

COMMUNICATING SOLUTIONS TO THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM IN 1380s FRANCE*

Magda Hayton and Robert L. J. Shaw

FROM the earliest days of the Great Western Schism (1378–1417), academics from across Europe working at the University of Paris urgently sought a means to return unity to the church. In its origin, however, the French monarchy had played a crucial role in fomenting division, and subsequently (between 1381 and 1391–92) even attempted to control and censure debate over the matter. In 1378, Charles V (†1380) offered support to the dissident group of French cardinals who had rejected the election of Urban VI and instead elected Robert of Geneva as “Clement VII” at Fondi (20 September 1378), and when Clement failed to take Rome, Charles resurrected an Avignonesepapacy that had only returned to Italy less than two years earlier, much to his consternation.¹ The price of these decisions was the Christian unity of the West. The French-aligned Angevin kingdom of Naples and that of Navarre joined the new Avignonesepapacy, and in time the kingdoms of Aragon, Castile and Scotland would follow. But while Charles V helped to open the split, three years later his brother, Louis, the duke of Anjou and regent for Charles VI, would help to ossify it: for Louis the only acceptable solution to the Schism was the *via facti*, the use of force to depose Urban VI and leave Clement VII alone to rule as pope. This would ideally be a military inter-

* This article is the product of conversations that began at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto, where both authors were supported by Andrew W. Mellon Fellowships in 2016–17. The authors would also like to thank Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski for providing comments and corrections prior to publication.

¹ On the Schism in general, see Paul Payan, *Entre Rome et Avignon: une histoire du Grand Schisme (1378–1417)* (Paris, 2009); *A Companion to the Great Western Schism (1378–1417)*, ed. Joëlle Rollo-Koster and Thomas M. Izbicki (Leiden, 2009). On academic responses to the Schism, see R. N. Swanson, *Universities, Academics and the Great Schism* (Cambridge, 1979). For the study of French affairs in this period, the detailed work of Noël Valois remains essential: *La France et le grand schisme d'Occident*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1896–1902).

vention in Italy through which Louis could gain personally; he had been adopted by Joanna I as heir to the throne of Naples and had Italian ambitions.

As a result, Louis clamped down on discussion of resolutions to the Schism, a discussion that the University of Paris, with its international membership, desperately wished to continue. In May 1381, the academics attempted to persuade Louis to support the *via concilii* (the use of a general council to end the Schism), but instead, he forced them to swear allegiance to Clement VII. Moreover, he issued a decree by which, according to the *Chronicle of Saint-Denis*, “on the orders of the aforesaid duke [Louis d’Anjou], it was publicly declared within the University of Paris that no one should make mention of the election of the pope or of a general council, on pain of incurring the indignation of the king.”² Thus began a ten-year period of royal censorship of open debate over the Schism, one that would only firmly draw to a close in 1392–93.³ While the initial target of repression was the University, the firmness of government action was felt far beyond it. As Noël Valois once commented, in these years, especially during the minority of Charles VI, “there was no longer a place for open discussion.”⁴

While this ten-year period of official censorship in France seems as if a period of silence, the writings examined in this study point to a continued conversation about the Schism among well-connected academics, monks, and lay persons in and around Paris. This conversation employed—and perhaps required—new focuses, new literary and rhetorical forms, and new back-channels of communication. All of these came together and played their part in modifying discourse concerning the resolution to the

² *Chronique du Religieux de Saint-Denis*, ed. Louis Bellaguet, vol. 1 (Paris, 1839), 86–88: *Chronica Karoli Sexti* 2.2, “quod gravius visum ex parte prefati ducis, in studio Parisiensi fuit publice intimatum, ne quis deinceps, super pena indignacionis regie incurrere, nec de electione pape, nec de concilio generali faceret mencionem.”

³ On the hardening attitude that arrived with Louis, duke of Anjou’s regency, see Swanson, *Universities*, 67–71, 76–79; and Valois, *La France et le grand schisme* 1:339–45. For background on the history of censorship at the University of Paris, see J. M. M. H. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris 1200–1400* (Philadelphia, 1998), and on censorship in England in this period, see Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, *Books Under Suspicion: Censorship and Tolerance of Revelatory Writing in Late Medieval England* (Notre Dame, 2006).

⁴ “Sous le gouvernement absolu des oncles de Charles VI, il n’y avait plus place en France pour la libre discussion” (Valois, *La France et le grand schisme* 1:368).

Schism, enhancing its existential and subversive qualities. Instead of academic treatises or communications to lay or ecclesiastical rulers openly and directly addressing the Schism, the traces of the conversation outlined here are found in such places as an anonymous *epistola diaboli* tract, marginal annotations to twelfth-century apocalyptic prophecies, monastic devotional material, and an allegorical travel narrative. Moreover, the conversants that we can identify—Pierre d’Ailly, Simon du Bosc, Pierre Pochet, Philippe de Mézières, and Pierre de Luxembourg, to name the most prominent—demonstrate that Louis’s attempt at repression and academic censorship resulted in new constellations of influence. As we will see, in 1395, shortly after the ban was lifted, some of these well-connected men were called upon to advise the French monarchy on how to bring an end to the Schism at a council of French clergy, and thus they were able to bring the ideas that they had been shaping behind closed doors into the light of open debate. While there were undoubtedly other avenues of clandestine communication in 1380s France, this article focuses on two discourses that were highly influential during the ban—one drawn from Hildegardian prophecy and one that took place amid the monastic reform activity of the French Celestines—and on their communication and influence. A figure that appears again and again throughout the twists and turns of our story is Pierre d’Ailly, and so it is fitting that we begin with two polemical works that he published anonymously in the months after Louis issued his decree.

ANOTHER WAY OF TALKING: PROPHETIC VOICES

In late 1381 or 1382, Pierre d’Ailly, the future chancellor of the University of Paris and key influencer at the councils of Pisa and Constance, having retreated to Noyon following Louis’s repression of academic discussion, put pen to paper on two anonymous, allegorical missives concerning the Schism: the *Invectiva Ezechielis prophete contra pseudo pastores* and the *Epistola diaboli Leviathan ad pseudoprelates Ecclesie pro scismate confirmando*. In the *Epistola*, it is the devil who speaks, propounding his wicked desire to keep the church disunited, celebrating those ecclesiastical prelates aiding him in this work by fomenting division, and venting his anger at those who cried out for a “General Council! General Council!”⁵ In the *Invectiva*, the stated author was none other than the

⁵ See Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, “The Conceptualization and Imagery of the

prophet Ezekiel himself, who addresses his letter “to all pseudo pastors.”⁶ For this “Ezekiel,” these pseudo pastors were churchmen whose behaviour had caused the schism between the Roman observance of Urban VI and the Avignonese observance of Clement VII, which included France.⁷ They are critiqued in the harshest possible terms as men who “not only look to have what is theirs but take what is not theirs, snatch away the things of others,”⁸ and instead of living according to the Gospels prefer to “pasture themselves” and live in “drunkenness,” “extravagance,” “filth,” “pride and vanity,” “womanly wantonness,” and “secular pomp.”⁹ The letter not only gives a diagnosis but predicts—even prophesies—a cure: the emergence of

Great Schism,” in *Companion to the Great Western Schism*, ed. Rollo-Koster and Izbicki, 155–56; an English translation of the text and discussion of authorship is found in Irving W. Raymond, “D’Ailly’s *Epistola Diaboli Leviathan*,” *Church History* 22 (1953): 181–91. The Latin text used by Raymond, as well as a transcription of the *Invectiva Ezechielis prophete*, can be found in Paul Tschackert, *Peter von Ailli (Petrus de Alliaco): Zur Geschichte des grossen abendländischen Schisma und der Reformconcilien von Pisa und Constanz* (Gotha, 1877), appendices IV (*Invectiva*) and V (*Epistola*).

⁶ “Ezechiel propheta domini universis pseudo pastoribus ue pro salute” (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France [BnF] lat. 3122, fol. 76v). There are five known surviving copies of the *Invectiva*; two are fifteenth-century collections of Pierre d’Ailly’s works (Paris, BnF lat. 3122, fols. 76v–78v, and Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, 531 [490], fols. 185r–187r) and three are prophecy collections where it was copied close to the Hildegardian “Schism Extracts,” discussed below (Paris, BnF lat. 3319, fols. 91v–94v [s. XIV ex.]; s’Gravenhage, Koninklijke Bibliotheek 71.E.44, fols. 144r–147v [1455]; and Tours, Bibliothèque municipale 520, fols. 215r–218r [1422]). On the three prophecy collections, see Magda Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy and French Prophecy Collections, 1378–1455: A Study and Critical Edition of the ‘Schism Extracts,’” *Traditio* 72 (2017): 453–91.

⁷ After stating that there are no pastors willing to speak the truth, d’Ailly writes that “the Son of God himself will speak the truth to them [i.e. the pseudo pastors]; he will make clear the cause of the present schism” (“ipse eis dei filius verum dicat, ipse presentis causam scismatis aperiat,” Paris, BnF lat. 3122, fol. 76v), and then proceeds to describe the failings of the clergy and how they have brought division. The need to speak the truth and reveal the cause of the Schism is seen in other texts emanating from the conversation outlined here; see nn. 100, 128 below.

⁸ “... qui non solum sua querunt sed et non sua capiunt, rapiunt aliena” (ibid., fol. 77r).

⁹ “*Ordinavit, inquit Dominus, hiis qui euangelium predicant uel annunciant de euangelio uiuere* [Jo 1:14]. Sed quomodo uiuere? Sane non ut pseudo pastores seipsos pascentes, non in crapula et ebrietate, non in luxuria et feditate, non in superbia et uanitate, non in muliebri lasciua, ... non in seculari pompa” (ibid.).

“good pastors, not one so much but many and among the many one above all the pastors.”¹⁰ This ultimate “good pastor, the good one who promotes the good ones” would “oppress the evil ones.”¹¹

Despite the ban, Pierre thus continued to write, to put down his thoughts on the Schism in a manner that might allow him to avoid censure. Writing anonymously, his irritation at the contemporary situation is palpable. Both from his own report and that of his protégé, Jean Gerson, there is evidence that Pierre had presented the University’s recommendation for a general council to Louis d’Anjou in 1381: he had been one of those crying out for a general council.¹² The fact that he chose to communicate in anonymous allegory—a relatively natural choice once one was no longer supposed to argue openly—helps to give his anger and concern more force: the opponents of peace were servants of the devil, “pseudo-pastors,” people at the edge of the faith and perhaps even heretics or apostates.

But amid Pierre’s frustration, it is interesting to observe that he found hope by taking on a prophetic voice, that of Ezekiel in the *Invectiva*. In the circumstances of the ban, this was surely an appealing strategy: rather than arguing for what he thought *should* happen, he stated what *would* happen in the voice of a prophet—drawing from and expanding on Ezekiel’s prophecies, especially those found in chap. 34, where the greedy shepherds are stripped of their flocks—which in turn redoubled the power and weight of the statement. Ezekiel had never spoken of a schism, of course, but the force of these predictions was reinforced by their alignment with other well-known prophetic sources that had, in particular the twelfth-century visionary Hildegard of Bingen (1098–1179). Evidence indeed suggests that Hildegardian prophecy found particular use within the period of the ban, providing another way of communicating ideas concerning the solution to the Schism, and in turn changing what people saw as being at stake in it.

¹⁰ “Sed absit ut hoc uel leuiter credamus, sed optamus uisceraliter ut sint pastores boni, non unus tantum sed multi et inter multos omnium pastorum unus” (ibid., fol. 78v).

¹¹ “... ipse pastor bonus, bonus qui bonos eligat, malos premat.... Hic sane qui non ex sanguinibus neque ex uoluntate carnis neque ex uoluntate uiri sed ex Deo nascitur [Ez 34:2], nec humana sed diuina auctoritate sublimatur et prosperibitur in secula seculorum. Amen” (ibid.).

¹² Valois, *La France et le grand schisme* 1:340–41.

The Hildegardian “Schism Extracts”

Like the works of many medieval prophets, Hildegard of Bingen’s corpus was read with renewed interest after 1378.¹³ For late medieval readers, including Pierre d’Ailly, Hildegard’s prophecies were readily available through the widely disseminated *Speculum futurorum temporum siue Pentachronon sancte Hildegardis* (*Mirror of Future Times or Five Times of Saint Hildegard*; henceforth *Pentachronon*), Gebeno of Eberbach’s compilation (ca. 1220) of excerpts from her writings.¹⁴ Hildegard herself had witnessed the schism of 1159–77 between Alexander III and Victor IV which left its mark on her thought,¹⁵ but it was Gebeno who excerpted and collaged her descriptions of future ecclesiastical tribulation and renewal to

¹³ On Hildegard generally, see the recent *A Companion to Hildegard of Bingen*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Debra L. Stoudt, and George Ferzoco (Leiden, 2014). On Hildegard’s reception during the Great Western Schism, see Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy,” and “Pierre d’Ailly’s *De falsis prophetis II* and the *Collectiones* of William of St. Amour,” *Viator* 44.2 (2013): 243–66; Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, “Prophecy and Suspicion: Closet Radicalism, Reformist Politics, and the Vogue for Hildegardiana in Ricardian England,” *Speculum* 75 (2000): 318–41; José Carlos Santos Paz, *Cisma y profecía: Estudio y edición de la carta de Enrique de Langenstein a Ecardo de Ders sobre el gran cisma* (La Coruña, 2000); André Vauchez, “Les théologiens face aux prophéties à l’époque des papes d’Avignon et du Grand Schisme,” *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome: Moyen-Âge* 102 (1990): 577–88; and Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Poets, Saints, and Visionaries of the Great Schism 1378–1417* (University Park, Pa., 2006). On the reception of prophecy in the period more generally, see Hélène Millet, “Écoute et usage des prophéties par les prélats pendant le Grand Schisme,” *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome: Moyen-Âge* 102 (1990): 425–55; and Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Notre Dame, 1993).

