

THE HISTORY OF THE MEDIEVAL PAPACY: A SURVEY OF RESEARCH, 1954-1959

The vast amount of scientific writing published each year in the field of Church history is an obvious indication that the temporal development of the Catholic Church is still a prominent theme in the field of historical research. Naturally the Church historian who undertakes a survey of his field of concentration is confronted with a large number of works, dealing with the internal history of the Church as well as with her external history, with her manifold relations to the whole wide world in which she exists. To make this survey possible, I have restricted its scope to the medieval papacy as it appears in the more important historical studies of the past five years.¹ It is my intention here to show the actual state of research on some aspects of the medieval papacy and to indicate the significance of this research for our understanding of the medieval Church.

The medieval papacy was more than a vital force motivating and contributing to the progress of history and culture. In its own right and by its own action in the spiritual and temporal orders, it created much of the history and culture of the period. The record of the achievements of the popes of the Middle Ages forms one of the most important sources for more than five hundred years of Western history; and no historian, secular or profane, can be indifferent to the interpretation of this record, which contains so much of the history of the civilized world.

The consequence of the creative activity of the medieval papacy in making history is that great problems have been handed down to the Catholic scholar of our day. It is the task, reserved to the Church historian, to solve these problems by historical method, to free them from the categories of modern thought, to cast aside the prejudiced interpretations accumulated in the course of the centuries, to situate these problems in their proper time and place within the framework of universal history, to discover them in

EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second in a series of Church history surveys which appear each year in the March issue.

¹ For the literature prior to the time covered in this survey, cf. Y. M.-J. Congar, O.P., "Bulletin d'histoire des doctrines médiévales," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 39 (1955) 439-49. The article by R. Folz, "La papauté médiévale vue par quelques-uns de ses historiens récents," *Revue historique* 218 (1957) 32-63, surveys the past thirty years. Cf. G. Michiels, in *Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 8 (1958) 33, n. 90. J. Lecler, "Bulletin d'histoire des doctrines ecclésiologiques," *Recherches de science religieuse* 47 (1959) 408-52, discusses thirty-four recent books on the ancient, medieval, and modern Church.

the peculiar circumstances surrounding their birth. The Catholic intellectual has every right to expect to find in historical writing on the papacy the highest degree of scholarship.

SOURCE BOOKS

Church history is always enriched by the publication of its sources; for despite the quality and quantity of historical writing, the historian must work from sources, the *caput traditionis*, if he is to be true to his vocation. Apart from the welcomed reprinting of certain collections of source material of major importance for Church history,² the most valuable contribution is H. Foerster's edition of the *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*,³ a collection of various ecclesiastical formularies and models of formularies which originated in the Early Middle Ages in the Roman chancery (H. Foerster and B. Botte) rather than in local episcopal chanceries (L. Santifaller). Foerster's work will certainly surpass the older, imperfect editions of L. Holstenius (1650), J. Garnier (1680), which is reprinted in Migne (*PL* 105 [1851]), and E. de Rozières (1869). However, it will not surpass the useful, informative edition of T. von Sickel (Vienna, 1889). For Foerster has not constructed a definitive, critical edition but has presented a diplomatic edition, built on three manuscripts: Vatican, Arch. XI, 19; Milan, Amb. I, 2 sup.; and Clairmontanus from Egmond-Binnen in Holland. What we have here is a mere reproduction of the texts of these manuscripts—unfortunately without proper commentary or analysis or indices—the basis, however, of a critical edition which each one presumably is to make for himself. The Foerster edition of the *Liber diurnus*, by rendering accessible the text of this important collection of documents, has rendered valuable service to diplomatists, Church historians, and historians of canon law.⁴

For the history of the medieval papacy, no handbook of source materials has recently appeared which is comparable to Carl Mirbt's *Quellen*,⁵ distinguished not only for the number and variety of documents which it presents, but also for the pertinent literature which accompanies each document. As Volume 43 of the publications of the Instituto Español de Estudios

² For example, J. von Pflugk-Harttung, *Acta pontificum Romanorum inedita* (Tübingen, 1881) has been reprinted by the Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt (Graz, 1958). The available reprints of source material of the first order are far too extensive to be listed here.

³ H. Foerster, *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum* (Bern: Francke, 1958).

⁴ For a fuller discussion of this work, cf. B. Botte, *Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 8 (1958) 212–13, n. 649.

⁵ C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus* (Tübingen, 1924).

Eclesiásticos of Rome, D. Mansilla⁶ has brought out a collection of papal documents for the period 959–1216, that is, from John XIII to Innocent III. This is the first part of a series which will present the texts of all papal documents preserved in Rome, concretely the papal Registers. It is not so much that we have here a new edition of the texts but rather a new printing of older editions with some corrections added. Since the editor frequently works from imperfect source material, his edition does not always present the best readings of the documents. However, as a corrective, useful indications are given at the head of each document which will guide the scholar to the more reliable sources. The chief usefulness of this work consists in its reprinting in a practical form a great amount of very important source material for the history of the medieval papacy.⁷

H. Schuster, K. Ringshausen, and W. Tebbe have brought out under the title *Quellenbuch zur Kirchengeschichte*⁸ two volumes of ecclesiastical documents translated into German. The first document poses the question: "What is man?" (Homer, *Iliad* 6, 146–49). The concluding document is "My Faith in the Bible," from Bishop T. Wurm's *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben* (Stuttgart, 1953). In general, the book is well put together. I note, however, that little space is devoted to the great dogmatic controversies of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries and that the treatment of the medieval papacy is far from adequate. However, the editors have presented very valuable documentation for the origin, growth, and development of Protestantism from its classical to its modern form.

