

A QUESTION OF IDENTITY: IS CEPHAS THE SAME PERSON AS PETER?

James M. Scott

The question whether the Cephas of *Galatians* 2.11 is Peter arose at least as early as the second century with Clement of Alexandria.¹ Because Paul harshly reprimands and corrects Peter in this passage, antagonists of the Church have found this scene crucial in attacking the Petrine primacy and infallibility. In 1708 Jean Hardouin, a French Jesuit, wrote his apologetic *Dissertatio: In Qua Cepham a Paulo Reprehensum Petrum Non Esse Ostenditur (An Examination in Which It Is Demonstrated that Cephas Rebuked by Paul Is not Peter)*, arguing that this Cephas was not Peter the apostle. The *Dissertatio*, intended only for a friend's reading, curiously ended up in print a year later as a small end-piece within Hardouin's ponderous *Opera Selecta*.² Although the *Dissertatio* is largely unknown due to so much of Hardouin's corpus placed on the *Index*, this work nevertheless makes a significant contribution to the Cephas/Peter debate. That Hardouin assuredly had the most bizarre literary theories and motivations ever expressed by a prominent scholar adds further interest and import to his argument.

¹Eusebius (*Eccles Hist*, 1.12.2) says that Clement raised this question in his *Hypotypes* 5. The remaining fragments of this work do not include this passage.

²Jean Hardouin, "Dissertatio in Qua Cepham a Paulo Reprehensum Petrum non Esse Ostenditur," *Opera Selecta* (Amsterdam: J. D. DeLorme, 1709).

I. THE IDEOLOGY OF JEAN HARDOUIN, S.J.

Hardouin, originally from Breton and thereafter of Paris, distinguished himself earlier in his career as a brilliant classical scholar, numismatist, and Church historian. His edition of Pliny received wide acclaim, the French Crown pensioned him for his massive history of the Church councils, and his numismata were recognized as essential at a time when critics turned to non-literary evidence.³ Hardouin's work with coins first raised his suspicions about the chronology, authorship, and orthodoxy of the patristic tradition. He says in his *Prolegomena*:

It was the month of August, 1690, that I began to scent fraud in Augustine and his contemporaries; in the month of November I suspected the same in all; and I detected the whole in the month of May, 1692.⁴

³Jean Hardouin, *Caui Plinii Secundi Naturalis historiae libri 37* (Paris: Franciscus Muguet, 1685); Jean Hardouin, *Acta conciliorum et epistolae decretales ac constitutiones summorum pontificum* (Paris, 1900), but the edition was finished in 1715. Hardouin's works on numismatics are gathered in *Opera Selecta* and in his *Opera Varia* (Amsterdam: Henry du Sauzet, 1733).

⁴Edwin Johnson, *The Prolegomena of Jean Hardouin* (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1909), 10. All English translations of the *Prolegomena* are Johnson's. All other translations from Hardouin's cited works are mine. Citations to Johnson are page numbers in his edition. Citations to all other works of Hardouin refer to pages or section divisions in the original Latin text (*Ad Censuram Scriptorum Veterum Prolegomena* (London: P. Vaillant, 1766). In this passage (1.18) Hardouin is specifically referring to his suspicions first raised when he was examining coins of the Herodian era. Recognizing inconsistencies based on Luke and Josephus, he says, "With this passage let me bring forth a conjecture, not of a truly chronic, vacuous prophet, but now of a man who nevertheless is perhaps more than due suspicious and excessively indulging his cleverness. Each one will accept this as he wishes." (*Chronologiae de nummis antiquis restitutae prolusio de nummis Herodiadum* (Paris: Anisson, 1693), 60.