¹⁴ *La obra de Gebenón de Eberbach*, ed. José Carlos Santos Paz (Florence, 2004). On the *Pentachronon*, see also the publications by Kerby-Fulton, Hayton, and Santos Paz cited in the previous note and Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, *Reformist Apocalypticism and Piers Plowman* (Cambridge, 1990); Magda Hayton, “Prophets, Prophecy, and Cistercians: A Study of the Most Popular Version of the Hildegardian *Pentachronon*,” *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 29 (2019): 123–62; and Elisabeth Stein, “Das ‘Pentachronon’ Gebenos von Eberbach: Das Fortleben der Visionstexte Hildegards von Bingen bis ins 15. Jahrhundert,” in “*Im Angesicht Gottes suche der Mensch sich selbst*”: *Hildegard von Bingen (1098–1179)*, ed. Ranier Berndt (Berlin, 2001), 577–91.

¹⁵ Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, “Prophet and Reformer: Smoke in the Vineyard,” in *Voice of the Living Light: Hildegard of Bingen and Her World*, ed. Barbara Newman (Berkeley, 1998), 70–90; Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Poets, Saints, and Visionaries*, 23–26.

form a composite image of a soon-to-come schism.¹⁶ In the *Pentachronon*, moreover, this schism is caused by a lack of attention to monastic and ecclesiastical reform, which comes with its resolution.¹⁷ With Hildegard's prophecies presented in this way, it is not surprising that the *Pentachronon* was popular throughout schism-era Europe, holding sway over learned readers in both obediences and being read both at the University of Paris and at Oxford. At the latter, those academics who supported the conciliar resolution quoted one of her prophecies in a letter they wrote to Richard II, king of England, attempting to win his support.¹⁸ There is likewise compelling evidence that during the debate ban in France, Hildegardian prophecy was one vector through which discussion persisted in and around Paris.

Amid a rising atmosphere of repression of opinion in France, one reader put into circulation a group of five excerpts from the *Pentachronon*—a short passage from Gebeno's prologue used as an extended rubric and four Hildegardian prophecies¹⁹—altering the Hildegardian narrative in order to illuminate the contemporary ecclesiastical crisis for French readers. This work, the "Schism Extracts," is found in seven known manuscripts of the

¹⁶ Gebeno writes in his *Prologus* to the *Pentachronon* that he composed the anthology with this schismatic tribulation in mind: "maxime autem et specialiter propter emendationem et correctionem claustralium et cleri eum [libellum hunc] descripsi, quia iuxta prophetiam beate uirginis grauissimi scismatis et confusionis laqueus in fine istius primi temporis super omnem clerum et ordinem ecclesiasticum extendetur, ita ut de patria et locis suis expellantur, nisi Dei clementiam ad misericordiam ardore sacre deuotionis studeant reuocare" (*La obra*, 5). This focus on an imminent schismatic tribulation is even more explicit in the version of the *Pentachronon* popular in France during the Schism; see Hayton, "Hildegardian Prophecy," 455–60.

¹⁷ The *Pentachronon* reflects Hildegard's apocalypticism in this respect. Hildegard taught in numerous places that reform was necessary and that if the clergy and, to a lesser degree, monastics failed to carry it out, God would force their hand by means of a purifying tribulation. See Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, "A Return to 'The First Dawn of Justice': Hildegard's Visions of Clerical Reform and the Eremitical Life," *American Benedictine Review* 40 (1989): 383–407, and *Reformist Apocalypticism*, 31–55; and Hayton "Hildegardian Prophecy," 456–57, and "Prophets, Prophecy, and Cistercians," 143–49, 153–58.

¹⁸ Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, "Oxford," in *Europe: A Literary History, 1348–1418*, vol. 1, ed. David Wallace (Oxford, 2016), 208–26. This is the Cologne Prophecy, discussed further below. See also Santos Paz, *Cisma y profecía* on Henry of Langenstein's use of the Cologne Prophecy.

¹⁹ See n. 29 below.

late fourteenth through mid-fifteenth centuries, three of which also contain the complete *Pentachronon* and Pierre d'Ailly's *Invectiva*; it circulated almost exclusively within French-speaking territories.²⁰ The evidence of the text's circulation and the rich number of annotations added in the margins have left for us a trail of evidence about the use of prophecy to converse about the Schism and its resolution despite repression.

The "Schism Extracts" circulated among those in and around Paris who had been involved in debates concerning the Schism, including not only influential members of the University but also members of monastic houses. The earliest datable witness is found in a large collection of Schism-related material that belonged to the Benedictine monastery of Jumièges, a manuscript that, as Annick Brabant and H el ene Millet have shown, was owned by Simon du Bosc.²¹ Simon was not only a monk of Jumi ges, becoming abbot there in 1391, but also a member of the law faculty at the University of Paris. Simon participated in many French councils, the French ecclesiastical diplomatic mission to both popes in 1405–6 and the Council of Constance. Most notably here, Simon was present at the 1395 council of the clergy in Paris called by Charles VI to discuss solutions to the Schism shortly after the ban had been lifted. His copy of the "Extracts" is found in a compilation once erroneously dated to ca. 1379–80 on account of its opening matter discussing the election of Urban VI.²² A closer study of this compilation, however, reveals that the content was ordered chronologically and quite possibly pieced together contemporaneously during the Schism.²³ The "Extracts" occur just after a

²⁰ For a critical edition of the "Extracts" and discussion of their manuscript transmission, see Hayton, "Hildegardian Prophecy."

²¹ Rouen, Biblioth que municipale 1355, fols. 91v–92v. On this volume and its two companions, Rouen, Biblioth que municipale 1356 and 1357, see Millet, " coute et usage," 430–36; and Annika Brabant, "Documenter le Grand Schisme d'Occident.  tude sur les recueils de deux intellectuels normands, Simon du Bosc et Simon de Plumetot," *M langes de l' cole fran aise de Rome: Moyen  ge* 123 (2011): 597–610.

²² Harold Lee, Marjorie Reeves, and Giulio Silano, *Western Mediterranean Prophecy: The School of Joachim of Fiore and the Fourteenth-Century Breviloquium*, Studies and Texts 88 (Toronto, 1989), 156. Rouen, Biblioth que municipale 1355 is certainly of late fourteenth-century construction, and it begins with documents about the contested election of Urban VI (1378), with over eighty folios of material on this matter: this content is likely to have been the source for the dating of 1379–80.

²³ The material in Rouen, Biblioth que municipale 1355 concerns the early Schism period, beginning with election of 1378 and ending with documents related to

set of prophecies concerning Charles VI that circulated in the first years of his reign, which began in 1380.²⁴ It thus seems certain that Simon obtained the text in the 1380s, and most likely the early 1380s, during the initial period of the ban.

Another two copies of the “Schism Extracts” likewise point to their early circulation among monastic houses. One is found in a late fourteenth-century compilation of the Carthusians of Mont-Dieu, where the “Extracts” sit among sermons and diverse spiritual matter.²⁵ The manuscript contains works devoted to preaching and the spiritual life of a French monastery; it includes sermons, poems to the Virgin and the Gospel of the Passion, all in French, as well as a Life of St. Thomas and an unfinished collection of sermons for the liturgical year in Latin. The “Schism Extracts” are copied near the end of the manuscript and are followed by a group of anecdotes recounting the dreams of various monks and an excerpt from the visions of a nun. The scribe who copied the text clearly felt that the prophecies were immediately relevant; perhaps shaken by their reading, they added a prayer to Saint Barbara petitioning for help:

Saint Barbara, most pious virgin, you who endured bodily shame and entreated God that those who hold you in their memories be liberated from every disgrace of this age, I pray of you humbly, see fit to beseech God so that by your love you might obtain that I be [removed] from any evil infamy.²⁶

The third monastic copy of the “Extracts” resides—with the *Pentachron* itself, as well as Pierre d’Ailly’s *Invectiva*—in a prophetic compilation of the early fifteenth century that belonged to the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris but later found its way into the hands of Charles of Or-

the *via cessionis* and the subtraction of obedience (up to ca. 1404). One of its companion volumes, Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale 1356, covers 1403–17 in a similar manner. See Brabant, “Documenter le Grand Schisme d’Occident.”

²⁴ Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale 1355, fols. 87v–89v. See Maurice Chaume, “Une prophétie relative à Charles VI,” *Revue du moyen âge latin* 3 (1947): 27–31; and Millet, “Écoute et usage,” 434. The Charles prophecies, the “Schism Extracts,” and the preceding material on the election of 1378 are each written in different hands.

²⁵ Charleville, Bibliothèque municipale 100, fols. 144r–147v.

²⁶ “Sancta Barbara piissima virgo, que corporeum obprobrium sustinuisti et Deum exorasti ut qui te in memoria aberant ab omni vituperatione huius saeculi liberarentur. Te supliciter exoro ut Deum exorare digneris, quatinus tui amore obtineas, ut me ab omni mala infami(…)” (ibid., fol. 147v).

léans.²⁷ Here the “Extracts” were included in a large collection of thirteenth-century Joachite and Sibylline works. Taking the Jumièges, Mont-Dieu, and Saint-Germain-des-Prés witnesses together, one gets the sense of a text that circulated through monastic channels in northern France during and shortly after the ban, channels that were distinct from but remained close to the academic environment; while the Carthusians did not send men to university, Jumièges and Saint-Germain-des-Prés did.

The final exemplar mentioned postdates the debate ban, but this and the other four fifteenth-century witnesses should not be discounted as having nothing to say concerning the early Schism period: from what can be seen of the manuscript tradition, their annotations often seem to reflect earlier exemplars, some of which have clearly been lost.²⁸ While it is impossible to reconstruct entirely which comments pertained to the period of the ban and which did not, the manuscript tradition certainly sprang from the constrained atmosphere of the 1380s in northern France. Indeed, to judge from the compiler’s choice of rubric, the very purpose of compiling the “Extracts” appears to have been to present clear, selected messages about the Schism while escaping censorship: taking a line from Gebeno’s prologue to the *Pentachronon*, the reader is reminded that Hildegard’s books were “received and canonized by Pope Eugenius [III] at the Council of Trier, in the presence of many bishops and prelates, as much French as Teutonic, and of St. Bernard of Clairvaux.”²⁹ Using a pre-existing, recognized prophetic work to talk about the Schism was a clever tactic to avoid censure, and especially so in the case of Hildegard:³⁰ the implicit question would seem to be how Louis, duke of Anjou, could stop people reading what the

²⁷ Paris, BnF lat. 3319, fols. 88v–91v; see Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy,” 478.

²⁸ See the stemma and discussion in Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy,” 479–81. The other witnesses are Angers, Bibliothèque municipale 320 (311) (France, Abbey of La Baumette, 1425–1450?); s’Gravenhage, Koninklijke Bibliotheek 71.E.44 (unknown provenance, 1455); Paris, BnF lat. 14726 (Abbey of Saint-Victor, s. XV); and Tours, Bibliothèque municipale 520 (France, Abbey of Marmoutier, ca. 1422).

²⁹ “Hec que secuntur extracta sunt de libris Sancte Hildegardis prophetisse, qui libri recepti et canonizati sunt a Papa Eugenio in Concilio Treverensi, presentibus multis episcopis et prelatibus, tam Francorum quam Theutonicorum, et Sancto Bernardo Clarevallensi Abbate” (Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy,” 483). On this passage, see *ibid.*, 460 n. 22. For Gebeno’s original, see *La obra*, 6.

³⁰ As Kerby-Fulton has shown, Hildegard’s prophecies, unlike other revelatory works, were able to avoid censure in England during this same period where they were likewise being used by reform-minded thinkers (“Prophecy and Suspicion”).

Church—including its French representatives—had already approved. This is but one example, however, of how the “Extracts” reflect their time: taken as a whole, the manuscripts offer a rare, if clearly imperfect, window into the atmosphere of those years. Among the topics treated in the annotations are ecclesiastical reform (particularly through disendowment), heresy, and the *via concilii*.