I would like to call attention here to two other books of the same general character: Prof. M. Pfliegler's *Dokumente*⁹ and A. Läßle's *Kirchengeschichte*.¹⁰ The former begins with the Acts of the Apostles and ends with the Concordat of August 27, 1953 between the Holy See and Spain. The latter begins with Vergil's Fourth Eclogue and ends with the solemn definition of the dogma of the Assumption by Pius XII on November 1, 1950. There is nothing of special importance about these two collections, which were designed more for use in religious instruction than for scholarly research.

But the two obvious deficiencies which one notes in these works justifies

⁶ D. Mansilla, *La documentación pontificia hasta Innocencio III (965–1216)* (Rome, 1955).

⁷ Cf. J. Sydow, in *Historisches Jahrbuch* 78 (1959) 438.

⁸ E. Schuster, K. Ringshausen, and W. Tebbe, *Quellenbuch zur Kirchengeschichte*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt: Diesterweg, 1955).

⁹ M. Pfliegler, *Dokumente zur Geschichte der Kirche* (2nd ed.; Munich: Tyrolia, 1958).

¹⁰ A. Läßle, *Kirchengeschichte in Dokumenten: Sammlung kirchengeschichtlicher Quellen für Schule und Studium* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1958).

mentioning them with the hope that future compilers of source material will profit from these remarks. First, the documents are not critically presented—a deficiency inexcusable in a book intended for nonscholars. Further, they are neither carefully situated in time and place nor accompanied by a judicious bibliography. Second, the collection of the source material, as a whole, is superficial. This is the necessary result of attempting to select documents from the general source material of almost two thousand years of Church history. The whole undertaking might have been more successful if the selection had been restricted to one or two special categories: e.g., Church and state; intellectual and spiritual life of the Church; papacy and hierarchy; religious movements; etc., and deepened by introduction, evaluation, bibliography, and commentary, if necessary.

CHURCH HISTORIES

The title of this section, "Church Histories," is to be understood in a large sense to include historical writings of the Church in general as well as detailed historical studies on various aspects of her life and activity. Characteristic of contemporary writing and research in this field is a twofold trend. First, there is the growing tendency to specialize, to concentrate more on aspects of the Church than on the Church as an historical entity, to write more ecclesiastical history than Church history. The tendency is perfectly in accord with parallel trends in modern historical scholarship. Second, theologically-minded historians and historically-minded theologians of our day are more and more preoccupied with *Heilsgeschichte*, the history of the Church as an instrument of salvation. A great amount of research, formerly devoted to Church history, is now directed to the study of the Church as a supernatural society developing in space and time according to its own unique laws. It well may be that the excessively positive, historical approach of the greater number of Church historians of the past century requires a new evaluation in the light of new historico-theological method. In defining Church history we have stressed the notion of *history* more than that of *Church*. Perhaps we should start once again by posing the essential question: "What is the material and formal object of Church history?"¹¹

In comparison with other periods, only a relatively small number of Church histories have been written recently;¹² and they are not of the highest

¹¹ Cf. on this rarely treated question O. Köhler, "Der Gegenstand der Kirchengeschichte," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958) 254-69; H. Jedin, "Kirchengeschichte als Heilsgeschichte?," *Saeculum* 5 (1954) 119 ff.; B. Botte, "Histoire et théologie: A propos du problème de l'église," *Istina* 4 (1957) 389-400.

¹² K. Bihlmeyer and H. Tüchle, *Kirchengeschichte* 1 (13th ed.; Paderborn: Schöningh, 1952) 21-29. A fourteenth edition appeared in 1956.

quality. The translation of the well-known Bihlmeyer-Tüchle *Kirchengeschichte* by V. E. Mills¹³ comes as a welcome addition to the Church histories available in English. In a review of Fr. Mills's translation,¹⁴ I have pointed out, as the essential criticism, his failure to take advantage of this new printing to bring the bibliography up to date and to correct the original work in terms of the conclusions of recent research. Still Bihlmeyer-Tüchle in English is a real contribution to the field. The second edition of J. Gottschalk's Church history,¹⁵ intended as a handy presentation of various themes from the history of the Church, conceived more for students than for scholars, offers nothing new.

PAPAL HISTORY

General papal history, like general Church history, also tends to be neglected. This is understandable, since we live in the age of the monumental work of such distinguished research scholars as L. von Pastor, H. K. Mann, E. Caspar, and J. Haller. There seems little original work left for us to accomplish in this very specialized field. In 1955 appeared the second printing (edition) of the monumental *Liber pontificalis*, critically edited by Msgr. Louis Duchesne some sixty-five years ago. In 1957 it was followed by a third volume, additions to and corrections of the original work of Duchesne. This third volume is the work of Prof. Cyrille Vogel of the Catholic Faculty of the University of Strasbourg.¹⁶

The following points are to be noted concerning this great undertaking.¹⁷ First, the original text of Duchesne's edition of the *Liber pontificalis*, in its own right almost perfect, has been left unaltered in the reprinting. Subsequent scholarship has recognized the soundness of the manuscript tradition on which he built his text and the accuracy of the readings which he selected. Certainly T. Mommsen's text does not differ in any major points from that of Duchesne. The editors, therefore, have been scrupulously careful to reproduce the work of Duchesne. Second, the additions and corrections which Prof. Vogel has published in the third volume are actually the work

¹³ K. Bihlmeyer and H. Tüchle, *Church History* 1, tr. from 13th ed. by V. E. Mills, O.F.M. (Westminster: Newman, 1958).