The “whole fraud” (“*totam... fraudem*”) that Hardouin refers to is the unimaginable conspiracy of cultural counterfeit. In his *Prolegomena* and other works Hardouin claims that with the exception of Homer, Herodotus, Pliny, and half portions of Vergil and Horace, all classical, patristic, and scholastic literature is a 14th century forgery, primarily accomplished by the Benedictines.⁵ The motive for such a conspiracy, Hardouin explains, was to establish a literary tradition that would be the vehicle for introducing and transmitting heresy.⁶ He claims that up to this point only the Church’s oral tradition existed, which accurately conveyed for 13 centuries her history and doctrine.⁷ Moreover, he believed that his own order, the Jesuits, was charged with maintaining orthodoxy and the authority of Rome.⁸ Once the full horror dawned on Hardouin, he wrote several works “to prove” his theory. His *Pseudo-Virgilius* and *Pseudo-Horatius* illustrate well Hardouin’s methods that argue for medieval counterfeit.⁹ In the *Pseudo-Virgilius* he claims that Vergil wrote only the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* and that the *Aeneid* is the work of the “monkish cohort” and very likely was first written in French. Hardouin’s proof turns on chronological inconsistencies within the early Augustan regime; the vast number

⁵For Hardouin’s statement of the canon of “authentic” classical authors, see *Prolegomena* 1.1, 15.20; “Pseudo-Virgilius,” *Opera Varia*, 308, 313; “Pseudo-Horatius,” *Opera Varia*, 332. In an earlier work Hardouin originally included “Tully” (*Chronologiae de nummis*, 60), who later was replaced by Plautus due to a conflict with the origin of the Julian family stated by Cicero (*Ad Fam* 8.15). (*Chronologiae Veteris Testamenti* (Paris: John Boudot, 1693), 55. For Hardouin’s allegations of conspiracy at the hands of the Benedictines, see *Prolegomena* 1.12; 7.11.

⁶*Prolegomena*, 1-3.

⁷*Prolegomena*, 2.2-3; 9.25.

⁸*Prolegomena*, 1.11, 17.

⁹See note 5 for full bibliographical information.

of “errors” involving grammar, geography, theology, and ethnography; and an enormous compilation of stylistic—mostly of diction—differences between the *Aeneid* and the other “authentic” Vergilian works. It is primarily syntax and phrasing in which Hardouin sees the shadow of original French composition. The *Pseudo-Horatius* follows the same model as that of the *Pseudo-Virgilius*, and Hardouin contends that Horace wrote only the *Satires* and *Epistles*. The *Odes* and other shorter works have the same tell tale signs of the “impious poets.”

Hardouin never explains why he has singled out Vergil and Horace for exposure. But he must have thought that if he could create doubt about the traditional authorship of the two greatest Roman poets, the rest of the tradition would be more easily dismissed. However, the work in which he planned to bring down the entire classical tradition and for which his *Prolegomena* was the introduction was never written, as Hardouin died immediately after finishing the *Prolegomena*.¹⁰

II. HARDOUIN’S ARGUMENT ON THE IDENTITY OF CEPHAS

The *Dissertatio*, then, was written about midway between Hardouin’s “uncovering of the whole fraud” in 1692 and the composition of the *Prolegomena* in 1729, during which time he became obsessed with exposing atheism and combating heresy within the ranks of the Church. Although he engaged in high-profile battles with

¹⁰Hardouin himself seems to hint at the end of the *Prolegomena* (20.1) of the unlikelihood of completing the project. He says, “I have gone through, with such censure, the case of the writings of Augustine, Bernard, and Thomas...but I must deal with the others while God grants me health and life.” (Johnson, 166)

the great Benedictine scholar Jean Mabillon,¹¹ his *Dissertatio*, was strangely—as mentioned earlier—not originally written for publication. In the work’s “Praefatio” the editor explains that the illustrious Abbot Drouyn sent to him from Paris a letter, dated March 20, 1708. The editor includes this letter, in which Drouyn says that about six months ago Hardouin himself sent to him a manuscript in his own hand of the *Dissertatio* as a gift. Drouyn explains that he has written to the editor to ask that he consider including this piece within the *Opera Selecta*. Since Hardouin had indicated to Drouyn that he was not intending to have it printed, Drouyn felt that nothing should be disagreeable to Hardouin about passing the work onto the editor. Drouyn says that he has sent to the editor the very copy received from Hardouin. The editor explains that the “*ipsa argumenti novitas & praestantia*” (“the very newness and excellence of the proof”) have convinced him to include the *Dissertatio* at the end of the *Opera Selecta*. (920)¹²

The structure of the *Dissertatio*.