The “Schism Extracts” within the Context of Debate

In no small part, the “Schism Extracts” helped readers to place the Schism within a broader historical narrative, providing apparent clarity over causation and eventual results. One of the prophecies used, originally from Hildegard’s *Liber divinorum operum*, focused on ecclesiastical reform through the disendowment of the church and its return to evangelical poverty.³¹ In Hildegard’s narrative, the allegorical figure of Justice petitions God to punish those clergy who are “violators of rectitude” (*preuaricatores rectitudinis*) and, reminiscent of Pierre d’Ailly’s *Invectiva*, rapacious wolves that devour their flocks, insatiable drunkards, adulterers, and plunderers of churches.³² Divine intervention comes in the form of the aristocracy forcibly removing wealth from the clergy and establishing a clear division between ecclesiastical and lay jurisdictions.³³ While at first resisting this intervention, the clergy eventually come to understand that they were in error and agree to the reforms. Annotations to this passage label clerical failings as the crimes of the church (*crimina ecclesie*) and describe the disendowment of the church (specifically, the loss of “estates and possessions” according to one scribe) as a return to “ancient poverty” (“*ecclesia reueretur ad antiquam paupertatem*”).³⁴ In several manuscripts they highlight that this shake-up will bring understanding to the church

³¹ This text, known as the “*Iusticia* prophecy,” was one of Hildegard’s most popular prophecies in the later medieval period and was often copied on its own; see Kerby-Fulton, “Return to ‘The First Dawn of Justice,’” and “Prophet and Reformer.”

³² “*Quamdiu rapaces lupos patiemur ... quasi lupi agnos nos deuorant atque in crapula uoraces sunt et adulteria quam plurima perpetrant. ... Raptores etiam ecclesiarum sunt*” (Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy,” 483–84).

³³ *Ibid.*, 484–85.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 484: “*ecclesie expellentur suis prediis et possessionibus*” is added to the annotations in the Rouen manuscript. These annotations are found in the Rouen, s’Gravenhage, Charleville, and Tours manuscripts, which include the earliest and latest witnesses.

(“uexacio dat ecclesie intellectum”) and result in the entire church being reformed for the better (“tota ecclesia in melius reformabitur”).³⁵ Some annotators also pointed to a humbling or humiliation of the church: because the church was compelled, it will be humbled before the laity (“ecclesia coram laicis coacta humiliabitur”).³⁶ Many of the ideas found in these annotations resonate with other writings of the period, as we will see.

From one aspect, this passage and its treatment represent a continuity with how intellectuals based at Paris were already using Hildegard’s prophecies in the immediate lead-up to the repression of academic debate: as the Schism became entrenched and as both sides solidified their legal position and the support of lay princes, it was natural enough to look to accepted prophecies for what was occurring and what was to come. Conrad of Gelnhausen’s *Tractatus de congregando concilio tempore schismatis (Epistola concordiae, 1380)* echoed this same passage in describing the “seduction of the simple” (*simplicium seductio*), the “destruction of lands, regions, and kingdoms” (*uastatio terrarum, et regionum et regnorum*), and the “removal and squandering of ecclesiastical patrimonies accrued by the blood of the martyrs” (*ablatio et dissipatio ecclesiasticorum patrimoniorum sanguine martyrum congestorum*).³⁷ Pierre d’Ailly did the same in his *Sermo de sancto Francisco*, delivered at Paris just seven months prior to Louis, duke of Anjou’s ban on 4 October 1380,³⁸ ex-

³⁵ The former annotation is found in the Rouen, s’Gravenhage, and Charleville manuscripts, the latter only in the Rouen and s’Gravenhage manuscript. Annotations in Angers, Bibliothèque municipale 320 more explicitly than any other present the laity as judge and jury of a church on trial for her crimes. The scribe begins by adding a rubric that this is “about the grave persecution of the church” (“de persecutione graui ecclesie”) noting the “verdict of the laity” (“laycorum sententia”) which is later “executed” (“sentencie executio”) with “just moderation” (“iusta moderacio”). Finally, the annotator notes how this leads to the “penitence and humble confession of the church” (“penitentia et humilis confessio ecclesiae”). See, Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy,” 483–85.

³⁶ This annotation is found in the Rouen and s’Gravenhage manuscripts (*ibid.*, 485).

³⁷ Conrad of Gelnhausen, “Epistola concordiae,” in *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, vol. 2 (Paris, 1717), 1201.

³⁸ *Sermo de sancto Francisco* in *Petrus de Alliaco: Tractatus et sermones* (Strassburg, 1490), fols. 161r–163v. On this sermon, see José Carlos Santos Paz, “Milenarismo franciscano en el *Sermo de beato Francisco* de Pedro d’Ailly,” *Hispania Sacra* 71/143 (2019), available at <https://doi.org/10.3989/hs.2019.006>. The authors thank Dr. Santos Paz for sharing this article with them prior to its publication. See

plicitly naming Hildegard as the primary source for his understanding of the Schism in terms of the church on trial as a consequence of clerical sin.³⁹ He delineated three stages to the current persecution of the church that, he writes, “by reason of the present schism is to be carried out against the clergy.”⁴⁰ First, “the church, on account of its various sins, is criminally charged”; here, he specifically pointed to the failings of “ecclesiastical men and especially pseudo pastors and prelates.”⁴¹ Pierre was especially interested in the relationship between pseudo pastors and the lay aristocracy, presenting the latter in somewhat less flattering terms than Hildegard had in her original narrative.⁴² He wrote of how “lands, cities and regions subject to the church are laid waste in a hostile way by seculars on account of the present schism” and that afterwards, “the church will be like a devastated city, robbed of her temporal riches by mercenaries and

also Louis B. Pascoe, *Church and Reform: Bishops, Theologians, and Canon Lawyers in the Thought of Pierre d’Ailly (1351–1420)* (Leiden, 2005).

³⁹ The prophetic authority that d’Ailly attributes to Hildegard on Schism-related matters is clearly stated in the conclusion to his sermon: “Sed ne forte nostra expositio et scripturarum applicatio a sapientibus mundi temeraria iudicetur quasi ex meo sensu procedere uideatur, nouerit charitas uestra quod premissa omnia que circa ecclesiam dicta sunt esse futura beata hyldegardis his temporibus implenda esse apertissime prophetauit, sicut patet ex libro suo Diuinorum Operum ex epistola ad Conradum regem Frederici imperatoris antecessorem, ex epistolis quoque ad Colonienses et Treuerenses ac etiam ex pluribus aliis eius dictis et scriptis que allegare dimitto gratia breuitatis. . . . Hec ergo pauca superius per me dicta tante autoritatis et tam autentice approbationis robore confirmata ideo uestre caritati proposui ut per ea contra preuisa persecutionum iacula cautiores reddamur et inter futura perturbationum mala per euangelice regule obseruantiam pacem Christi ueram finaliter consequamur” (*Sermo de sancto Francisco*, fol. 163v). In this sermon, Pierre draws heavily from Gebeno of Eberbach’s *Item de eisdem hereticis ex Apocalypsi*, an exegetical work which was included in some versions of the *Pentachronon* and in which Gebeno combined Hildegard’s prophecies with those of the biblical Apocalypse and offered his interpretations; see Santos Paz, *Cisma y profecía*, 18–21, and “Milenarismo franciscano.”

⁴⁰ “Hoc est . . . persecutio . . . que occasione presentis scismatis exercenda est contra clerum” (*Sermo de sancto Francisco*, fol. 163r)

⁴¹ “. . . quidem qualiter ecclesia propter peccata uaria sit culpabiliter accusenda. . . . Sane experientia docente uiri ecclesiastici et specialiter pseudo pastores et prelati in omnibus his peccauerunt et alia plura flagicia perpetrarunt” (ibid.).

⁴² The idea of an unholy alliance between false pastors and the lay aristocracy is also present in Pierre d’Ailly’s *De falsis prophetis II*; see Hayton, “Pierre d’Ailly’s *De falsis prophetis II*,” 256–57.

she will be cruelly left to be devoured by pseudo pastors, i.e., wolves.”⁴³ The third stage will be the consolation of the church and at that time the “evil pastors will be punished” and “they will be confounded by the idols to which they have sacrificed, that is, by the secular princes whom they honoured more often than God and worshipped as if idols.”⁴⁴ To complete this consolation, God will send “new judges through whom, by God’s grace, the church will be brought back to the ancient justice of the evangelical rule.”⁴⁵ Among the reasons that God will send these judges, d’Ailly states, is so that they can “preach the gospel of the kingdom to the prelates adulterating the word of God.”⁴⁶ Louis Pascoe has argued that d’Ailly’s “new judges” represent theologians who, as teachers and preachers, will help in the reform of the church; as will be seen, there is evidence suggesting that Pierre, along with like-minded masters from the university and a young reformist cardinal, prepared to fulfill this prophecy through a preaching tour in the late 1380s.⁴⁷

In comparison to Pierre and Conrad, however, the “Extracts” have a somewhat more radical tilt in their blunt equation of Hildegardian prophecies with present times and a more limited interpretative framework—annotations rather than a wider argument. With Conrad, the total stripping of ecclesiastical property is presented as negative, even if the Church had been let down by the greedy: its riches, after all, had been “accrued by the blood of the martyrs.” Pierre’s outlook sees it as part of a tribulation with

⁴³ “Ad litteram plane uerum esse uidetur quod terre ciuitates et regiones ecclesie subdite propter presens scisma ab alienis hoc est a secularibus hostiliter uastabuntur ... sic filia syon, idest ecclesia, postquam fuerit quasi ciuitas que uastatur suis temporalibus diuitiis spoliata a mercenariis et pseudo pastoribus, [idest] lupis, deuoranda inhumaniter relinquetur” (*Sermo de sancto Francisco*, fol. 163r). Cf. Pierre d’Ailly’s similar descriptions of pseudo pastors as wolves in his *De falsis prophetis I* and *II* (see Hayton, “Pierre d’Ailly’s *De falsis prophetis II*”).

⁴⁴ “...punientur ergo teste Deo pastores mali.... confundentur enim ab idolis quibus sacrificauerunt, idest a principibus secularibus, quos sepe plus quam Deum honorantes quasi idola coluerunt” (*Sermo de sancto Francisco*, fol. 163r).

⁴⁵ “His itaque repulsis consolabuntur iusti, exaltabuntur honesti, et instituentur iudices noui per quos ecclesia ad antiquam euangelice regule iusticiam Dei gratia reducetur” (ibid.).

⁴⁶ “...ad predicandum euangelium regni prelati adulterantibus uerbum dei” (ibid., 163v). This passage is taken from the Joachimite *Super Hieremiam*.

⁴⁷ Pascoe, *Church and Reform*, 180–81. For an alternative interpretation of d’Ailly’s “new judges” as Franciscans, see Santos Paz, “Milenarismo franciscano.” On the preaching tour, see pp. 333–34 below.

an eventually positive result, but there is no hint that he supported the loss of such patrimonies. Some of the annotators of the “Extracts,” however, seem more certain: the despoliation of the Church allowed a return to “ancient poverty.”

Another passage chosen for the “Extracts” is a long selection from Hildegard’s Cologne Prophecy that focuses on a different topic of concern within Schism-era discourse: “hypocrites” or “heretics” and their role in the crisis.⁴⁸ This prophecy depicts a group of seducing hypocrites who are experts at feigning sanctity. Sent and encouraged by the devil, they preach against the clergy for their drunkenness, luxury and failure to fulfill pastoral duties—Pierre d’Ailly’s *Invectiva* brings this same image to the fore—and through their preaching win the support of the laity. This brings a chastising persecution in which even the “doctors and wise ones who then faithfully persist in the catholic faith” are driven out.⁴⁹ Ultimately, however, the seducing hypocrites are revealed for who they are, hunted down by the lay princes they have seduced, and killed; the clergy, reformed through their tribulations, “will shine as if the purist gold and will remain so for a long time.”⁵⁰ Among the numerous annotations to this prophecy in the “Extracts” are those emphasizing that “the devil is nourished by the crimes of the clergy” (“dyabolus pascitur in criminibus clericorum”), that he “encourages [the hypocrites] to persecute the church” (“dyabolus hor-

⁴⁸ The Cologne Prophecy was originally a sermon that Hildegard preached at Cologne and survives in a letter sent to the bishop of Cologne upon his request for a copy of the sermon; see especially, Konrad Bund, “Die ‘Prophetin,’ ein Dichter und die Niederlassung der Bettelorden in Köln: Der Brief der Hildegard von Bingen an den Kölner Klerus und das Gedicht *Prophetia Sancte Hyldegardis de Novis Fratribus* des Magisters Heinrich von Avranches,” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 23 (1988): 171–260; Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, “Hildegard of Bingen and Anti-Mendicant Propaganda,” *Traditio* 43 (1987): 386–99; and eadem, “When Women Preached: An Introduction to Female Homiletic, Sacramental, and Liturgical Roles in the Later Middle Ages,” in *Voices in Dialogue: Reading Women in the Middle Ages*, ed. Linda Olson and Kathryn Kerby-Fulton (Notre Dame, 2005), 31–55.

⁴⁹ “Cumque isti [i.e., the heretics] cursum erroris sui hoc modo confirmauerint doctores et sapientes qui tunc in fide catholica fideliter persistunt undique persequentes expellent” (Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy,” 490).

