is the first corollary the first *principium*, article 3, conclusion 3; the numbers of the extant articles do not always correspond to what is announced in the more polished *collationes*; internal divisions are inconsistently described; sections are left for later but never accomplished, and so on.

True, on folio 61v, after the sermons and before the principal questions, there is an odd list of five question titles, the first of which is in a different hand from the other titles : « *Utrum Victor fortissimus ex condignitate mereatur certum pignus gloriae beatae, id est, utrum viator mereatur de condigno vitam beatam* », and then these :

1. *Utrum Victor potentissimus medius in Trinitate sit Filius verissimus Virginis intemeratae.*
2. *Utrum Victor invictissimus in sua humanitate sit cibus suavissimus animae gratificatae.*
3. *Utrum Victor fortissimus ex valoris dignitate merebatur certum pignus gloriae perpetuitate.*

⁶ DUBA and SCHABEL, « Remigio, Scotus, Auriol, and the Myth », *passim*.

4. *Utrum Victor altissimus natus in aeternitate possit fuisse factivus mundi sempiternitate*

Thematically, these questions correspond to books I-IV-III-II, which is yet another sequence. Moreover, the third of these questions, which is topically close to the question written above in the other hand, does not come close to matching the question that Pierre actually asks for book III, which is « *Utrum Virgo fidelissima Victoris sit Mater cuius, ut tenet fides pia, Deus fuit Pater* », and nowhere does Pierre address the topic of merit in his *principia*. What folio 61v means is thus a mystery.

Unfortunately, exactly what the *Sententiarum* did in 1382-1383 also remains a mystery, but it is possible that they lectured on the four books in the sequence I-IV-II-III and yet delivered their *collationes* and *principia* in the sequence corresponding to books I-II-III-IV, however awkward that may sound. It is also possible that, unlike the principal debates, the time devoted to lecturing on the books of the *Sentences* was not so rigidly prescribed, which would explain why treatments of book III are often so short: reading I-IV-II-III, the bachelors frequently failed to leave themselves sufficient time for book III. I will return to this general problem in a separate study.

Pierre Leduc considered the texts edited below to be particularly important, since the material from the four days of his principal performances covers more than half as many folios as what he recorded for the 122 normal lectures on the *Sentences*, although some of this length is due to the necessary rehearsing of arguments from the previous *principia* for the benefit of the audience members, to whom Pierre refers on occasion in both sermons and questions. At the end of his fourth *Principium*, Pierre adds some remarks concerning the aftermath of his bitter dispute with his Dominican *socius*, Jean le Gay, over the Virgin Mary. Relatively speaking, the University of Paris was suffering in 1382-1383. Earlier in the century, the rise of the University of Oxford and the struggles between France and England that culminated in the Hundred Years' War drastically reduced the flow of English theologians to Paris⁷. The Black Death and the establishment of new universities in Central Europe then took their toll, and when in 1381 the University of Paris required loyalty to the Avignon Pope Clement VII in the context of the Great

⁷ W. J. COURTENAY, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England*, Princeton 1987, p. 151-175.

Schism, it led to the mass exodus of German scholars⁸. None of the known bachelors reading the *Sentences* in 1382-1383 was English or German.

In 1389 the Dominicans left Paris, further impoverishing the University. The cause was the dispute over the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary and the so-called Monzon Affair (1387-1389), which resulted in the condemnation of the Dominican Juan Monzon, who opposed the doctrine. Among those who attacked the Dominicans was the young Victorine Simon de Plumetot, who penned a poem on the Immaculate Conception⁹. As Courtenay's article relates, Plumetot attached his self-portrait to Pierre Leduc's manuscript, in which Pierre's *principia* portray vividly the landscape at Paris vis-à-vis the quarrel a few years before the Monzon Affair. The titles of all of Pierre's *principia* emphasize the Virgin Mary, but after Pierre's second *principium* the Dominican bachelor Jean le Gay engaged him in debate about the relative dignity of the Virgin and the Pope. The exchange descended to the legend of the female pope and *ad hominem* jokes about Jean and his mother, ascending to a crescendo in the fourth *principium*, after which Pierre added one final note to his text, in which he remarks that he heard that Jean was offended by Pierre's defense of the Immaculate Conception, which Jean denied in claiming that the Virgin descended from vice. Pierre writes :

It seems to me that he rather clearly excites a dog that wants to sleep, namely reciting those opinions that we must never mention. So I was moved to express the more common opinion [in favor of the Immaculate Conception]... Although there are [different] opinions on her conception, nevertheless the one that I hold is most pious and grows stronger from day to day, such that against one disbeliever there are one hundred adhering to this truth... This was also the opinion of my venerable doctors and fathers, master Hugh, Richard, and Adam [of Saint-Victor], who were the roots and the shoots of the Faculty of Theology here at Paris, and they preached this opinion 140 years before Thomas [Aquinas] ! So although our voice has

⁸ J. H. OVERFIELD, *Humanism and Scholasticism in Late Medieval Germany*, Princeton 1984, p. 3-12.

⁹ B. GUENÉE, *Entre l'Église et l'État. Quatre vies de prélats français à la fin du Moyen Âge*, Paris 1987, p. 189-201 (in English : *Between Church and State. The Lives of Four French Prelates in the Late Middle Ages*, trans. A. GOLDHAMMER, Chicago 1991, p. 159-169) ; P. KRUPA, *Une grave querelle. L'Université de Paris, les mendiants et la conception immaculée de la Vierge (1387-1390)*, Warsaw 2013.

resounded in some places louder than in others, it has not abandoned the struggle of our fathers.

One can hardly be surprised that the Dominicans left a few years later.

* * *

The edition below classicizes the orthography but retains the structure of the text in Paris, BnF, lat. 14800 (= *P*), attempting to place paragraphs on an inserted cedula and elsewhere according to Pierre Leduc's instructions. Marginal subtitles are inserted between \these brackets/, editorial insertions between <these brackets>. * = *lectio incerta*. The *apparatus criticus* is exhaustive, including corrections, but in standardizing orthography variant spellings or idiosyncratic abbreviations are ignored if no other word could be meant. At times the scribe crosses things out, indicated by *del.*, at times he removes them with dots underneath, indicated by *exp.*, and at times he seems to forget to remove words that he intends to replace above the line or in the margin, in which case the items I believe Pierre meant to delete are in [these brackets] followed by the replacement words in \these brackets/.

The major divisions of the four *principia* questions are treated as articles, as announced in the *collationes*, although in the questions themselves Pierre also seems to employ the terms *dubia*, *conclusiones*, and *propositiones* for these divisions. At the end of the first, third, and fourth *principia* Pierre adds what appear to be later *replicationes*, perhaps delivered or written at some other occasion during the term. To make the dialogues with *socii* more clear, the arguments of the *socii* are often given in quotation marks, followed by Pierre's responses, usually in separate paragraphs.