The *Dissertatio* itself, written in Latin with some Greek and Hebrew “proof-words,” comprises 20 sections, each something less than a page in length. In the work’s

¹¹Hardouin squared off with Mabillon over the issue of the authenticity—and hence veneration—of the bones from Rome’s catacombs. Mabillon claimed that the bones of the early martyrs were long since removed and scattered and that the current remains were not relics to be venerated. (Jean Mabillon, *Eusebii Romani ad Theophilum Gallum Epistola de Cultu Sanctorum Ignotorum* (1698)) Hardouin’s reply, consistent with his theories of Benedictine conspiracies, was that the elimination of valid devotions was another expression of atheism and an attempt to erode the traditions of the Church. (Jean Hardouin, *Réponse de Theophile françois à la letter du prétendu Eusebe romain* (Cologne: Pierre Marteau, 1699, 16, 24, 31). Clement XI supported Mabillon, who did not write a retraction at Hardouin’s request. (45)

¹²In-text citations to the *Dissertatio* are page numbers within the *Opera Selecta*.

final paragraph Hardouin's own summary provides an outline for his scheme of five proofs. (933) He says that the first six sections deal with chronology; that is, how it is not possible that Peter before the Jerusalem Council or Cephas and Peter after the Council were able to be rebuked by Paul in Antioch. Sections 7-16 treat his second argument, which is the consideration of the names "Peter," "Cephas," "James," and "John." The third proof, sections 17-18, develops from the authority of Holy Scripture, and the fourth in Section 19 argues from the long history of the Church. Finally in the last section Hardouin deals with the consequences of his adversaries' false propositions.

Hardouin provides his own introduction before Section 1. He begins by saying that his object is "to tear out an error which besets the minds of even many Catholics, who think that Peter the Apostle and the same Prince of the Apostles was rebuked by Paul, and to adduce many serious arguments." (920)

(“ad evellendum, qui plerorumque etiam Catholicorum animis insedit, errorem, existimantium Petrum Apostolum, & eumdem Principem Apostolorum, fuisse reprehensum a Paulo, nec pauca sunt, nec levia proferenda argumenta”)

The passage in which this Cephas was rebuked by Paul is Gal 2.11-14. Paul confronts Cephas "to his face" and "condemns" him for eating with uncircumcised Christians, "living like a Gentile," and providing a poor example for them "to live like Jews."¹³ Again, the question at issue is the identity of this Cephas.

¹³Biblical translations are from Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger, editors, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (New York: Oxford University, 1977).

Hardouin continues that “one would hope in vain to eradicate this error from the minds of men unless he displayed strong reasons.”

(“*...tamen illum eripi posse ex hominum animis, nisi validas exhibeat rationes, frustra quis speraverit?*”) (920)

He next announces the clarion theme of the *Dissertatio*, namely, that “this error is contrary to the sacred writings themselves and injurious to the Holy Apostolic See.” (920)

(“*...errorem hunc esse sacris ipsis litteris adversum, sanctaeque Apostolicae Sedi injurium...*”)

Hardouin concludes his introduction by saying that he will chart out the whereabouts of Peter and Paul after the death of Jesus “in order to make clear whether any year can be marked out when Paul saw Peter in Antioch.” (920)

(“*...ut palam fiat, an aliquis adsignari possit annus, quo Paulus Petrum Antiochiae viderit.*”)

Thus Hardouin, drawing from *Acts*, *Corinthians*, and *Galatians*, annalistically identifies in Section 1 the movements and locations of Peter, Paul, and Cephas from AD 33 to 58.

(921) Using this chronology as a basis, Hardouin begins his argument.

The argument from chronology.

Hardouin opens in AD 49, the year of the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15. The general line of this argument is that the Cephas in Antioch in Gal 2 cannot be Peter, since for chronological and motivational reasons Peter could not have returned to Jerusalem for the Council. First, Hardouin reads *Acts* 15.2 as implying that Cephas did not accompany Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem but instead remained in Antioch. (922) (“*Cephas interim*

Antiochiae remanente uti colligi oportere ex Acta 15.2”) And if Peter had been in their company, Luke would have named him, not merely referring to him as “some of the others” (“*quidem ex aliis*”). (922)