⁵⁰ The full description of the reformed clergy reads “Tunc aurora iusticie et nouissima uestra meliora prioribus erunt ac de omnibus preteritis timorati eritis et quasi purissimum aurum fulgebitis et sic per longa tempora permanebitis” (ibid., 491). On this passage and clerical reform in Hildegard’s writings, see the publications listed in n. 17 above.

tatur suis ad persecutionem ecclesiae”), and how they then “persecute the doctors of the church” (“isti doctores ecclesie persequentur”).⁵¹ The annotations also underscore that these “are the scourge of the church by which her crimes will be purged” (“isti erunt flagellum ecclesie quo eius crimina purgabuntur”), and, finally, that “after the predicted scourge, the church will be renewed for the better” (“post predicta flagella ecclesia in melius renouabitur”), thus presenting an ultimately reformist prophecy.⁵² Hildegard’s Cologne Prophecy was widely circulated in the centuries after her death and its most popular interpretation was as an anti-mendicant prophecy.⁵³ She had originally been warning of the danger of Cathars, but during the Schism, the heretical hypocrites were identified with new groups, including Hussites and Wycliffites.⁵⁴ For learned readers of the “Schism Extracts” during the ban, however, there was another possible identification: the implacable partisans of the competing obediences and those who tried to silence debate by persecuting “the doctors of the church”—the highlighting of this section must surely be read as an allusion to the censorship of the time. Notably, it was an identification which diverged from the earlier caution advised by the University of Paris, which had (prior to the end of open discussion) banned members from calling others heretics as a result of their papal allegiance.⁵⁵ The neutrality of that

⁵¹ The first two annotations are found in the Rouen, s’Gravenhage, and Angers manuscripts and the third in the Rouen and Angers manuscripts; see Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy,” 488–90.

⁵² These annotations are found in the Rouen and s’Gravenhage manuscripts, with similar annotations also found in the Angers manuscript: “scopa sunt ecclesiae” and “purgatis peccatis renouabitur ecclesia,” respectively (*ibid.*, 491).

⁵³ Kerby-Fulton, “Hildegard of Bingen;” Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, Magda Hayton and Kenna Olsen, “Pseudo-Hildegardian Prophecy and Antimendicant Propaganda in Late-Medieval England: An Edition of the Most Popular Insular Text of ‘Insurgent Gentes,’” in *Prophecy, Apocalypse and the Day of Doom: Proceedings of the 2000 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Nigel Morgan, Harlaxton Medieval Studies 12 (Donington, Lincolnshire, 2004), 160–94; José Carlos Santos Paz, “Guillermo de Santi-Amour y la versión original de la profecía antimendicante *Insurgent Gentes*,” *Studi Medievali* 57.2 (2016): 649–87.

⁵⁴ Pavlína Cermanová, “Constructing the Apocalypse: Connections Between English and Bohemian Apocalyptic Thinking,” in *Europe after Wyclif*, ed. J. Patrick Hornbeck, II and Michael Van Dussen (New York, 2017), 66–88.

⁵⁵ Swanson, *Universities*, 45–69; Philip Daileder, “Local Experiences of the Great Western Schism,” in *Companion to the Great Western Schism*, ed. Rollo-Koster and Izbicki, 92.

position was maintained—the “Extracts” hint at no partisanship—but a new body of heretics (partisans of all sides) was defined.

There can be little doubt that this identification of schismatic partisans as heretics continued to be discussed in Paris during the ban, for it appears in an anonymous Parisian theological *quaestio* that emerged in 1391, a year in which the theologians of the University briefly attempted to revive debate but were forcefully rebuffed by Charles VI with the support of the law faculty: *Utrum parisiensis universitas ad prosequendum unionem ecclesiae ad semper et pro semper obligatur* (Whether the University of Paris should be obliged, always and forever, to pursue the union of the Church).⁵⁶ This text labelled those lawyers who supported the royal position against debate as schismatics and asserted that the faculty would be “suspect in faith” (*suspecta in fide*) if it continued to hold its position.⁵⁷ Those who stand in the way of ecclesiastical union, the author asserts, are heretics.⁵⁸ In December 1392, with the duke of Burgundy acting as regent for the mentally ill Charles VI and the debate ban effectively lapsed, Jean Gerson would likewise argue in his tract *De jurisdictione spirituali* that all those who were unwilling to bring an end to the Schism were heretics.⁵⁹ Was the reading of Hildegardian prophecy the origin of this departure? The earliest work attributed to a known author in which the identification is made—Pierre d’Ailly’s *De falsis prophetis II*—suggests so. In this work, Pierre identifies Hildegard’s hypocrites from the Cologne Prophecy as those who were prolonging the Schism through their opposition to conciliarism and bringing persecution against orthodox clergy through their alliance with lay rulers.⁶⁰ *De falsis prophetis II* was written sometime between 1378 and 1388; whether penned before or during the ban, however, the fact that Hildegardian prophecy became a particularly useful vector for discussion during that time, as evidenced by the “Schism Ex-

⁵⁶ Swanson, *Universities*, 76–78. The full text of *Utrum parisiensis* can be found in Jean Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Palémon Glorieux, vol. 6 (Paris, 1965), 1–21. According to Glorieux, the tract was written by Gilles des Champs or Jean Gerson (*ibid.*, ix).

⁵⁷ *Utrum parisiensis*, 19. See Swanson, *Universities*, 78.

⁵⁸ “Tertia conclusio; isti sic impediētes huiusmodi unionis prosecutionem uere debent dici schismatici” (*Utrum parisiensis*, 20).

⁵⁹ As Swanson has noted, this line of argumentation “rapidly assumed prime importance in tracts produced in the search for an end to the division” (*Universities*, 81).

⁶⁰ Hayton, “Pierre d’Ailly’s *De falsis prophetis II*,” 258–60.

tracts” as well as d’Ailly’s *De falsis prophetis II*, suggest that it may well have been a transformative influence around this issue.⁶¹

The allusion the “Extracts” contain to a general council is also instructive. Their compiler and readers were clearly keen to find something that could be interpreted as support for a council, the university’s position just prior to the ban, but getting there required the citation of another very radical prophecy, and its placement in contemporary time. The passage, the second derived from Hildegard’s *Liber divinorum operum*, describes a moment in which both the Holy Roman Empire and the Roman Church have ceased to exist as “universal” hierarchies.⁶² All that remains are kingdoms and bishoprics organized locally, free from an Empire that had become “more onerous than useful” and from a papacy “unworthy of religion.”⁶³ Hildegard had written that “these things will come about partly through wars and they will be completed partly by the common counsel and agreement of both spiritual and secular peoples.”⁶⁴ For the Schism-era annotators of the “Extracts,” this reference to *consilium* within the context of a fractured papacy lent prophetic support to the idea of a general council to end the Schism: both the earliest and the latest witnesses carry the marginal annotation “*concilium generale*.”⁶⁵ Through the circulation of the “Extracts,” the promotion of conciliarism could continue despite the duke of Anjou’s ban and particular distaste for this topic. But at what cost? Using bare prophecy to do so meant predicting the destruction and reconfiguration of all universal hierarchies, and placing a radical vision of the future in the present day. The general council that had been preferred by the University of Paris prior to the ban—a council to adjudicate on who was the true pope and to reunite Christendom around a single candidate—was replaced by a more radical vision of Church government.

⁶¹ Ibid., 265.

⁶² Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy,” 486–87.

⁶³ “...latitudo romani imperii magis sibi oneri quam utilitati”; “in apostolico nomine nullam [*sic*] inuenient cum religione dignitatem, honorem nominis illius inminuent” (ibid.).

⁶⁴ “Hec autem ex parte per bellorum incursionem euenient, ex parte quoque per commune consilium et consensum et spiritualium et secularium populorum perficientur” (ibid., 487).

⁶⁵ These are the Rouen and s’Gravenhage manuscripts. In Angers, Bibliothèque municipale 320, this passage is annotated with “clerus et populus utriusque hierarchie destructioni iuste consentiet” (ibid., 487).

A text quite possibly written by Simon du Bosc offers insight into how some among the readers of the “Schism Extracts” might have struggled to accept all that the prophecies entailed, particularly the radical reordering prophesied to occur in the wake of persecution and tribulation. In the same manuscript where we find Simon’s copy of the “Extracts” is the only known copy of a tract entitled *De dictis prophetarum et scripture sacre ad ostendendum que verisimiliter ventura sunt ecclesie* (On the sayings of the prophets and holy Scripture, in order to show what will probably happen to the church). While undated, its position in the volume suggests that it too was written in the 1380s, and its lack of attestation anywhere else implies that it either contains Simon’s own reflections or those of someone close to him.⁶⁶ The writer did not explicitly mention any medieval prophecies, limiting his discussion to biblical texts. But in the concluding chapter 10, he cautiously offered his thoughts on how and by whom the church will be attacked: here we see many of the same themes present in the “Extracts” and the writings of Pierre d’Ailly. The author stated that there will be three kinds of evil men (*triplex modus hominum malorum*) who will bring harm to the church: the first are those who have faith without charity; the second those who seem to have good deeds, but are “without faith for the unity of the Roman church” (“*Alii erunt habentes opera bona apparentis, sed absque fide ad unitatem romanis ecclesie*”) and are “the hypocrites whom the apostle said would come in dangerous times” (“*et isti sunt ypocrite quos apostolus dicit esse futuros in temporibus periculosis,*” 2 Tim 3:1–5); and the third kind of evil men have “neither faith nor good deeds” and will be “unjust bellicose plunderers” (*bellicosi predatores iniusti*), whom the author later indicates are members of the lay aristocracy.⁶⁷ The author was clearly among those who identified the hypocrites of the Cologne Prophecy as the primary malefactors of the contemporary schism. What is of greater interest here, however, is that this text goes beyond its biblical sources to reflect a reading of Hildegard in which the narratives of the second passage from the *Liber divinorum operum* discussed above and the excerpt from the Cologne Prophecy are merged. The author described a scenario in which the hypocrites preach against the sins (avarice, pride, simony, etc.) and excessive wealth of the prelates and

⁶⁶ Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale 1355, fols. 107r–113v. See Millet, “Écoute et usage,” 435–36. On the dating of texts within the manuscript, see n. 22 above.

⁶⁷ Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale 1355, fol. 113r. The author also describes this group as “illis laicis” and “principes” (*ibid.*).

thereby incite lay princes, the “bellicose plunderers,” to take away ecclesiastical wealth.⁶⁸ This, the author suggested, will be what impedes prelates, identified as “evil pastors,” from carrying out their pastoral office, as described in Ezekiel 34 where the prophet writes that their flocks will be taken away—a passage prominently cited in Pierre d’Ailly’s *Invectiva*.⁶⁹ In his concluding paragraph, the writer turned to what the possible outcome of all of these troubles might be:

Whether the ecclesiastical estate thus chastised and humiliated from such a shaking will recover understanding and turn to God, and the church itself, forced by the heat of tribulation, will come to its senses and to a small extent enjoy a respite in peace and fulfill what the Lord said, “I will give you pastors after my heart” [Jeremiah 3:15] etc., or, if it will be as it is written in Ezekiel 7:26, “confusion after confusion will come” etc., and we ought to beware of those preaching this peace, not to mention the apostolic word, “They spoke,” etc. [1 Thessalonians 5.3], God knows.⁷⁰

Here, the author appears to be responding to the scenario presented in the “Extracts”; he used the same language found in the annotations—*humiliare, uexatio, intellectus*—as he pondered whether the church will be

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ “Per hos [i.e. the hypocrites allied with the bellicose men] ergo prelati forsitan impedirentur, de facto, ab exercicio officii pastoralis, sicut de malis pastoribus Dominus dicit Eze. 33 [Ez 34.10], *Cessare eos faciam et ultra non pascant gregem nec pascant amplius pastores semetipsos. Liberabo gregem meum de manu ipsorum, et non erit eis ultra in escam*” (Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale 1355, fol. 113v). Throughout the tract, the author interprets passages from Ezekiel in terms of contemporary ecclesiastical crises and notes on fol. 109v that “prophetia ezechielis de ecclesia quasi est historia.” It is possible that he had Pierre d’Ailly’s *Invectiva* in mind when writing this tract. The author may have had access to one of the prophecy collections in circulation at this time, some of which included copies of both the *Invectiva* and the “Extracts” (see n. 6 above).

⁷⁰ “Utrum autem status ecclesiasticus sic castitatus et humiliatus ex tali uexatione recuperet intellectum et conuertatur ad Deum et ipsa ecclesia coacta a tribulationis feruore respiscat et aliquantulum in pace respiret, et impleatur quod Dominus dicit, *Dabo uobis pastores iuxta cor meum* [Ier 3:15] etc., aut si fiat sicut scriptum est Eze. 7 [Ez 7:26] *Conturbacio super conturbacionem ueniet* etc. et cauere debeamus de predicantibus istam pacem, sed uerbum apostolicum *Dixerunt* etc. [1 Thess 5.3], Deus nouit” (Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale 1355, fol. 113v).

reformed for the better after the tribulation. Unlike Pierre d'Ailly, this writer was wary of such promises of renewal.

Such a response to prophecy speaks to the grave impact of schism on the psyches of the learned and perhaps also of the pessimism encouraged by the debate ban. But given what has been seen of the "Extracts," one can also wonder to what extent the forms of communication required in the context helped to produce such effects. If one could only offer an alternative interpretation of the Schism via notes on prophecies taken verbatim from the past and did not feel able to offer a broader, synthetic argument in the manner of Pierre d'Ailly or Conrad of Gelnhausen prior to the debate ban, the division could only appear more epochal and ominous. Readers of the "Extracts" could be both excited by the promise of root-and-branch reform they offered and alarmed at the gravity of the upheaval simultaneously predicted.