¹⁴ R. E. McNally, S.J., in *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 19 (1958) 658-59. Cf. D. R. Reul, in *Revue bénédictine* 69 (1959) 153-54.

¹⁵ J. Gottschalk, *Kirchengeschichte* (2nd ed.; Bonn: Hanstein, 1956). Cf. W. Hug, in *Historisches Jahrbuch* 78 (1959) 422-23.

¹⁶ *Le Liber pontificalis*, text, introduction, and commentary by L. Duchesne. Vol. 3: *Additions et corrections de Msgr. L. Duchesne*, edited by C. Vogel (Paris: de Boccard, 1957).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-4.

of Duchesne himself, prepared over the thirty years between the publication of his second volume (1892) and his death (1922). Therefore, the third volume is to a large extent the result of Duchesne's own research. Third, Prof. Vogel has added to the body of the notes left by Duchesne select bibliographical notices on each pope and papal history. He has also added a history of the text of the *Liber pontificalis* since the appearance of Duchesne's edition. There is scarcely need here to call attention to either the importance of the *Liber pontificalis* for papal history or the value of Prof. Vogel's contribution to historical research.

One important addition to the text of Duchesne can be made on the basis of a manuscript from Tortosa (Cod. Dertusensis, Bib. Cap. f. 166^v-174^v), discovered by P. M. March in 1911 and published by him in 1925. This manuscript differs in some important points from that (Vat. lat. 3762) used by Duchesne, but it does not actually displace his text. Prof. Vogel has collated the two manuscripts and presents (pp. 143-71) what is now the definitive text of a source of the first order for the lives of Popes Paschal II, Gelasius II, Callistus II, and Honorius II.

The past five years have seen the appearance of the third volume of F. X. Seppelt's *Geschichte der Päpste*,¹⁸ as well as a second edition of Volumes 1, 2, 4, and 5, the latter being partly the work of G. Schwaiger. Characteristic of this work is the author's fine combination of scholarship and style—an almost perfect example of the best *haute vulgarisation*. Because of the simplicity and directness of expression, a recent reviewer of this work, T. Schieffer,¹⁹ has called it "an almost modern *Liber pontificalis*." Built solidly on research, composed without a large number of footnotes, the work at times distresses the reader because it presupposes that his background is sufficiently broad to follow the historical trends of nineteen centuries of history.

Unfortunately, there is not in English, nor in any language so far as I know, an adequate encyclopedia of the papacy²⁰ which could serve both as the *point de départ* for research and as the source for accurate scientific knowledge of the popes and their significance for history and culture. I would conceive such a work as the common project of a number of scholars, specialists in ancient, medieval, Reformation, and modern history. It would

¹⁸ F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts*, Vols. 1-5 (Munich: Kösel, 1954-59).

¹⁹ T. Schieffer, in *Historisches Jahrbuch* 78 (1959) 424-27.

²⁰ Works such as the *Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon* and even the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* do not really fill the need of which there is question here. *The Encyclopedia of the Papacy* by H. Kühner, tr. K. J. Northcott (New York: Philosophical Library, 1958), is not worthy of serious consideration.

be an up-to-date, clear, straightforward presentation of papal history built on sound scholarship and accompanied by a select bibliography and a list of the critical editions of the most important source materials.²¹

CULTURAL HISTORY

The intellectual life of the Middle Ages continues to attract the attention of many scholars, even in the hydrogen age.²² In 1956 appeared the first English translation of Gustav Schnürer's *Kirche und Kultur im Mittelalter*.²³ Written from the viewpoint that the Middle Ages is "the Ecclesiastical Period of Western Civilization," the book professedly tries to establish the thesis that the preponderant role in the formation of Western culture belongs to the Church. The value of Schnürer's work is not so much in his factual presentation of history as in his very well founded insights into the development of medieval culture, which he knew and appreciated so deeply. His chapters on Gregory the Great, St. Boniface and the papacy, and the union of papacy and Empire form a clear, carefully-reasoned, though perhaps somewhat romantic presentation of the foundations of the great medieval problem, *sacerdotium* and *imperium*.

Dom J. Leclercq's *L'Amour des lettres*²⁴ is one of the finest treatments to date of the problem of the monastic culture of the Middle Ages. The work grew out of a series of conferences given in Rome to the students of San Anselmo's during the winter 1955-56. It is the good fortune of these young monks to have had such a distinguished *conférencier* introduce them to the intellectual and ascetical traditions of their ancient order. Monastic culture included an asceticism and a theology. Both were built on the Bible and the Fathers. The asceticism was more an atmosphere of holiness which the monastery created than a set of fixed rules which specified a method of perfection. The monastic theology, at times almost indistinguishable from the asceticism, was "a climate, a mentality formed by personal experience

²¹ Attention is called here to the recent reprinting of W. Norden's *Das Papsttum und Byzanz* (New York: Franklin, 1959). Originally published in Berlin in 1903, this work is still a classic for the history of papal relations with Byzantium between 1050 and 1453. At the time of the preparation of this article, I did not see the recent work of J. S. Brusher, S.J., *Popes through the Ages* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1959).