Hardouin maintains that it is all but impossible that Peter, who never had seen Antioch within the 14 year period from Paul’s conversion, would in the 15th year “have raced in unbelievable speed” (“*incredibili celeritate advolasse*”) from Jerusalem to Antioch, been rebuked there by Paul, and within a month have hastened back to Jerusalem to be consulted by Paul about the very controversy back in Antioch. (922) In fact, Hardouin thinks this situation is quite the opposite; that the issue that divided Paul and Cephas at Antioch was the cause itself that motivated Paul to go to Peter, as a judge, in Jerusalem. He says, “For it is clear that Peter was in Jerusalem at that time, when some from Judaea went down to Antioch, since indeed it was reported to Peter, as if to a judge, the circumstances of the cause that had divided Paul from Cephas at Antioch.” (922)

(“*Tunc enim Hierosolymis Petrum fuisse, cum descenderent quidam de Judaea Antiochiam, manifestum est: siquidem ad Petrum, velut ad Judicem, de causae statu relatum est, quae Paul a Cepha Antiochiae disjunxerat.*”)

It also does not make sense to Hardouin that Peter, who argued in Jerusalem against gentile circumcision, could be the same as Cephas in Antioch, who feared the arrival of the Judaeizers from Jerusalem (Gal 2.12, Acts 15.1) and withdrew himself from them. This leads Hardouin to defend Peter against heresy and to ask for the first time in the *Dissertatio* who is responsible for these attacks against the “Supreme Pontiff.” (924) Hardouin says that Peter must be “clean from any blemish of heresy” (“*immunem*

haereo labe...Petrum") and that it is unthinkable that any "Summus Pontifex" would withdraw himself from baptized Christians solely because they were not circumcised. He continues, "Certainly if any pope today would conduct himself in this way, even in some corner of France or Germany, not just in a heavily populated city, such as Antioch was, deservedly he would have slipped into heresy...and would be an heretic of the worst and most pernicious type." (924) Furthermore, Hardouin argues that Peter would not be frightened and withdraw from the uncircumcised gentiles at Antioch, since circumcision was not compelled, but only for "a good showing in the flesh" (Gal 6.12), and since Peter himself was comfortable in the company of Cornelius, who was an uncircumcised gentile. (Acts 10.28) The Holy Spirit, teaching Peter in the Jerusalem Council ("cui...*Spiritus Sanctus...in Concilio praecepisset*"), would not allow him, concludes Hardouin, to act otherwise. (924)

Who, then, says Hardouin, is condemning Peter of this heresy? He answers, "clearly the heretics" ("plane *haereseos*"). (924) Hardouin identifies these in bibliographical terms as the Judaeizers or the so-called "circumcision party" of Gal 2.12 and Acts 11.3, that is, those whom Cephas cowardly feared and Peter courageously opposed. However, at the end of the *Dissertatio* Hardouin "reveals" who of his contemporaries are the heretics that are supporting the ancient Judaeizers and thus insist on the identification between Cephas and Peter. Hardouin fears that if Peter can be shown to have erred in his words and actions, then how many times may his writings be in doubt. Thus "the defenders of this truly heretical position do not see that they unwisely threaten and weaken the very authority and faith of the sacred writings." (925)

(“*Non vident profecto contrariae sententiae defensores, ipsam se
sacrarum litterarum auctoritatem ac fidem imprudenter imminere ac
labefactare.*”)

The argument from the name “Cephas.”

Hardouin’s second argument, regarding the specific name of *Cephas*, comprises half of the *Dissertatio*. One theme within the argument is that the context of *Cephas* is not respectfully appropriate for Peter. Some examples: Why would Paul, who has recently and always referred to *Peter*, suddenly call him by another name? (925) Why too would Cephas be in the middle of the series of “*Jacobus and Cephas and Joannes*” (Gal 2.9)? And similarly in I. Cor 1.12? Peter is always listed first; or if this is a crescendo, then last, but not in the middle. (925) Why was Barnabas influenced more “by them” (“*ab eis*”) (2.13) than by Cephas (“*ab eo*”)? The phrase “even Barnabas” (2.13) also indicates to Hardouin that Barnabas is more important than Cephas, who is even overlooked in I. Cor 3.6. (927) Furthermore, Hardouin does not believe that Paul would have violated Christ’s command about reprimanding one’s brother first privately (Matt 18.15). (926) Although Paul could have done this, Hardouin explains, to someone who “has not been increased by Christ with the same respect” (“*non fuerit pari honore auctus a Christo*”), this certainly would not be Peter. (926)

A final example from Hardouin that Cephas is subordinated to others is Paul’s boasting that diminishes Peter. First Paul says that he, rather than other “guides in Christ,” is the Christian father of the Corinthians. (I Cor 4.15) Hardouin concludes that Cephas is not Peter, “since it is appropriate that Peter is believed to have been the father of all Christians” (“...*cum Petrum credi par sit fuisse omnium...Christianorum patrem*”).