Overall, the "Extracts" help us to understand how the learned continued to engage with the issue of bringing the Schism to an end in the period of the ban. If the prophecies of Hildegard had already influenced debate prior to the ban, and would do so afterward, one can see how the distribution of such a text might have provided continuity, in a manner that was harder to censor. But this retreat to earlier prophecy also brought forth radical visions of the future: of a Church almost destroyed by bad priests, by a seduced laity, by heretics, and, if ultimately reformed, quite possibly completely redefined in terms of its government. They take the reader a long way from the "neutral" University proposals for peace and a general council prior to the ban, even if those who argued these positions had also had an eye to Hildegard. This form of prophetic communication also raised the question of what the learned could actually do themselves to help bring about the most positive (and perhaps least disruptive) outcomes: the prophecies offered a means to think through the existential dimension of the crisis and lent their authoritative weight to calls for ecclesiastical reform but did not offer specific actions that could be taken and living examples that could change minds.

The "Extracts" were just one expression of the on-going conversation among academics from the University and monks from surrounding houses that employed literary forms beyond the reach of Louis's ban. As we will see, the *vita Christi* genre and allegory likewise offered alternative means for discussion, while lessons from monastic life and reform brought with them a defining emphasis on peace, softening the radicalism we have witnessed in the "Extracts." We will also see this clandestine conversation

turn from the use of “safe” literary forms to action when several of those involved in it come together to promote the canonization of an ecclesiastical prelate who embodied their reformist aspirations, Pierre de Luxembourg, in the late 1380s and early 1390s.

PIERRE POCQUET, PHILIPPE DE MÉZIÈRES, AND PIERRE DE LUXEMBOURG:
THE CELESTINE CONNECTION

While the echoes of Hildegardian prophecy are clear within Pierre d’Ailly’s works of this period, the positive conclusion to the crisis that he provides in the *Invectiva*—the arrival of a pure, reforming pope—derived from another strand of late medieval apocalyptic thought, the *pastor angelicus* tradition. This idea was one of Joachite and Franciscan origin, although it had come to be strongly associated with Hildegard in the fourteenth century.⁷¹

What is especially interesting here is that fourteenth-century apocalyptic thought suggested that such a *pastor angelicus* had a papal precursor: Celestine V. He began life as Pietro da Morrone, later canonized as St. Peter Celestine, a celebrated Abruzzo hermit, and his growing fame as an ascetic and healer led to his election as pope on 5 July 1294. A familiar name at the *curia* by this point, he was chosen as a compromise candidate to break nearly two years of factional deadlock in the conclave following the death of Nicholas IV. Reluctant to undertake the office (his consecration on 29 August 1294 only occurred following the intervention of Charles II of Naples), he resigned it only five months after his election and was the first pope ever to do so, a fact that would prove key to his symbolic importance during the Schism. Those who celebrated him, not least within Spiritual Franciscan circles, found within this a testament to his simplicity, purity, and fundamental humility, as well as the sinister influence of his oft-hated successor, Boniface VIII, who subsequently kept Peter under house arrest until his death in 1296.⁷² He was canonized under

⁷¹ The *Pentachronon* and the “Schism Extracts” were often copied alongside angelic pope prophecies, including the *Invectiva*, as they circulated among French readers in and around Paris; see Hayton, “Hildegardian Prophecy.” Moreover, some scribes attributed illustrated papal prophecies to Hildegard; see Santos Paz, *Cisma y profecía*, 31–32.

⁷² On Celestine V as a “prototype of the angel-pontiff to be,” see Reeves, *Influence of Prophecy*, 401. On the Spiritual Franciscans and Celestine V, see Bernard

pressure from Boniface's great enemy, Philip IV of France, not long after the former's death. But there is more to Peter's life than this. He had, prior to his pontificate, founded a reformed Benedictine congregation, which came (from the early fourteenth century) to be known by his papal name: the Celestines. Their lives were guided by some very distinctive constitutions with a marked ascetic and penitential dimension: strict vegetarianism and a very precise, rigorous interpretation of Benedictine poverty were hallmarks of their congregation, while liturgical endeavours were multiplied.⁷³

Although the Celestines initial expansion occurred in Italy, in Pierre d'Ailly's lifetime they were doing very well in France. Introduced to the region by Philip IV in 1300 at the height of his conflict with Boniface, their greatest period of expansion there occurred in the years ca. 1350–1450: they built thirteen new houses in that century, to make a total of seventeen by the mid-fifteenth century. Their founders included some of the most important political figures in the region: Charles V, Charles VI, and John, duke of Bedford (as “regent” of France) all founded houses, alongside the likes of Enguerrand de Coucy, François de Montaignu, and Louis II, duke of Bourbon.⁷⁴ Because of the Schism, the French arm of the Celestines became self-governing under their own provincial chapter and hierarchy in early 1380, a status that Clement VII granted to them following the entreaties of Charles V.⁷⁵ At a time when Pierre d'Ailly's thoughts had turned to a *pastor angelicus*, St. Peter Celestine's image could be seen plainly on the front of the Celestine monastery of Paris, in statue form, between similar representations of Charles V and his queen, Jeanne de Bourbon.⁷⁶ St. Peter Celestine was, however, more than just an

McGinn, “Angel Pope and Papal Antichrist,” *Church History* 47 (1978): 155–73. On Celestine V's pontificate, see P. Herde, *Cölestin V* (Stuttgart, 1981), 31–142.

⁷³ See Karl Borchardt, *Die Cölestiner*, 20, 22–23, 275–77. On the development of their constitutional outlook, see Robert L. J. Shaw, *The Celestine Monks of France: Observant Reform in an Age of Schism, Council, and War* (Amsterdam, 2018), 65–115.

⁷⁴ On the importance of the Celestines to French political elites, see Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 211–36.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 65.

⁷⁶ Alain Erlande-Brandenburg, “Jean de Thoiry, Sculpteur de Charles V,” *Journal des Savants* 3 (1972): 218–24. On the symbolism of these statues—and of the Celestines more broadly—within the reign of Charles V, see Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 214–21.

example of an angelic pastor. The example of his resignation itself seemed to offer a spiritual model for the resolution of the Schism via the *via cessionis*—the simultaneous resignation of both papal claimants to allow for a new election—as was frequently stated after the ban on debate had subsided: soon after this point, the *via cessionis* became official royal policy (from 1395), its popularity in French circles overtaking the idea of either the *via facti* or an adjudicating general council, the solution that the University of Paris had earlier preferred. As Pierre d’Ailly, who came to support this royal position, wrote in a *vita* of the St. Peter Celestine composed in 1407, “If only this example of humility, worthy of honour, had been imitated by those arrogant men, who in our own time, so miserable and grievous, strive to pursue the highest of honours, the Church of Christ, now for almost thirty years lacerated by dreadful division and abominable schism, would not remain so!”⁷⁷

While the French Celestines of the Schism period were bearers of a legacy in which reformers came to find pertinence, their most prominent member actively broke from the government line in the name of peace in the 1380s.⁷⁸ Pierre Pocquet (†1408), a former lawyer in *utroque iure* from Arbois, near Besançon and right on what would become the border between the two papal observances, was returned as either provincial prior (the head of the French Celestines) or vicar-general (the deputy head) at each provincial chapter between 1380 and 1396: he was their effective leader throughout the early period of their independence. He was also well connected within the corridors of power. It seems likely that he had had some sort of personal connection with Charles V (†1380) and his queen, possibly acting as a confessor, and came to have other royal connections

⁷⁷ “Heu! Heu! Utinam hoc honorandae humilitatis exemplum hi imitari meruisent, qui in hoc nostro tam misero tamque luctuoso tempore, superbis honoris insectari nisis sunt: non jam fere triginta ii annis Ecclesia Christi eorum horrendo dissidio ac nefando schismate lacerate maneret” (Pierre d’Ailly, “Vita S. Petri Celestini,” ed. Franz Xaver Seppelt, in *Monumenta Coelestiana* [Paderborn, 1921], 174).

⁷⁸ On Pocquet and his thought, see Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 96–99, 139–60, 247–50, 253–59. For other shorter biographical treatments, see Olivier Caudron, “Poquet (Pocquet; Pierre), Célestin, V. 1340–1408,” in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, ed. Maurice Viller et al., (Paris, 1937–95), 12:1922; and Marielle Lamy, “Pierre Poquet: un maître spirituel chez les Célestins à la fin du XIVe siècle,” in *Expériences religieuses et chemins de perfection dans l’Occident médiéval: études offertes à André Vauchez par ses élèves*, ed. Dominique Rigaux, Daniel Russo, and Catherine Vincent (Paris, 2012), 391–408.

too, including Louis, duke of Orléans, the brother of Charles VI.⁷⁹ While Celestine monks, because of their strict enclosure, were not able to attend university, he would nevertheless become a good friend of Jean Gerson, leading light of the Council of Constance,⁸⁰ and it seems improbable that Pierre d'Ailly, Gerson's mentor, and another man with strong royal connections (he would become the *aumônier* of Charles VI in 1391), would not also have known him well. Pierre d'Ailly's *vita* of Celestine V was written at the request of the "Celestine fathers" at a time when Pocquet was still alive and d'Ailly would become a benefactor of the house of Mont-de-Châtres.⁸¹ Other evidence, as will be seen, also points to Pierre d'Ailly's connection with the Celestines.

But if Pierre Pocquet was well connected and well supported, he was also a man on his own mission. He embarked on a rigorous reform of the French Celestines, tightening ascetic regulations in their constitutions even further, demanding a precise "regular observance" (*observantia regularis*) through them, in line with many other Observant monastic reforms of this era.⁸² Schism-era independence gave him the opportunity to perfect a pure monastic community. But his zealotry nevertheless pressed against the wider division of the Church, even if it had given freedom to the French Celestines: while others largely stayed quiet in the 1380s, Pierre Pocquet spoke up for the end of the Schism and the purification of the Church and its hierarchy, as witnessed in his *Orationarium in vita Domini nostri Jesu Christi et de suffragiis sanctorum* (Prayer cycle on the life of the Lord Jesus Christ and concerning the suffrages of the saints).

The *Orationarium*, the Schism, and the *via cessionis*

This *Orationarium* is known in five late fourteenth- and fifteenth-century French Celestine manuscripts,⁸³ as well as at least nineteen exter-

⁷⁹ Caudron, "Poquet," 1922; on the connection with Louis, see below.

⁸⁰ On the connection with Gerson, see Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 122–34, 253–59.

⁸¹ Albert de Roucy, "L'obituaire des Célestins de Saint-Pierre-en-Chastres," *Bulletin de la Société historique de Compiègne* 1 (1869–72): 185–93.

⁸² Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 65–67, 88–100.

⁸³ Paris, BnF lat. 3633 (Celestines of Gentilly, s. XV), 18206 (Celestines of Paris, s. XIV ex.—appears to be the earliest Celestine copy), and 18330 (Celestines of Paris, s. XVI); Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 519 (Celestines of Paris, s. XV); Chicago, Newberry Library, Case MS 37.5 (Celestines of Amiens, s. XV¹). The eighteenth-

nal witnesses of the same era.⁸⁴ The earliest copy with a date is external: it was copied at Saint-Denis and carries the mark of 1391, which represents the clearest date *ante quem*.⁸⁵ The content of the work shows that it was written at some point after the start of the Great Western Schism, and indeed almost certainly after 1381, the start of royal repression of debate concerning the Schism.⁸⁶

The *Orationarium* is above all a devotional and contemplative text, a *vita Christi* of the sort that enjoyed such success in the late Middle Ages with a final section on other devotional figures (*de suffragiis sanctorum*) and a pronounced emphasis on interior prayer: the text is indeed structured as a prayer cycle, interspersed with lengthy narrative sections and meditations. As interior as that might sound, the themes explored by the *Orationarium*, whether in the exposition and meditations on the narrative or in the prayers, were full of fine, calculated, and, at times, relatively original moral guidance. Pierre Poquet was concerned to ground French Celestine ascetic reform and community in the spiritual logic of the Scriptures. There are two guiding beatitudinal goals that recur time and time again in

century library catalogue of the province (Paris, BnF fr. 15290) lists six copies in their possession at that point: three from Paris, one from Amiens, one from Offémont, and one from Marcoussis, The primary manuscript referenced here will be Paris, BnF lat. 18206, because of its early construction.

⁸⁴ Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal 754 (Saint-Victor, bought in 1444); Paris BnF lat. 1200 (Saint-Denis, ex-libris of 1391), 930 (Charles, duke of Orléans), 3314 (Jean d'Angoulême), 14502 (Saint-Victor, before 1502), 14584 (Saint-Victor, s. XV); Clermont-Ferrand, Bibliothèque municipale 123 (Abbey of Saint-Maur, s. XV), Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale 238 (St. Sepulcre Abbey, s. XV), Metz, Bibliothèque municipale 631 (Carthusians of Rettel, s. XV), Vendôme, Bibliothèque municipale 283 (ex-libris of "G. Alain," s. XV); Barcelona, Biblioteca Universitaria 572 (Carmelites of St. Joseph, s. XV), Le Puy, Grand Séminaire 7 AV 018 (no provenance, possibly s. XIV ex.); Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek 802 (Cistercians of Alzelle); Subiaco, Biblioteca dell' Abbazia 286 (Subiaco, 1485) and 299 (Subiaco, 1456); Prague, Národní knihovna XIV.F.7 (no provenance, s. XV); Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 1303 (Augustinians of Brixen, ca. 1450); Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana F 50 (St. Lawrence outside-the-walls, ex-libris of 1463).