²² In addition to the works mentioned infra, I recommend two stimulating, if not scholarly, works: R. P. Ruysse, *France religieuse du XII^e au XV^e siècle* (Paris: Casterman, 1958), and J. Le Goff, *Les intellectuels au moyen âge* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1957).

²³ *Church and Culture in the Middle Ages* 1: 350-814, by G. Schnürer, tr. G. J. Undreiner (Paterson: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1956).

²⁴ J. Leclercq, O.S.B., *L'Amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1957). The Fordham University Press has promised for January, 1960 an English translation of this work under the title, *The Love of Learning and the Desire of God*.

of the things of God." It implied not only a desire of heaven, flight from the world, thirst for learning, but also a taste for profane culture as an intellectual foundation for theology. The problematic here is to be found in the opposition between the sacred and the profane elements. Of special value is the chapter devoted to Gregory the Great, "Docteur du désir," a Father too often undervalued on the basis of the poorly selected homilies in the Roman Breviary. The author's graceful style easily sustains the reader's interest, and his technique of filling his book with learning without at the same time making it difficult is charming.²⁵

Le mouvement doctrinal, by A. Forest, F. van Steenberghen, and M. de Gandillac,²⁶ is a comprehensive, complete, compact treatment of the intellectual life of the High Middle Ages. Its theme is the intellectual movements from John Scotus Erigena in the ninth century to the close of the fourteenth century. Though this excellent volume is directly interested in the doctrinal development of the medieval world, it has relevance for the history of the papacy. There are, for example, some brief but good pages on Innocent III and Gregory IX and their relations to the university problems of the thirteenth century. The chapter on William of Occam by M. de Gandillac is valuable for the political theories of the Late Middle Ages.²⁷ The work is carefully documented with sources and bibliography.

Another doctrinal work which throws light on the papacy's share in the formation of the intellectual life of the Middle Ages is M. D. Chenu's²⁸ penetrating study of the world of ideas of the twelfth century. His selection of characteristic themes is refreshing. The chapters, "Conscience de l'histoire et théologie," "Grammaire et théologie," "La mentalité symbolique," and "La théologie symbolique," open up new insights into the medieval mind at work. A reflection which one carries away from these two works is that the medieval papacy's interference with *studium* was minimum, her cooperation maximum.²⁹

²⁵ Cf. O. Lottin, in *Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 8 (1958) 51-53, n. 141.

²⁶ A. Forest, F. van Steenberghen, and M. de Gandillac, *Le mouvement doctrinal* (= Fliche-Martin, *Histoire de l'église* 13; Paris: Bloud-Gay, 1950).

²⁷ Naturally *Le mouvement doctrinal* is to be supplemented by such works as A. Fliche, C. Thouzelier, and Y. Azais, *La chrétienté romaine (1198-1274)* (= Fliche-Martin, *Histoire de l'église* 10; Paris: Bloud-Gay, 1950).

²⁸ M. D. Chenu, O.P., *La théologie au douzième siècle* (Paris: Vrin, 1957).

²⁹ M. M. McLaughlin, "Paris Masters in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries and Ideas of Intellectual Freedom," *Church History* 24 (1955) 195-211, presents an interesting, if somewhat one-sided, interpretation of the spirit of liberty in the scholarship of the medieval intellectuals. Cf. H. Bascour, in *Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 8 (1959) 391, n. 1188.

MEDIEVAL THEOCRACY

Of all the many aspects of medieval studies, the most comprehensive, the most difficult, and the most elusive is the problem of *sacerdotium* and *imperium*, Church and state, in the Middle Ages.³⁰ It requires a thorough mastery of voluminous source materials and a very solid foundation in political theory³¹—a rare combination indeed. The whole problem is further complicated by a confused and confusing terminology which is associated with the expression of medieval political ideas, and by the fact that the meaning of the problem itself shifts with the steady ebb and flow of history. The Carolingian Church-State problem is quite different from that of the Hohenstaufen centuries later. Precisely because the problem is relevant to our contemporary theology and political theory, it suffers from confessional prejudice and partisan apologetics. Until recently, almost all the research in medieval Church and state has been the work of non-Catholics. Catholics feel that it is not too late to take one more look at the whole problem. The results of their scholarly efforts have been indeed rewarding.