(927) Second, Hardouin says that “Paul glories in that he has learned the gospel from Christ the Lord Himself and witnessed the testimony to the Resurrection,” whereas “Cephas was educated by the other disciples of Christ in Jerusalem after 16 years.” (927) That Peter was clearly educated by Christ and Paul’s expression superiority to Cephas in this respect prove to Hardouin that Cephas is someone other than Peter.

The argument from Holy Scripture.

Hardouin’s longest and most elaborately argued section of the *Dissertatio* deals with John 1.42, in which Jesus says, “So you are Simon the son of John? You shall be called Cephas.” Hardouin claims that this is the key passage from which everyone gets the idea that anywhere *Cephas* is mentioned, this must mean Peter. He points out that *Cephas* appears in Job 30.6, Jer 4.29, and in forms of *Caiaphas*. (928)¹⁴ Hardouin explains that Jesus did not intend that Peter be called *Cephas* everywhere, but that this name was respectful and easily remembered among the Syriac and Hebrew language communities, such as those of Jesus Himself; that elsewhere other names for Peter would be appropriate. In particular *Petros* and *Petrus* would be used where Greek and Latin were the dominant languages. (929) Moreover, Peter calls himself *Peter* or *Simon Peter* in his own epistles, and no one else calls him *Cephas*. So why, asks Hardouin, would Paul call him *Cephas* just in Antioch, Corinth, and Galatia, where coins demonstrate that Greek is the spoken language? (929)

¹⁴For the question whether ‘Cephas’ is an attested name, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Kepha’ and Peter’s name in the New Testament,” *To Advance the Gospel* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1981), 112-24.

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

Hardouin stresses the importance given to using Greek or Latin names for Peter. “Sacred writers especially considered this very carefully, that is, the necessity to make known the highest priest in the universal Church to the Greek and Latin speakers with a word from the Greek and Latin form, not from a foreign one.” (929)

(“...oportet summum...in universa Ecclesia Antistitem, Latinae Graecaeque formae vocabulo Graecis Latinisque innotescere, non peregrinae.”)

Furthermore, Peter especially and Paul require Latin names since the one is the head of the Roman Church, and the other is the chief evangelist in the Roman world, not to mention that many of Paul’s epistles were written to Rome and her colonies. (929) So, reasons Hardouin, just as *Paul* is never *Saul* outside Palestine, so too with *Peter* and *Cephas*. (930)

In this argument about the names themselves Hardouin first raises his suspicions about conspiracy and heresy. He says, “Therefore, this very passage (*John* 1.41), which some of the adversaries perhaps wrongly use in order to persuade the ignorant, amazingly makes Peter the Apostle sometimes to be called Cephas in the sacred books...” (929)

(“Ergo hic ipse locus, quo quidam ex adversariis fortassis abutuntur, ut suadeant imperatis, Petrum Apostolum in divinis libris Cepham interdum appellari, mirifice facit...”)

As for the identity of these “adversaries,” Hardouin takes this up in his third argument “from the authority of Holy Scripture and of the Church.”

Although Hardouin does not mention his conspiracy theory about the 14th century Benedictine forgeries that he discusses in his *Prolegomena* referred to above, his

contention in the *Dissertatio* is that someone deliberately changed *Cephas* in the Greek codices to *Petrus* in the revised *Vulgate*. He says that the original *Vulgate* is older than Jerome, and it did not read *Petrus*. But Jerome “himself acknowledged that he disagreed with several, at least Latin, copies received everywhere that had *Cephas*, where he himself wrote *Peter* in place of *Cephas*.” (932)

(“...ipse agnosceret, se a plerisque, saltem Latinis, & ubique receptis exemplaribus, quae Cepham haberent, ubi Petrum ipse pro Cepha scribebat, dissidere.”)