⁸⁵ Caudron, "Poquet," 1925, states that the work was produced between 1378 and 1389. Caudron's date *ante quem* may derive from the mention of "Urbanists" (*urbanista*), i.e., supporters of Urban VI, who died in 1389 (see n. 101), albeit this does not seem quite as secure a date *ante quem* as 1391.

⁸⁶ Paris, BnF lat. 1200. For a much wider discussion of the *Orationarium* and its doctrine, see Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 96–99, 142–54, 247–50. See also the brief description in Lamy, "Pierre Poquet," 398–99.

his guidance, both drawn from the Sermon of the Mount [Matthew 5–7]. One was “cleanliness of heart” (*mundicia cordis*—derived from “Blessed are the clean of heart,” Matthew 5:8) which for him meant purity on a physical level—a “chastity and temperance by which the mind is purged and clarified”⁸⁷—as well as purity of interior direction. John Cassian’s concern that ascetic efforts were to be done on account of “purity of heart” (*puritas cordis*) was maintained, but Pierre’s preference for the language of “cleanliness” reflected not only the exact language of the Sermon on the Mount but also the precise rigours enshrined in the Celestines’ constitutions.⁸⁸ The other key goal was “peace” (“Blessed are the peacemakers,” Matthew 5:9). For the author, this spoke to the focus on legislation that was so prominent within his “Observant” brand of reform. Conformity to law brought peace: “in the observance of God’s commands and meditation on divine law, one is strengthened, just as it is said ‘much peace have they that love thy law’ [Psalm 118:165].”⁸⁹ But within that statement lay the caveat that it was divine law above any human code that mattered, and that any observance that led not to peace but instead to communal rancour and despising one’s brother did not truly conform to this divine standard.⁹⁰

But if the focuses on “cleanliness” and “peace” were related to his monastic reform work, they also sharpened his focus on the Schism. Above all, he considered the ongoing division an affront to the ascetic morality he espoused: a greed apparent through both internal and external signs was at the root of the division. His first discussion of the Schism follows directly from a passage comparing the money changers whom Jesus threw out of the Temple [Matthew 21:12–17, Mark 11:15–19, Luke

⁸⁷ “Aliomodo, sumitur pro castitate et temperancia, qua mens purgatur et clarificatur, ad videndum deum, quando homo non cogitat que sunt mundi sed toto corde eterna desiderat, et per amorem deum amplectitur quousque possit eum videre, quem tantum plus videt quantum seculo moritur. Istam autem plus impedit mundiciam fetor luxurie quam aliquid aliud, quia luxuriosus mundas cogitationes habere non potest” (Paris, BnF lat. 18206, fol. 50r).

⁸⁸ On this emphasis in Pocquet’s work and relation to Cassian, see Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 97, 148–50. Pocquet would also render Cassian’s *Conferences* in simple Latin for his novice monks (*ibid*).

⁸⁹ “Et in observatione mandatorum dei, et meditatione legis divine roboratur, iuxta illud, Pax multa diligentibus legem tuam” (Paris, BnF lat. 18206, fol. 50v).

⁹⁰ On the distinctive dynamics of law and discretion among the French Celestines, see Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 65–154.

19:45–48, John 2:13–16] to those “who sell and buy benefices in the Church.” After a foreshadowing discussion dealing with the split between the Latins and the Greeks,⁹¹ he turned to the Latins, “who savagely commit debauchery among themselves and shred and tear the seamless tunic of the Church.”⁹²

Here, Pierre blamed a greed within Christian society that again manifested itself in a highly physical and tangible manner: “And in every part men do not cease to pollute you [the Church] by simonies, lusts, robberies, poms, drunkenness and all types of vices, suffering nothing for you.”⁹³ Again and again, on no less than six further occasions, he turned back to the state of the current, divided church, always citing the same unclean causes. For instance, in a tribute to the apostles, he contrasted their lives with the current state of a Church riven by “schism” as well as “falsehoods, lies, deceits, and murders,” all “disguised under the label of ‘the utility of the Church.’” Between these disasters, the same essentially ascetic failings are brought out in terms of capital sins and their physical symptoms: “pride, lusts, greed, revelries, drunkenness.”⁹⁴ Sin stacked evil upon evil. Uncertainty followed over salvation: “Those indeed who one part says are absolved and cleansed, the other part believes polluted, fettered, unclean, and—unless they are reabsolved and rewashed by them

⁹¹ “Greculi quippe adversus latinos insanientes eos scismaticos et innumeris erroribus implicatos appellare publice non verentur, eis in nullo communicare volentes, sed ut porcos immundos abhominantes. Et hii a turcis in captivitatem redacti sunt. Latini vero greculos scismaticos et hereticos reputantes, facta et dicta ipsorum in derisum habentes non compaciuntur afflictioni ipsorum, nec eciam eos ab errore misericorditer revocare satagunt” (Paris, BnF lat. 18206, fols. 68v–69r).

⁹² “Sed heu, nostris temporibus percussa est ecclesia plaga pessima vehementer et a planta pedis usque ad verticem non est in ea sanitas, ab ortu solis usque ad occasum et ab aquilone usque austrum in ea nil intactum nil integrum remansit sed ob dolorosissimum, pessimum et periculosissimum scisma latinorum inter se feraliter debauchantium et tunicam ecclesie inconsutilem, ecclesiam videlicet romanam, crudeliter dicerpentium et lacerantium, omnia infecta sunt erroribus et repleta criminibus, exposita contentionibus et ipsius sacramenta in derisionem et contemptum versa sunt” (ibid., fol. 69r).

⁹³ “Et in omni parte symoniis, luxuriis, latrociniis, pompis, ebrietatibus et omni genere viciorum maculare non cessant, in nullo tibi compacientes” (ibid., fol. 69v).

⁹⁴ “Sed ve, ve, ve, propter peccata nostra et patrum nostrorum, nunc perditur scimatibus superbiis, luxuriis, avariciis, comessacionibus, ebrietatibus, falsitatibus, mendaciis, simulacionibus, homicidiis sub colore utilitatis ecclesie palliatis et omnium criminum enormitatibus” (ibid., fol. 147v).

—ruined by God.”⁹⁵ Here Pierre perhaps drew from his connections on the borderlands of the papal obediences, where priests of an alternative allegiance were close by and these questions thus more likely to play on the consciences of the devout: the Celestines of Paris certainly had many recruits from the county of Burgundy in these years.⁹⁶ In turn, he thought, came heresy and errors: “Upon seeing this, the unfaithful deride the faith and its Sabbath, and through us the name of God is blasphemed among them and they are made solid in their error.”⁹⁷

If a moral uncleanness had caused the split, regaining the now lost peace and unity was seen as a prerequisite for a Church “thoroughly cleansed of vices.” Recalling the Roman troops who divided Christ’s garments but did not tear his tunic [John 19:23–24], Pierre Pocquet stated that “those who today tear the unity of the Church so cruelly are worse than the soldiers who crucified the Lord Jesus.”⁹⁸ He begged that such men would realize just how much evil they had caused through division, and hoped that “the supreme dignity of the Church would come to rest upon one alone, who, with God working in him, would preserve it in peace and union, expel simony and Gehazi’s ambition from it, remove all avarice, prideful pomp, gluttony and disgrace from it, and—with it cleansed from all vices—adorn it with the elegance of virtues.”⁹⁹

But how would this unity under a single, cleansing pope be re-effected? In Pierre Pocquet’s view, one particular stumbling block in its way was the lack of discussion. He was, it would seem, quite aware of the context of the repression of debate, and not only that, quite critical of it, as seen in his first discussion of the Schism found in the “money changers” passage:

⁹⁵ “Quos enim una pars dicit se absolvere et mundare, alia pars reputat maculatos, vinculatos et immundos, et nisi ab ipsis reabsolvantur et relaventur a deo perituros” (ibid., fol. 69r).

⁹⁶ Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 113, 240–41.

⁹⁷ “Quapropter videntes hoc infideles derident fidem et sabbata eius et per nos nomen dei inter eos blasphematur et in suo errore solidantur” (Paris, BnF lat. 18206, fol. 69r).

⁹⁸ “Et sic qui hodie unitatem ecclesie scindunt tam crudeliter sunt militibus crucifixoribus domini jesu deteriores” (ibid., fol. 103r).

⁹⁹ “Et utinam saperent et intelligerent quantorum sunt causa malorum, et sorte divina ad unum solum pervenerit suprema dignitas ecclesie, qui eam in pace et vera unione deo in se operante servaret, de ea simonem et gyezy expelleret ambicionem, avariciam, superbam pompam, gulam et omnem turpitudinem ab ea removeret, eamque cunctis viciis emundatam decore virtutum adornaret” (ibid.).

And alas, while this greatest sea of evils is recent, it is nevertheless lamented only by a few, and it is little attended by those who ought to remedy it somehow. And since it is worse that the truth should not be known of so great a division, the road by which it can be known is declared impossible by them, perhaps fearing to produce their works in the light lest they should be exposed by them.¹⁰⁰

The comment is especially startling when one takes into account the context of French Celestine supporters: implicitly, he was criticizing the policy of a monarchy that had been very kind to his order.

But would Pierre Pocquet offer any hard solution himself if the king would not? While he took care never to be totally explicit, when one looks at his discussions alongside each other, it is hard to believe his readers would not have come away with a strong impression that he favoured a peaceful, multilateral approach. By focusing on cleanliness vs. corruption and peace and unity vs. scandal and disunity as the key dialectics of the Schism, he avoided partisanship entirely, despite the favour also shown to the congregation by Clement VII. In a prayer contained within the latter part of the work (*de suffragiis sanctorum*), he contrasted St. Paul's hatred for disunity with the attitudes of contemporary churchmen and openly advocated a neutral position: "Lately indeed, each one says, 'I indeed am a Clementist,' or, 'I, on the contrary, am an Urbanist,' but few dare to say openly, 'I, however, am of Christ.'"¹⁰¹ Celestine monastic values as encapsulated by the legacy of their founder also suggested a more precise solution. His discussion of Peter of Morrone (Celestine V) is found at the culmination of the section of *de suffragiis sanctorum* devoted to confessors, to whom one was indeed to pray for the end of the Schism and unity: "Oh confessors, blessed in Christ, who once resided in the unity of holy mother Church ... come to its aid, now it is shaken by schism, and busy yourselves in holy prayers to restore its unity, so that we, placed in its

¹⁰⁰ "Et heu, hoc tam maximum pelagus malorum quamvis recens sit, a paucis plangitur et ab illis qui aliquantulum remediare deberent minime attenditur, et quod peius est ne veritas possit sciri tanti discriminis via qua sciri posset impossibilis ab ipsis iudicatur, forsitan timentes opera sua producere in lucem ne ab ipsa manifestarentur" (*ibid.*, fol. 69r).

¹⁰¹ "Unusquisque enim modo dicit, ego quidem sum clementinus, alius vero ego autem urbanista, pauci vero palam audent dicere, ego autem Christi" (*ibid.*, fol. 148v).

unity, might chant the praises due to Christ harmoniously.”¹⁰² While Pierre began by celebrating the Celestine founder’s monastic qualities, especially his asceticism, “the harshest abstinence among all of those I have read about,” he then moved on to discuss this morality in action during his papal renunciation. Celestine V had “from an ardent love of the Saviour, fled the papacy and completely deserted all glory, joys, honours, riches, and delights of this world in a manner beyond all others.” Thus, “the saying of Scripture was most truly appropriate to him: ‘there was not found the like to him, who in this kept the law of the most High’ [Sirach 44:20].”¹⁰³ The latter quotation is noteworthy. Reading between the lines, Pierre seems to have been suggesting that one of his favourite monastic doctrinal emphases—a divine law that was always directed towards peace—might require a pope to resign. Given his lack of partisanship, it is hard to avoid the implication that he was recommending something akin to the *via cessionis* through his deployment of both Celestine example and ideology.

Webs of influence

Pierre Pocquet’s discussion of the Schism is distinctive in its emphasis on monastic values, and yet it is also clear that he had his finger on the pulse of the conversations that have been seen earlier in this article. In particular, the crisis of the Western Church depicted in the “money changers” passage follows the exact same trajectory as the part of Hildegard’s Cologne Prophecy related to the Schism by the “Extracts.” The crimes of the Church—simony above all, and all manner of debauchery beyond this—divide the Church; if the physicality of these images was character-

¹⁰² “O beati Christi confessores in unitate sancte matris ecclesie olim permanentes, et in ea deum digne confitentes, et pro statu eius dum in ea essetis sepissime deum deprecantes, ipsam propter scismata fluctuantem adiuuate, et orationibus sanctis ad unitatem reducere satagite, ut in unitate eius positi laudes christo debitas concorditer decantemus. Amen” (ibid., fol. 151r).