Central to the medieval concept of theocracy is the medieval concept of the papacy—conceived as having such a fulness of spiritual power that it pours over into the temporal order. Two recent articles, appearing at almost the same time, indirectly show that the Petrine texts (Mt 16:18; Jn 20:19–31), as understood in the ninth and tenth centuries, were not unanimously accepted as the foundation of the universal, spiritual primacy of the Holy See. H. M. Klinkenberg³² finds in his study of the history of the exegesis of Mt 16:18 through the tenth century two different traditions existing side by side: Cyprian's, represented by Atto of Vercelli (*ca.* 961) and RATHERIUS of Verona (*ca.* 974); and Leo the Great's, represented by Abbon of Fleury (*ca.* 1004). The former, a conciliar approach, situates the pope in the *ecclesia universalis* as *primus inter pares*. The latter, more in conformity with the traditional Catholic doctrine, maintains the universal primacy of the pope. On the basis of a study of Haimo of Auxerre's (*ca.*

³⁰ The utmost caution must be observed in speaking of Church and state in the Middle Ages. The duad, Church and state, must be purified of all modern connotations before it is applied historically. The expression "Middle Ages," as predicated of the period between Antiquity and Reformation, is highly equivocal. For an original and penetrating analysis of the medieval world, cf. W. C. BARK, *Origins of the Medieval World* (Stanford: Stanford Univ., 1958).

³¹ The ever-growing bibliography in medieval Church-State is enormous. Cf. e.g., H. CONRAD, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte 1: Frühzeit und Mittelalter* (Karlsruhe: Müller, 1954) 170–77, 407–27.

³² H. M. Klinkenberg, "Der römische Primat im 10. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung* 72 (1955) 1–57.

865) *Homily for the Octave of Easter* (PL 118, 489–96) and his *Homily on the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul* (PL 118, 759–63), J. Gross³² concludes that he did not recognize the universal primacy of St. Peter. Consequently, his successor, the pope, could not have the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church. These two studies have a certain value for the history of dogma in that they show that there is no constant and universal tradition of interpreting these texts in the sense of the Vatican definition. However, we note here a certain lack of finesse in handling the sources. Exegesis in the Early Middle Ages served more than one purpose. In its interpretation a fourfold sense was sought, and the moral and the anagogic sense were frequently more important to the preacher than the literal and allegoric.³⁴ This our two scholars have failed to stress. The whole history of the interpretation of the Petrine texts through the Middle Ages requires detailed study.³⁵

M. Pacaut,³⁶ the distinguished expert on medieval political ideas, has recently brought out a much-welcomed history of medieval theocracy, probably the by-product of his greater work on Alexander III. According to Pacaut, theocracy passed through the following stages in its development: (1) *Carolingian*: *Sacerdotium* gives birth to *imperium*. The two draw together, the latter receiving from the former a religious mission in this world, the defense and protection of the Church. The *finis* of *imperium* as such coincides with that of *sacerdotium*. (2) *Ottonian-Salian*: The *imperium* becomes more "spiritualistic." The *sacerdotium* begins its reform. As a logical consequence of the Investiture Controversy the Church brings forth a truly theocratic doctrine with emphasis, however, on the spiritual element. (3) *Hohenstaufen*: With the help of the new Roman Law and Aristotelianism, decisive intellectual factors on the side of *imperium*, the German emperors react against papal theocracy. The idea now emerges clearly that the *potestas imperialis* is of direct divine origin. (4) *Innocent III*: Innocent stands at the summit of a monistic *christianitas*. (5) *Innocent IV*: The doctrine of theocracy finds here its fullest expression. Papal sovereignty, in itself one

³² J. Gross, "Die Schlüsselgewalt nach Haimo von Auxerre," *Zeitschrift der Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 9 (1957) 30–41.

³⁴ It is worth recalling here the medieval couplet: "Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria, moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia."

³⁵ Theodore T. Taheny, S.J., of Woodstock College, is at present writing his doctoral dissertation on this important theme under my direction.

³⁶ M. Pacaut, *La théocratie: L'Église et le pouvoir au moyen âge* (Paris: Aubier, 1957). Cf. for reviews of this work, *Revue bénédictine* 69 (1959) 159–60; J. Lecler, in *Recherches de science religieuse* 47 (1959) 438–39; G. Michiels, in *Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 8 (1958) 42–43, n. 117.

and indivisible, embraces the *plenitudo potestatis* in both the temporal and the spiritual domains. (6) *Boniface VIII*: Unaware of the revolutionary developments in world history, the papacy continues to insist on its theocratic position within the framework of *christianitas*. Theocracy moves away from the theoretical towards the dogmatic. But the strength of *imperium* in both thinkers (Marsilius of Padua and William of Occam) and contenders (Philip the Fair against Boniface VIII, and Ludwig the Bavarian against John XXII) reduces the papal theocracy to the realm of the academic. In broad outline, this is the substance of the work. It contains nothing which is really new, but the presentation, especially the documents, recommends it highly.

DONATIO CONSTANTINI

Almost from the time (1440) that Lorenzo Valla³⁷ first proved the spuriousness of the *Donatio Constantini*,³⁸ historians have been trying to determine the authorship and significance of this celebrated forgery, to situate it in time and place. The document, of first-rate importance for the study of the history of the medieval papacy, especially the origin of the Papal States, is highly enigmatic. The most recent study of this document is the work of E. Griffe.³⁹ According to him, the *Donatio* is not the work of the Holy See (Stephen II) attempting to legalize its demands of the Frankish kingdom. There was no need of such a document at the time, since the friendship of the treaty of Ponthion (754) was still strong between the Holy See and the Franks. The document is essentially a justification of the new Western Empire vis-à-vis the claims of the Byzantine Empire, and it was probably composed by a cleric of St. Denis working sometime between 802 and 812. The interpolation of the *Vita Hadriani* in the *Liber pontificalis*, in which the so-called Donation of Quierzy is rooted, was probably prepared about 817,

³⁷ Valla proposed his thesis in *De falso credita et ementita Constantini Donatione declamatio*, at once a bitter attack on the authenticity of the *Donatio* and the temporal power of the papacy.