The original *Vulgate* translated *Cephas*, to which Hardouin says Eusebius and Jerome were witnesses. “For both Eusebius and Jerome himself were witnesses that the *Vulgate* edition, at least as far as it everywhere displayed the name *Cephas* in this narration, was older than Jerome himself.” (932)

(“Vulgatam enim editionem, saltem quatenus Cephae nomen in hac narratione ubique praefert, vetustiorem Hieronymo ipso esse, & Eusebius testis est, & ipsem Hieronymum.”)

Hardouin blames the Church for neglecting and allowing this opinion and thus the version of the text to continue. He says “the Roman and the Catholic Church never has admitted this nor does (she) still, but most steadfastly reject the single basis of that opinion as false and contrary and resistant to divine literature.” (931)

The root of the *Peter-for-Cephas* substitution, explains Hardouin, is in the deliberate corruption of the Greek codices. He says that the doctors of the Church were distracted and gave heretics an opportunity to damage the Church. (932) Hardouin identifies this group as the Montenses and says that in his day they are the Jansenists,

who want the New Testament published in French.¹⁵ He says, “*Cephas* has been changed into *Peter* by those very ones who lie that they are Roman Catholics.” (932) (“...*ab istis, inquam, ipsis, qui se Romanos Catholicos esse mentiuntur, mutatus est Cephas in Petrum.*”) Hardouin asks, “What person who wants to be called Catholic would deny that the Greek reading of the *Vulgate* everywhere destroys and corrupts the meaning of the *Vulgate* edition?” (932) In this particular passage of *Galatians* this is more “than just a varying or dissimilar interpretation among various codices.” (932) (“...*quam diversa dissimilisque in diversis codibus interpretatio sit.*”) Hardouin says that this reading strikes at the core of the Church’s strength.¹⁶

For the rest of this argument Hardouin explains how the heretics have manipulated the two names in various combinations of different Greek codices to bring about the same deleterious effect upon Peter’s authority within the Church. He concludes this section by saying, “It was necessary that these men ...clearly employed so many deceptions and some indeed before the very time of Clement of Alexandria in order to persuade posterity by at least a corrupted Greek text—since they were not able to do so

¹⁵ Hardouin says this Jansensist group is known as the Montenses in Hainaut (Belgium). (“...*Montensibus (Jansensianos hoc nomine intelligimus...qui Montibus in Hannonia...)*” (932)

¹⁶ In the *Prolegomena* Hardouin elaborates upon the scheme to undermine the *Vulgate*. He says that since the inerrant edition was already in the hands of the faithful the evil gang had to devise ways to undercut its authority as the received text. The Benedictines accomplished this by forging ancient-looking manuscripts in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin and concealing them in libraries. Once “discovered,” these “older” readings appeared to have greater authority and caused textual emendations in the original editions of the *Vulgate*.

(6.1-4) At this point, however, Hardouin says nothing about the change from *Cephas* to *Peter*.

from the Latin text received in the Church—that Peter was rebuked by Paul. In this matter they were indeed very fruitful.” (932)

(“*Tot scilicet uti fraudibus, & quibusdam quidem ante tempora ipsa Clementis Alexandrini...hos homines oportuit, ut Petrum a Paulo reprehensum fuisse, cum ex Latino textu in Ecclesia recepto non possent, ex Graeco saltem corrupto posteris suaderent. Qua in re nimium sane felices fuerunt.*”)

The argument from the tradition of the Church.

Hardouin’s fourth argument derives from the power of the Church due to its long and rich tradition. He briefly refers first to the early defenders of his argument, such as Clement, Eusebius, and Dorotheus of Tyre. He says that it is important that the ancient support is from the East, “in these places where the memory of this disagreement is able to be held more clearly and transmitted to posterity.” (933) (“*...in his locis, ubi certior haberi, transmittique ad posteros, eius dissidii memoria potuit.*”) Hardouin also cites Jerome, who, although he took the opposite position, nevertheless admits that there are those who believe that Cephas is not Peter but someone else from the 70 disciples. (932) Continuing to move through the centuries, Hardouin refers to Anselm, who thinks that Cephas in *Galatians* is someone else of the same name. Hardouin concludes by asking, “What is the use of adducing more (examples), since the voice alone of sacred scripture ought to be sufficient, which continually proclaims and has thus far been explained by us with the power of God?” (933)

(“*Sed quid juvat plura proferre, ubi sola satis esse debet, quae perpetuo clamat, & a nobis est cum Dei ope explanata hactenus, sacrae scripturae vox?*”)

The argument from the consequences of this heresy.