¹⁰³ “Beatum petrum celestinum confessorem almificum institutorem et patrem religionis nostre, a quo et celestini nuncupamur, simplicitate columbina, et benignitate repletum, inter omnes quos legerim durissime abstinencie per innumeras afflictiones carnem suam martirizantem, ex ardenti amore salvatoris papatum omnem gloriam, gaudia, honores, divitias et voluptates huius mundi supra omnes alios ita perfecte deserentem, ut suo liberius posset servire creatori, quod verissime convenit sibi illud scripture: non est inventus similis illi, qui in hoc conservaret legem excelsi, maxime postquam papatus in tanto honore haberi cepit et tantis divitiis habundare: istum igitur angelicum virum devotione maxima exora” (ibid., fol. 151v).

istic of Pierre Pocquet's monastic reform ideology, they were very similar to the descriptions provided by Hildegard's prophecy and Pierre d'Ailly's *Invectiva* which drew clear influence from it ("drunkenness," "lusts," "poms"). These circumstances then embolden heretics, who "deride the faith and its Sabbath" as a result of the shambles; here the debt to a pre-conceived narrative seems particularly strong, since it is unclear what heterodox groups Pierre might have known about or come into contact with, and he provides no identification. The fact that he did not directly equate these heretics with schismatic partisans (as the "Extracts" do) might even suggest an independent reading of the *Pentachronon*.

Pierre Pocquet's *Orationarium* was not just a private reflection on the Schism and it probably contributed to the continuing conversation in the period of the ban. If the text spread far and wide in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,¹⁰⁴ its first datable distribution—1391 to the abbey of Saint-Denis, which occurred while Pocquet was certainly present at the nearby Celestine house of Paris—again suggests that monastic back-channels represented a conduit for continued discussion of the Schism during the ban. The Saint-Denis manuscript was copied up by Renaud de Bétencourt—most likely a master of novices at the house—alongside other Schism-related texts, for instance a poem of Jean de Saint-Remi that dates from the first year of the Schism and which criticizes the partisans of both sides.¹⁰⁵ Interestingly, this distribution probably also followed hot on the heels of Charles VI reinforcing the ban on debate in 1390/1.¹⁰⁶ Its teachings, moreover, here found the potential to overflow monastery walls, as a result of Saint-Denis's royal connections and the presence of their monks at the university.

But the text, its context, and its external distribution arguably bear witness to an even more influential back-channel conversation. Pierre Pocquet was not alone in writing about the Schism at the Paris house. Philippe de Mézières (†1405), a former crusading knight and key counsellor of Charles V lived unprofessed there from 1380 until his death. If, on the one

¹⁰⁴ Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 247.

¹⁰⁵ Paris, BnF lat. 1200. On this copy and its context at Saint-Denis, see Donatella Nebbaj-Dalla Guarda, "Des rois et des moines. Livres et lecteurs à l'Abbaye de Saint-Denis (XIII^e–XV^e siècles)," in *Saint-Denis et la royauté. Études offertes à Bernard Guenée, Actes du Colloque international en l'honneur de Bernard Guenée*, ed. Claude Gauvard and Françoise Autrand (Paris, 1999), 367.

¹⁰⁶ Swanson, *Universities*, 75.

hand, he was a noted friend of Pierre d'Ailly,¹⁰⁷ he would also have been under Pierre Pocquet's spiritual guidance: his *Songe du Viel Pelerin* (1387–89) seems to lean heavily on that heritage, and perhaps particularly on the Celestine thought of the latter.¹⁰⁸ This voluminous allegorical poem takes its protagonist—the “pelerin” who takes the name of *Ardant Désir*, a figuring of Philippe himself—on a tour across Europe and beyond, assisting *Reine Vérité* in her inquiries on the moral state of the world: she wishes to judge whether she, along with the other virtues (*Charité, Sapience, Paix, Miséricorde* and *Justice*) would be justified in returning to a world they had fled in horror. Nevertheless, this journey begins and ends at the Celestine house of Paris. In the East, the threat of the Turks and relations with the Greek church are discussed at length, but the solution to the Western Schism is also treated: the old crusader's concerns over the Ottomans seem only to have intensified his desire for Christian unity. While Philippe made clear in the voice of *Ardant Désir* that he believed that Clement VII was still “the sovereign lieutenant on earth of sweet Jesus and the sovereign chief of the Church”¹⁰⁹ when asked by *Reine Vérité* to offer an opinion of the competing papal claims, he refused to pass blanket judgement on those that followed Urban VI.¹¹⁰ Meanwhile, sinful corruption is excoriated at both *curiae* in extended sections set in Genoa (where Urban's court then resided) and Avignon,¹¹¹ and, without obvious partisanship, *Reine Vérité* calls on Charles VI to focus on reuniting and reforming the Church in her advice to the monarch.¹¹² This figure even broaches the subject of a reforming general council, perhaps drawing here from the thought of Philippe's friend Pierre d'Ailly,¹¹³ but in the midst of

¹⁰⁷ Bernard Guenée, *Between Church and State*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago, 1991), 144–45.

¹⁰⁸ Philippe de Mézières, *Songe du Viel Pelerin*, ed. Joël Blanchard, 2 vols. (Paris, 2015).

¹⁰⁹ “Ma treshonnouree dame Verité la royne, dit Ardant Desir, toutes les choses cy dessus simplement et grossement pour cause de briefté tellement quellement recitees par moy, pour ma suer et pour tous nos adherans, pour conclusion de mon opinion avec nostre champion et avec les simples vielles devotes et catholiques, je confesse doucement que le Debonnaire, pape Clement, est souverain lieutenant en terre de doulx Jesus et souverain chief de l'eglise” (ibid. 1:424–26).

¹¹⁰ Ibid. 1:413–27.

¹¹¹ See especially ibid. 1:286–99, 394–403

¹¹² Ibid. 2:1064.

¹¹³ Ibid. 2:1057–52.

this, she calls on Charles VI to lay before the competing popes the example of not only the humble Gregory the Great but also Celestine V.¹¹⁴ As Swanson has commented, the mechanics Philippe laid out for this conciliar suggestion were not in fact incompatible with the *via cessionis*: the council was to be convened with the support of both existing papal claimants (as well as the king of France) and could potentially result in the election of a new pope and church reform.¹¹⁵

Clearly, conversations had taken place between Philippe de Mézières and Pierre Pocquet. It is fair to say that the ties of influence perhaps ran both ways, even if Pierre was the spiritual master: Pocquet would surely have known less about the divisions between Greeks and Latins if he had not known Philippe. Another point in common is that they both chose to include discussion of the Schism in the context of texts that were far broader: even more so than for the compilers of the “Extracts,” their thought on this issue was subsumed within wider discourses—of monastic reform and the fate of Western Christendom respectively—which evidently mattered dearly to them, and within literary models that did not directly advertise their connection to the Schism. This did not mean it was a side issue to them. It is clear enough from their words that both authors were deeply concerned with it. What is more, the forms chosen, however much by accident or design, provided them with strong strategies to communicate a difficult issue to influential audiences amid the challenges of repression.

Philippe’s *Songe* speaks directly to Charles VI, as if its well-connected author intended to put it under the nose of those at court: he certainly had the contacts to do so. Pocquet could perhaps have done something similar through his royal connections: if it is clear that his *Orationarium* was aimed primarily at monastic audiences, the wider devotional emphasis of the work on the life of Christ had the potential to make its teachings accessible to lay audiences, and Pocquet himself may not have been averse to the idea. For instance, Louis, duke of Orléans, fell under the influence of the Celestines in 1393 and certainly took Pocquet as a confessor.¹¹⁶ His

¹¹⁴ Ibid. 2:1061. He would also contrast Celestine V with current clerical morals on other occasions; see *ibid.* 1:299, 352.

¹¹⁵ Swanson, *Universities*, 75. Swanson also suggests that Philippe might have been referring to an abortive attempt at the University of Paris in 1387 to suggest the *via cessionis* to the king.

¹¹⁶ Caudron, “Poquet.”

sons both possessed copies of the text: it thus seems very likely that Louis also possessed it.¹¹⁷ While his attachment to the Celestines began shortly after the reopening of debate on the Schism, Louis would have remained a difficult audience for the *Orationarium*'s discussion of the ongoing division: through his marriage to Valentina Visconti, he too had Italian ambitions that made him one of the more tenacious Avignonese partisans. Nevertheless, his position does become more flexible over the course of the 1390s and 1400s. He would publicly back the royal policy of the *via cessionis*, taking part in the embassy to Avignon in 1395: if he showed little support for the French subtraction of obedience from Avignon in 1398, neither did Pierre d'Ailly, or seemingly, the French Celestines.¹¹⁸ Louis's lapses from support for the *via facti* might be explained in pragmatic, political terms: at times where his influence at court was eclipsed, it was expedient to toe the line. But were matters of conscience also involved? We know from a sermon of Gerson that Louis became open to discussing his political fortunes with Pocquet, who offered moral advice in response: close to the end of his life, Pierre had told him that his troubles were "money, with which you must pay your debts to God."¹¹⁹ Might something like the *Orationarium* have presented another vector of influence over that most thorny issue of the Schism?

Another example, this time from during the period of repression, draws Pierre d'Ailly, Philippe de Mézières, and the Celestines together: the life

¹¹⁷ See n. 79 above. Louis's son Charles also owned a copy of the "Schism Extracts"; see n. 27 above.

¹¹⁸ Eugène Jarry, *La vie politique de Louis de France, duc d'Orléans, 1372–1407* (Orléans, 1889), 138, 162, 209–11, 301–2; Christopher M. Bellitto, "The Early Development of Pierre d'Ailly's Conciliarism," *The Catholic Historical Review* 83 (1997): 226; Hélène Millet and Emmanuel Pouille, *Le vote de la soustraction d'obédience en 1398* (Paris, 1988). In the latter, there is no mention of the Celestines in the bulletin of the vote.

¹¹⁹ This is mentioned in a sermon of 1408, shortly after Louis's murder: "Du darain nommé je sçay par tesmoings digne de foy que quant en sa vie aucuns eurent coniuéré et il vint a sa congnoissance, il s'en plaignoit a ung religieux frère Pierre Bourgoignon, le quel li respondi: 'C'est argent, Sire, qui vous vient pour paier vos debtes envers Dieu'. Lors, sans plus délibérer, respondi: 'Et puis que ainsi est, je pardonne tout de bon cuer, comme je attens pardon de Dieu'" (Jean Gerson, "Veniat Pax," in *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Glorieux, 7.1:113). Gerson refers to Pierre Pocquet as "Pierre Bourgoignon," as he would also do in a later letter to John, duke of Berry; on this identification, see Max Lieberman, "Chronologie gersonienne X: Le sermon Memento finis," *Romania* (1962): 85 n. 1.

of Cardinal Pierre de Luxembourg (1369–87). Pierre de Luxembourg hailed from an extremely influential princely house with lands at the borders of the observances and was made bishop of Metz at the tender age of just fourteen and then cardinal at sixteen by Clement VII: his elevation had much to do with securing elite support in a contested region.¹²⁰ Interestingly, however, he was also keen to forge his own religious path of asceticism and otherworldliness that would lead many both in Avignon and Paris to remember him as a saint when he died at the age of just seventeen.

The witness statements of his abortive canonization procedures, begun in 1390 and behind which Pierre d'Ailly appears to have been the prime mover,¹²¹ give a clear impression of a young man whose key spiritual influences lay outside the papal court. Rather, his own religious life was forged in the midst of some of the conversants we have already discussed. On his seemingly quite frequent stays in Paris after he was elected bishop of Metz (1385), it appears that he fell under a heavy monastic influence: according to his friend, Nicolas Clacquin, a canon of Cambrai, he visited the monasteries of the Celestines and Carthusians “ever more regularly.”¹²² It was around this time that the most dramatic phase of Pierre de Luxembourg’s religious development took place, with Philippe de Mézières perhaps providing some of the impetus: he would visit Philippe at the Paris Celestine house two or three times a week according to his brother, André de Luxembourg, bishop of Cambrai. Through Philippe, according to Guy de Mézières, a canon of Boulogne (and perhaps Philippe’s nephew), he also began to converse with “some other Celestines.”¹²³ An

¹²⁰ For modern accounts of Pierre de Luxembourg’s life, see Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Poets, Saints and Visionaries*, 75–78; and Richard Kieckhefer, *Unquiet Souls* (Chicago, 1984), 33–44.

¹²¹ “Commentarius Praevarius: Petrus de Luxemburgo” in *AASS* 27 (Jul. II), 500; Pascoe, *Church and Reform*, 162–64.

¹²² “Processus de vita et miraculis B. Petri de Luxemburgo,” in *AASS* 27 (Jul. II), 527–607, at 549.