³⁸ Cf. for the text of the *Donatio*, C. Mirbt, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-12, n. 228. An English translation is found in S. Ehler and J. Morrall, *Church and State through the Centuries* (London: Burns and Oates, 1954) pp. 15-22. Cf. *infra* n. 44.

³⁹ E. Griffe, "Aux origines de l'état pontifical," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 53 (1952) 216-31; 55 (1954) 65-89; 59 (1958) 193-211; "A propos de la *Donatio Constantini*," *ibid.* 58 (1957) 238-41. These articles deal with (1) the Donation of Constantine and the Donation of Quierzy; (2) the relations between Charles the Great and Hadrian I; (3) the relation of the imperial coronation of 800 to the *Donatio Constantini*; and (4) the interpolations in the *Vita Hadriani* in the *Liber pontificalis*.

after the death of Stephen IV, and is the work of certain Roman clerics who hoped thereby to gain imperial support.⁴⁰

TRANSLATIO IMPERII

In the development of the political theory of the medieval world, the doctrine of *translatio* is one of the essential ideas reflecting the ever-changing relations between *sacerdotium* and *imperium*. It is also a fundamental idea in the historiography of some of the most representative of the medieval historians. Under the direction of F. Kempf, S.J., of the Gregorian University, P. A. van den Baar⁴¹ has made a significant contribution to the history of political ideas in his study of the origin and development of the ecclesiastical conception of the *translatio imperii* from the Carolingian period to Innocent IV (d. 1254). This work, excellent from almost every viewpoint, combines the historical with the theoretical. It is well conceived. Its method is solid. One admires the author's ability to select and stress the important, to draw conclusions with delicacy, to compress much learning into a small space.

Translatio imperii, like all expressions with a long history, is equivocal.⁴² In a general, neutral sense, *translatio* expresses the idea that the one *Imperium Romanum* was transferred on Christmas Day 800 from the Greeks of Byzantium to the Franks or Germans through the coronation of Charles the Great as emperor. The expression, however, can be contracted and determined to a nonecclesiastical and an ecclesiastical sense. The former signifies that the origin of the new Empire, that is, its transference from the East to the West, is due either to the *virtus* or power of Charles himself or to the activity of the people of Rome, considered as citizens par excellence

⁴⁰ E. Griffe's thesis is by no means unanimously accepted. M. Pacaut, *op. cit.*, p. 37, holds that the Donation is of Roman origin and was prepared in the period 750-60, after the return of Stephen II from the Frankish lands. W. Hoppe, in the *Sachwörterbuch zur Deutschen Geschichte*, ed. H. Rössler and G. Franz (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1958) pp. 554-55, agrees with E. Griffe to the extent that he finds the origin of the document in St. Denis ca. 750-70. He diverges from him on the date. W. Ohnsorge, *Abendland und Byzanz* (Darmstadt: Gentner, 1958) pp. 79-110, agrees that the document was prepared after 800, actually in 804, but assigns it Roman provenance. Obviously the problem of the *Donatio* is still an open question.

⁴¹ P. A. van den Baar, *Die kirchliche Lehre der Translatio Imperii Romani (Analecta Gregoriana 78; Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1956)*. For a review of this work, cf. M. Pacaut, in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957) 542-44.

⁴² W. Goetz, *Translatio imperii: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1958) pp. 37-62.

of the old Empire. The latter sense adds to the notion of *translatio* the authority of the Apostolic See as its constitutive element and the defense of the Church as its principal motive. It is with this latter sense, the ecclesiastical usage of the word, that the work of P. A. van den Baar is chiefly concerned. The other senses are of indirect or secondary importance to the whole theme.

The full development of the doctrine of *translatio*, understood in its ecclesiastical sense, comprehends the following five elements:⁴³ (1) The imperial coronation of Charles the Great represents the transference of the one Roman Empire from the East to the West. (2) This transference took place by virtue of the apostolic authority of the Holy See. (3) *Translatio* is rooted in the Church's need to be defended against her enemies. (4) Because of the Holy See's involvement in the historical transference of the Empire, she has the right to interfere in questions which touch on the Empire. (5) The Holy See possesses the right, in case it should be necessary for the defense of the Church, to institute a new transference.⁴⁴

The *translatio* idea finds its historical origin in the Carolingian epoch, in the historical conjunction of Byzantium, the Franks, and the Holy See. In the course of the late eighth century, the political (e.g., Empire), spiritual (e.g., heterodoxy), and military (e.g., Liutprand) authority of Byzantium was played out. The new situation in the Italian peninsula—the Lombard threat to the Apostolic See and the Byzantine incapacity to act—called forth a daring new policy. This new policy, foreshadowed a generation before when the Pope first sought help from Charles Martel, was fully signified by the imperial coronation of Charles the Great on Christmas Day, 800.⁴⁵ The papal axis had turned from an East (Byzantium) to West (Rome) relationship. Henceforth it would revolve in the direction North (Franconia)—South (Rome).