The fifth and final argument in the last section of the *Dissertatio* describes and laments the enormous amount of damage that this false interpretation by the Jansenists and other heretics has caused the Holy See. Hardouin says, “...by this design of theirs the authority of the highest Pontiff in defining issues of faith, who is the Vicar of Christ just as Peter was, is overthrown...” (933)

(“*isto exemplo, summi Pontificis, qui est aequo Vicarius Christi, ac Petrus fuit, auctoritas in definiendis fidei controversiis convellatur...*”)

Hardouin then quotes at length from “a very recent and false writer of theirs,” Paschasius Quenellius (Pasquier Quesnel), whose book is *La Discipline de l'Eglise*. (933) Hardouin quotes and cites five passages from Quesnel, which he condemns as “false and impious.” Typical of these passages is Quesnel’s statement about Peter’s subordination:

“...que S. Paul a bien fait de reprendre S. Pierre, parce qu'il y alloit de la foi: & il fait toujours voir, qu'un inferieur peut corriger son superieur, quand il s'agit d'un point d'importance de la discipline ou de la foi, quand il n'y a personne au dessus qui le puisse faire.” (933)

After summarizing the preceding five arguments within the *Dissertatio*, Hardouin ends the work by quoting *Luke 22.31-2*, one final appeal for the primacy of Peter.

“Simon, Simon,...I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.”

III. MOTIVATIONS, SUB-CURRENTS, AND RECEPTION

Hardouin's *Dissertatio*, though strangely motivated, nevertheless provides the first systematic proof of the identity of Cephas in *Galatians*. Prior to Hardouin, as he himself cites (932-33), several Fathers throughout the first millennium have merely remarked that Cephas is one of the seventy disciples or someone else with the same name as the Apostle Peter.¹⁷ Hardouin's intractable assertion that not a word was written—nor even needed to be written—to maintain the orthodoxy of the first thirteen centuries of the Church in part derived from his belief that his own order, the Jesuits, was charged with sustaining the pure authority of Rome.¹⁸ This was especially crucial to Hardouin's mission at a time when fanciful stories of national origins claimed "direct revelation" from the East to the exclusion of Peter and Rome. For example, Francus, the son of Trojan Hector, is said to have by-passed Rome and gone directly to Gaul from Troy.¹⁹

¹⁷In the last two centuries this debate has received more attention. For a discussion of recent scholarship of this subject see Fitzmyer, 114, nn. 15, 16; James Likoudis, "Were the Apostle Peter and Cephas of Antioch the Same Person?" *Serviam Newsletter* (Jan-Feb 1996), 1-4; Likoudis, "Peter and Cephas—Once Again," (Mar 1997), 1-3. Although Barnikol's focus is to argue that Gal 2.7-8 is an interpolation, he provides a helpful scheme of the Cephas/Petros occurrences, the textual tradition of these attestations, and references to 19th and 20th century scholarship about these issues that impinge on the question of Cephas' identity (Ernst Barnikol, "The Non-Pauline Origin of the Parallelism of the Apostles Peter and Paul. Galatians 2.7-8," *Journal of Higher Criticism* 5/2 (Fall 1998), 285-300).

¹⁸*Prolegomena*, 1.11.

¹⁹For more discussion on this subject see James M. Scott, "The *Aeneid* as the Inspired Revelation of the Roman Church: Jacques Hugues' *Vera Historia Romana*," *Prudentia* (34) 2002, 36-41.

It remains a mystery why Hardouin reportedly said to Abbott Drouyn that he had no intention to publish the *Dissertatio*, a work clearly of his stock-in-trade. I suggest that he did not yet want to introduce his enormous conspiracy theories in this short essay, but rather preferred to wait until his fuller arguments came forth in parts of the *Opera Varia* and the *Prolegomena*—and of course the *Censura* itself which he did not live long enough to start. Or perhaps he thought that the approval of and submission by the prestigious Abbott Drouyn would gain more credibility for the conspiracy that he first gently alludes to in the final sections of the *Dissertatio*.