¹²³ “Dixit quod post regressum suum de Lotharingia, Parisiis, insimul dicti DD. Petrus Cardinalis et Philippus miles conversabantur bis vel ter in septimana, et de hoc est fama publica in civitate Parisiensi” (ibid.); “Dictus testis vidit et audivit quod d. D. Philippum de Mazeriis et nonnullos alios Cælestinos et Carthusienses interrogabat de modo vivendi ipsorum, et de statu religionis eorum” (ibid.). On Guy, see “Une collection des lettres de Philippe de Maizières (Notice sur le ms. 499 de la bibl. de l’Arsenal) (Suite et fin),” *Revue historique* 49 (1892): 313 n. 2.

early seventeenth-century *vita* written by the French Celestine Martin de Bourey claims that one of these was none other than Pierre Pocquet.¹²⁴ Whether or not this author had any additional information on the matter, he is almost certainly correct: it seems improbable that Pierre Pocquet would not have taken an interest in such a distinguished guest. Pierre de Luxembourg is also reported to have developed a personal asceticism that mimicked the extreme ascetic practices of St. Peter Celestine: he not only fasted heavily, often eating nothing but bread and water and severely diluting his wine, but also insisted on mortifying his flesh in the harshest manner. As cardinal (from 1386), he practiced flagellation, tied a cord tightly around his waist, and attempted to procure a hair shirt.¹²⁵

Mirroring Pierre Pocquet's ascetic morality, however, these feats also seem to be tied to an outlook on the Avignonese church that was at variance with Avignonese propaganda. Pierre de Luxembourg was certainly very averse to the luxury at the papal court: at one point, he apparently tried to flee Avignon to live as a hermit but was dissuaded from this by his confessor Gilles, who argued that to do so might suggest that he doubted Avignonese papal legitimacy.¹²⁶ While there is no clear evidence that he ever explicitly denied that legitimacy, the testimony in 1390 suggests that he was ambivalent about those above and around him. Guy de Mézières reported that "he often heard the said Lord Pierre bewailing the entanglements of the Roman Curia [in this case, that of Avignon], and their government."¹²⁷ His Parisian conversations also apparently produced a plan to depart on a preaching mission to "reveal the truth on the matter of the Schism, and to recommend the estate of the Church to the prayers of the faithful wherever they were."¹²⁸ Jean de la Marche, a canon lawyer, and

¹²⁴ This detail is recorded in the early seventeenth-century *vita* "Commentarius Praevarius: Petrus de Luxemburgo," 500.

¹²⁵ "Processus Petri," 539 (testimony of André de Luxembourg). For a summary of St. Peter Celestine's ascetic life, see Shaw, *Celestine Monks of France*, 75–76.

¹²⁶ "Processus Petri," 549.

¹²⁷ "Super XLIV articulo dixit, quod saepe audivit d. D. Petrum conquerentem de involutionibus curiae Romanae, et regimine ejusdem" (*ibid.*, 549).

¹²⁸ "Item quod proposuerat, secum assumptis in sacra Pagina, et Decretorum doctoribus, facere praedicari verbum Dei in locis aptis, per quos transiret in ejusmodi peregrinatione, et cunctis audire volentibus, mandata legis, et articulos fidei, Sacramenta Ecclesiae, et misericordiae opera; et in omni conclusione sermonis veritatem aperire super facto schismatis, ac Ecclesiae statum orationi fidelium ubique commendare" (*ibid.*, 550).

Gilles d'Orléans, a theologian and Pierre's confessor—both of whom knew of Pierre's trips to the Celestine house, the former stating that he was present—would report that he proposed to tour with learned men, “three masters in theology and three doctors of law” according to Gilles. The former would have been Gilles, François de Saint-Michel, and Pierre d'Ailly (also a friend of Philippe de Mezieres, as noted earlier); the latter would certainly have included Jean de la Marche.¹²⁹ The presence of Pierre d'Ailly is instructive enough for what they might have preached, and it is hard not to note a sense of prophetic fulfillment in their common action: were they themselves cast as the “new judges” who would “preach the gospel of the kingdom to the prelates adulterating the word of God” that Pierre d'Ailly had drawn from prophecy?¹³⁰

The atmosphere of continued censorship remains palpable here: the witnesses all avoid discussing exactly what *via* Pierre de Luxembourg favoured to end the Schism. And yet, once again, we have subversive communication. People continued to talk. Moreover, the planned preaching mission and the canonization process show that they had become smarter about how they might convert influence into action. They could still not debate the Schism at the University without risk—Charles VI would indeed reiterate the ban in 1391—but they could preach on the dangers of the Schism elsewhere and, after Pierre's early death, seek to canonize their saintly friend in terms that strongly alluded to a change of policy. If they had been successful, they might have bound the Avignonese papacy to Pierre de Luxembourg's policy: they had literally made Pierre's efforts to heal the Schism through reconciliation articles of sanctity. Among them was also an article that might have put pressure on Charles VI: “that [Pierre de Luxembourg] intended above all to discuss with the Lord King of France the danger for his conscience and soul that stemmed from the

¹²⁹ “...dixit, quod proponebat tres Doctores de quolibet, videlicet tres magistros in theologia, et tres Doctores in Decretis. In theologia intendebat habere magistros Franciscum de S. Michaële, Petrum de Alliaco, magistros in theologia seculares, et ipsum loquentem, qui, ut dictum est, juraverat. Interrogatus de nominibus Doctorum Decretorum; dixit quod magister Joannes de Marchia debebat esse unus, auditor d. D. Petri” (ibid., 551; testimony of Gilles d'Orléans); “dixit, quod ipse D. Petrus C. multum affectabat habere secum doctores in theologia, qui sibi legerent de ea. Ipse D. Card. affectabat scire prædicare, et postmodum ire pro defensione fidei catholicæ” (ibid., 552, testimony of Jean de la Marche).

¹³⁰ See n. 47 above.

troubles inflicted upon his people”; it is hard to think that he did not have the Schism in mind here.¹³¹ The notaries avoid stating the matter directly, and at times gloss over it—another article stated that he intended to bring the emperor “back to the unity of the holy Church and to obedience to our lord Pope”—but the broader ambivalence towards the Avignonese papacy found within the articles suggests that those behind the canonization—above all Pierre d’Ailly—hoped to use Pierre de Luxembourg’s sanctity to bring about a more peaceful solution to the Schism.¹³²

LEGACY AND CONCLUSION

This canonization process of 1390 was most likely put to a halt because of its subversive connotations, and the other threads of conversation we have seen did not immediately produce tangible political results. The royal government did not switch to support a *via concilii* in the early 1380s despite Hildegardian prophecy suggesting its inevitability. Whatever audience the work of Philippe de Mézières and Pierre Pocquet may have had in the late 1380s, Charles VI and his Marmouset government did not shift from the *via facti*. The switch in French royal policy to support the *via cessionis* was proximately precipitated by Charles’s decline in mental health (from August 1392), and the emergence of Philip, duke of Burgundy as the dominant power at court: his political interests criss-crossed the borders of the papal obediences and the peaceful resolution of the Schism would thus have been very useful to him. The French proposal for a *via cessionis* that followed also represented a pragmatic acceptance of realities from one aspect. The Schism was so entrenched that lobbying for simultaneous resignations seemed the most plausible way of uniting adherents to a new pope. The failure of the French withdrawals of obedience in 1398–1403 and the first conciliar effort at Pisa in 1409, which merely produced a third pope, suggests that their logic in backing the *via cessionis*

¹³¹ “LXV. Item quod intendebat principaliter cum D. Rege Franciæ conferre de periculo conscientiae suæ et animæ, super gravaminibus populo suo illatis” (ibid., 550).

¹³² “LXXI. Item quod disponebat, ad Regem Romanorum, suum consobrinum, accedere et ipsum informare de facto schismatis, quem non dubitabat posse reducere ad sanctæ Ecclesiæ unitatem, et ad obedientiam D. N. Papæ” (ibid., 550).

was not entirely misplaced, even if the Schism would eventually be forcibly resolved by the Council of Constance.

But these political realities do not mean that such conversations were without effect. When the floodgates opened from 1392 onward, it was the precise frames of reference and ideas that had been refined in these conversations, and also those who had participated in them, that suddenly came to shape events. St. Peter Celestine's and Pierre de Luxembourg's legacies became overtly associated with the *via cessionis*, and both the Avignonese papacy and the French monarchy attempted to seize hold of them for their own purposes. On 22 February 1393 Clement VII announced the foundation of a Celestine house, dedicated to *Saint-Pierre Celestin*, atop Pierre de Luxembourg's grave. As the French government began to put pressure on the Avignonese pope to avow the *via cessionis* at the same time, the foundation appears as lip-service to the idea. In April 1393, however, Charles VI issued his own charter, declaring himself principal founder. The laying of the first stone of the Celestine house of Avignon on 26 June 1395 was performed by the dukes of Orléans, Burgundy and Berry (in the absence of Benedict XIII). According to the contemporary journal of the royal secretary Gontier Col, Gilles d'Orleans, one of the key participants in the canonization process and one of Pierre de Luxembourg's proposed travel companions, preached a sermon in which he suggested placing two writs concerning the Schism on Pierre's grave, one in favour of the *via cessionis*, the other in favour of Benedict XIII's *via conventionis* (some sort of negotiated settlement, without commitment to resignation). The hope was that Pierre would perform a miracle to show his true preference, the assumption being that those present fully understood that this was for the former, despite it never being publicized.¹³³

The stone laying took place on a royal embassy which indeed communicated to Benedict the decisive switch in royal policy towards publicly demanding a *via cessionis*. Prior to this, in February 1395, Charles VI had called a meeting of the clergy in Paris to discuss the solution of the Schism, with the expectation that it would approve this course. Amid so many important churchmen, three groups were singled out in the council's advisory letter to the king (preserved in the Saint-Denis chronicle) as

¹³³ "Journal de Gontier Col," in *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum, historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium amplissima collectio*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, vol. 7 (Paris, 1724), 479–528, at 509–10.

having influenced their decision, aimed at ending the “detestable schism” in the aim of “true union, a firm peace, and harmony among souls.” All three of these groups had participated in the conversation outlined here. One was the University of Paris, who sent both Simon du Bosc and Pierre d’Ailly to the council. Alongside them were two monastic congregations: the Celestines, who certainly provided a location where the conversation continued both orally and in writing; and the Carthusians, another rigorist monastic congregation who both possessed the “Extracts” and were also close to Pierre de Luxembourg.¹³⁴ The Carthusian written opinion provided for the occasion of the February 1395 council (a Celestine opinion does not survive) argues in support of a simultaneous resignation of popes at a reformist council, and evokes the hope that these conversants felt at the turning of the tide.¹³⁵ They expected that when this council occurred “the time of grace will be fulfilled, that which is spoken of by the prophet: ‘on that day, the merchant shall be no more in the house of the Lord’ [Zachariah 14:21], who, with a scourge made of little cords, drove all those selling doves and the traffickers from the Temple [cf. John 2:15].”¹³⁶ The fulfilment of prophecy on the extirpation of sinful clergy—explicitly biblical but well aligned with the interpretations of Hildegard we have seen and Pierre Pocquet’s evocation of Christ throwing the money changers out of the Temple—was here stated with the confidence of men who felt their time had come.

¹³⁴ “Concludendo et eligendo per modum oppinionis et consilii solum, attenta de liberatione religiosorum ordinis Cartusiensis et Celestinorum et Universitatis Parisiensis, et quod necesse est Ecclesie sancte Dei, sub periculo desolacionis ejusdem, istud detestandum scisma, brevius quam fieri poterit, extirpari, et Ecclesiam uniri, nec vie pretacte vel alie, que per scribentem ymaginari valeant, sint sufficientes ad veram unionem, pacem firmam et concordiam animarum, preter viam cessionis utriusque partis, istam viam satis gravem quasi instinctu Spiritus Sancti elegit” (*Chronique du Religieux de Saint-Denys* 2:236).

¹³⁵ “Opinio Carturiensium super via cessionis,” in *Veterum scriptorum ... collectio*, ed. Martene and Durand, 7:474–79. This has been described as “a refreshingly religious argument that reads well after the political calculations of the secular leadership” (Howard Kaminsky, *Simon Cramaud and the Great Schism* [New Brunswick, 1983], 132).

¹³⁶ “Putamus, aiunt, tempus gratiae impletum iri, quod dicitur per prophetam, in die illa non erit ultra mercator in domo Domini, qui facto de resticulis funiculo, columbas vendentes negotiatoresque de templo ieecerit” (*ibid.*, 478).

Seen from this perspective the ban on debate that Louis, duke of Anjou, brought about in 1381 can thus be seen as not only repression but an inflection point, or even a creative opening. Debate shifted in part as a result of how people responded to these circumstances, through inventive forms of communication, and was carried out by an eclectic set of individuals: academics, monks, a quixotic crusader, and a teenage cardinal. The stark, if selective, use of prophecy lent itself to radicalism and kept the flag flying for conciliar suggestions, which became increasingly associated with root-and-branch reform. The retreat of debate into monastic cloisters, meanwhile, oriented it towards examples of monastic humility and peace among brothers, which in turn gave the turn to the *via cessionis* real spiritual grounding, with the renunciation of authority creating the humble atmosphere required for true reform. And despite the local quality of the conversation we have outlined here, its influence should not be underestimated, neither on the shape and tone of later royal policy, nor on intellectuals: indeed, this was the same circle from which sprang Jean Gerson, arguably the leading intellectual light of the Council of Constance. Above all it should serve as a reminder that the exigencies of how people communicate do not merely affect how ideas spread, but are the crucible in which they are forged.

Missouri State University.
Masaryk University.