For the development of the ecclesiastical conception of *translatio*, the most important elements of these historical happenings are: (1) the authority

⁴³ P. A. van den Baar, *op. cit.*, pp. vi–vii.

⁴⁴ At this point I would like to distinguish the idea of *Translatio imperii* from *Donatio Constantini*. The former is built on history, the latter on fiction; the former on Pope Leo's coronation of Charles the Great, the latter on Pope Sylvester's healing of Emperor Constantine; the former is motivated by the pope's need of the emperor, the latter by the emperor's gratitude to the pope. The former supposes *unum imperium*, the latter a *duplex imperium* (East and West). This is not said to diminish the importance of the *Donatio Constantini* for medieval political thought.

⁴⁵ The sources do not inform us on the exact meaning either of the coronation on Christmas Day, the underlying causes of it, or the motives of Leo III and Charles the Great.

of Leo III in the coronation of the new Frankish emperor, and (2) the emergence of this new Frankish emperor as "defensor ecclesiae." These elements are certainly stressed after the middle of the ninth century. That a new Empire, coexistent with the old Empire of Byzantium, had arisen, would prevent the coalescence at this time of the idea of *translatio*.

And after the middle of the ninth century the Roman, Frankish, and ecclesiastical elements interact on one another. In fact, at this time, the expression "translatio imperialis potestatis" first emerges.⁴⁶ The Romans, conscious of the greatness of their imperial past, were prepared to accept the new emperor as the only true Roman emperor; and the Franks were willing to associate their new Christian emperor with Rome, the birthplace of the Empire and the seat of the Roman Church. In the Church resided the existential foundation (i.e., coronation) of the Empire and the essential motive (i.e., defense) for its existence. This was the climate of thought in the late ninth century.

But this thought was not sufficient to constitute either the idea or the theory of *translatio*. The Franks continued to regard their new Empire as a *magnum imperium* of the Frankish nation; the Romans considered their Empire as their sovereign rule over the Romans and the *patrimonium sancti Petri*—their own *parvum imperium*. Neither considered the Empire as a continuation of the ancient *Imperium Romanum*. Both recognized the existence of the double empire, East (Byzantium) and West (Frankish), an idea which precluded *translatio*, based on the notion of *unum imperium*.⁴⁷

This development, though interrupted by the general collapse of the West, specifically the Carolingian Empire, and by the regrettable decadence of the Holy See, was resumed in the Ottonian and Salian period, an epoch of decisive importance for the vigorous evolution of *translatio*. For it saw the renewal by John XII in 962 of the Western Empire in the person of Otto the Great; and this renewed Empire emerged as the heir of the ancient Roman Empire. This *Imperium Ottonianum* grew spiritually and even developed an ecclesiastical character. *Imperium christianum* became identified with the *Imperium Romanum*. The whole spiritual climate of the time created the atmosphere in which the idea of *translatio* could best thrive. For the unity idea, implicit in *Imperium Romanum* and explicit in *christian-*

⁴⁶ P. A. van den Baar, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁴⁷ On the problem of the "double empire" at this period, cf. the excellent works of W. Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter* (Hildesheim: Lax, 1947) and *Abendland und Byzanz* (Darmstadt: Gentner, 1958), a collection of the best of his writing over more than twenty-five years.

itas, inclined men to think more and more of the oneness of empire, the essential presupposition of *translatio*.⁴⁸

The spiritualizing of the concept of *imperium* increased in intensity even through the bitter Investiture Controversy; but more significant than this transformation is the steady rise of the papacy to new power, new prestige, and new glory. Freed from the secular influences, it too reached a new spiritual height. And in the warm glow of this spiritual renewal the idea of *translatio* grew, not consciously and systematically but organically and naturally. The idea is present everywhere, though the theory itself has not yet crystallized. The sources show that *translatio*, as a political theory of papal power, played no decisive part in the harsh struggle between *sacerdotium* and *imperium*.⁴⁹

Almost four hundred years were required for the full development of *translatio* from historical event (800) to idea (1100–1150) to theoretical formulation (1148) to adoption into canon law (*ca.* 1209–10). About the year 1148 we find the first formal expression in legal terms of the doctrine of *translatio*⁵⁰ in the *Stroma* or *Summa*⁵¹ of Roland Bandinelli,⁵² the future Alexander III (1159–81). From the papal action in deposing the last Merovingian king, Childerich (*ca.* 751), and in elevating the first Carolingian king, Pepin, Roland concludes to the pope's right of *translatio* and *depositio*. Roland's argument would seem to be this: we know what the pope can do from what he has done. From the papacy's share, therefore, in the particular historical events prior to the coronation on Christmas Day, 800, he concludes to a universal papal right. But Roland Bandinelli's originality is rather in the formulation of *translatio* as a theory than in his discovery of it as an

⁴⁸ On the whole question of the Ottonian renovation, cf. the admirable work of Percy E. Schramm, first published in 1929 and recently reprinted: *Kaiser, Rom, und Renovatio* (Darmstadt: Gentner, 1957).

⁴⁹ P. A. van den Baar, *op. cit.*, pp. 145–46.

⁵⁰ The Scholastic canonists did not give a prominent place to the doctrine of *translatio*. They tried, however, to reconcile it with the Gelasian dualism. In reply to the question of the source of the pope's and the emperor's authority, scarcely any of them invoked this principle.