Hardouin's scholarly powers were formidable, and in issues of more modest assertion, such as his work with numismatics, his contemporaries and even modern scholars have acknowledged his importance. For example, Allen, who is ever on the lookout for inventive interpretation, passingly, but respectfully, refers to “Father Jean Hardouin” and others as “truly fine numismatists.”²⁰ It would seem that the Gallicanism and Jansenism of his day, to which he briefly refers in his *Dissertatio*, drove him to the extremes that he later expressed in his *Prolegomena*. In earlier works Hardouin already showed his suspicions of Jansenism. For example, at the end of his massive *Acta Consiliorum* he appended the full text of Clement XI's Ultramontane and anti-Jansenist

²⁰Don Cameron Allen, *Mysteriously Meant, The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance* (The Johns Hopkins Press: Baltimore, 1970), 261. Momigliano calls him “brilliant” and he and Grafton seem in part to defend Hardouin due to the intense intellectual milieu that he was caught up in. (Arnaldo Momigliano, “Ancient History and the Antiquarian,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13 (1950) 285, 302; Grafton, 196.

encyclical *Unigenitus* that “provoked Gallican sensibilities.”²¹ His works on Vergil and Horace are full of assertions that the *Aeneid* and *Odes* were originally composed in French for furthering Jansenism.²² In his works later than the *Dissertatio*, when his theories of conspiracy and his alarm at the heresy within the body of falsified literature are fully exposed, Hardouin unreservedly identifies the “impious cohort” as Jansenists who, among other crimes against the Church, were plotting to create episcopal autonomy for the French bishops.²³ Hardouin also connects Jansenism with the causes of the French Benedictines in his attack upon the Maurists’ edition of Augustine. Hardouin says that Wyclif was the first to write under the name of Augustine, and later this “contrary gospel” (“*kakangelion*”) became “infallible.”²⁴ Such is the subtext of the *Dissertatio*, when Hardouin introduces the work by speaking of the current “injury to the Holy See” (“...*sanctaeque Apostolicae Sedi injurium*”). (920)

The irony that in the end confounds all of Hardouin’s arguments is the literary and historical support that he himself adduces. When he shores up his proof in the *Dissertatio* by citing the works of those Fathers who have questioned the identity of Cephas, he relies

²¹That the French clergy and parliament required this to be removed before publication, see Alexander Sedgwick, “The Nature of Jansenism,” *Jansenism in the Seventeenth-Century of France* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1977), 191; also *Prolegomena*, 4.4.

²²For example, see *Pseudo-Virgilius*, 283-4, 296, 323 and *Pseudo-Horatius*, 340, 349, 350.

²³In his *Prolegomena* Hardouin speaks of the conspirators’ purpose “to abrogate the primacy of the Pope.” (8.9-10)

²⁴*Prolegomena*, 4.12-13. Mabillon’s preface to the edition carried the day with Clement XI and added even more anger and confirmation that the conspirators were successfully subverting the faith and the authority of Rome.

on the early “authority” of those very personages who he later says either never existed or at least did not write what the literary tradition holds. So, for example, Eusebius’ reference to Clement’s stating that Cephas is one of the seventy²⁵ is then a double fiction that Hardouin presents as persuasive! Similarly, he was once asked how he could have written his highly acclaimed history of the pre-Tridentine councils, if, according to him, they never occurred. His answer was, “God and I only know.”²⁶ This illogical method of drawing “truthful” conclusions from admittedly “false” premises surely led to the work placed on the *Index* in the year of its publication. Obviously the Church could not tolerate, for example, the premise that the *Vulgate* was translated by someone else earlier than Jerome and the conclusion that some impious monk a thousand years later used Jerome’s identity to introduce and defend an heretical interpolation. It was the unimaginable profundity and consequence of Hardouin’s mission that finally made him an out-cast.²⁷ The tragedy of this great mind and defender of the faith is that he was destroyed by the very thing that he devoted himself to protecting, namely, the sacred tradition of the Church.

²⁵See note 1.

²⁶Johnson, xiv.

²⁷Catholics and even his own order rejected him: *Prolegomena*, 1.14, 10.3; Johnson, xiv, xxi; Grafton, 189.