⁵¹ P. A. van den Baar, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

⁵² Master Roland Bandinelli is well known in history for his famous question, asked of Frederick Barbarossa at the stormy Diet of Besançon in 1167: "From whom then does he (i.e., the emperor) have the empire, if not from our lord the pope?" Cf. Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici* 3, 10. The significance of this question in its historical setting has received various interpretations. W. Ullmann, "Cardinal Roland and Besançon," *Sacerdotio e regno da Gregorio VII a Bonifacio VIII (Miscellanea historiae pontificiae* 18; Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1954) 107–25, interprets this somewhat differently than P. A. van den Baar, *op. cit.*, pp. 72–73.

idea.⁵³ For it was well known at this time that the pope could depose the emperor and transfer the Empire.⁵⁴

If Leo III (d. 816) fathered *translatio* as a concrete, historical event, Innocent III (d. 1216) nurtured it as a practical, political principle. Almost the entire pontificate of Innocent was occupied with burning Empire questions. On the death of Henry VI in 1197, two candidates, Otto IV of Braunschweig (d. 1218) and Philip of Swabia (d. 1208), were elected by the German princes to the imperial throne. The subsequent years were filled with tragedy for the Empire as the son of Frederick Barbarossa, backed by France, fought the son of Henry the Lion, backed by England. The loss to the Empire in money, prestige, and power was enormous. It is against this real, historical setting, the Double Election and the Throne Controversy, that Innocent III was given the golden opportunity to apply the principle of *translatio*, elaborated by centuries of development. In his *Regestum super negotio Imperii Romani*,⁵⁵ a collection of letters dealing explicitly with the Throne Controversy, we find the clearest expression of his understanding of *translatio*. In the short space of three years, from the end of 1199 to the beginning of 1203, it is mentioned seven times.⁵⁶

He tells the legates of Philip that the Throne Controversy should have been brought sooner to the attention of the Apostolic See, "ad quam negotium istud principaliter et finaliter dinoscitur pertinere: principaliter, quia ipsa transtulit imperium ab Oriente in Occidentem, finaliter, quia ipsa concedit coronam imperii."⁵⁷ In the famous *Deliberatio* he explains more fully. The Controversy is of concern to the Apostolic See, "cum imperium noscatur ad eam principaliter et finaliter pertinere: principaliter, cum per ipsam et propter ipsam de Grecia sit translatum; per ipsam translationis attricem propter ipsam melius defendendam; finaliter, quoniam imperator a summo pontifice finalem sive ultimam manus impositionem promotionis proprie accipit, dum ab eo benedicatur, coronatur, et de imperio investitur."⁵⁸

⁵³ M. Pacaut, in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957) 543-44, questions P. A. van den Baar's interpretation of the assertum on *translatio* and *depositio* in Roland's *Summa*.

⁵⁴ E.g., Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus* 5, 23. This work was composed between 1143-46.

⁵⁵ *Regestum Innocentii III papae super negotio Romani Imperii*, ed. F. Kempf, S.J. (*Miscellanea historiae pontificiae* 12; Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1947). Review by G. B. Ladner, in *Traditio* 6 (1948) 385-86.

⁵⁶ P. A. van den Baar, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

⁵⁷ Cited from the *Responsio domini pape facta nuntiis Philippi in consistorio*. Cf. *Regestum* 18, p. 52, ed. F. Kempf, S.J.

⁵⁸ Cited from *Deliberatio domini pape Innocentii super facto imperii de tribus electis*. Cf. *Regestum* 29, p. 75, ed. F. Kempf, S.J. Cf. on the translation of the difficult words, "prin-

Innocent's right to interfere in the Throne Controversy was built on *translatio*, which was conceived to be founded on the historical event of the papacy's role in the transference of the *imperium* from the Greeks to the Franks to the Germans. But there is a deeper foundation. The Empire is ordered to the papacy inasmuch as the emperor's chief *raison d'être* is the defense of the Church and the promotion of her interests, an obligation inherent in the imperial coronation by the pope. But the deepest foundation of *translatio* is the principle that from the pope, as supreme head of *christianitas*, flows an indirect right or power over the Empire. From this supremacy of the pope, Innocent ultimately derives *translatio* as a papal right.⁶⁰ His basic, fundamental principle is juridico-historical: the act of transference initiated by Leo III and the supremacy of the pope in Christendom.⁶⁰

Through the later acceptance of the decretal *Venerabilem*⁶¹ into the *Compilatio tertia*, the doctrine of *translatio* received a permanent place in the Church's teaching on the Empire.⁶² *Translatio* is not a fundamental principle of medieval politics. P. A. van den Baar concludes his masterful study of this question with the words: "The doctrine of *translatio* contributed very little to the development of the political ideas of the medieval Church. It should not really be considered a fundamental principle of papal politics. This negative result is perhaps the most important of our investigation."⁶³

THE REFORM PAPACY

Imperium probably never realized more enormous power over *sacerdotium* than it did at the infamous Synod of Sutri (1046). The pendulum of history had swung far towards caesaropapism. With the pontificate of Leo IX (1048-54) the pendulum began to fall. The history of the victorious withdrawal of the papacy from imperial control, the renewal of its priestly

cipaliter" and "finaliter," P. A. van den Baar, *op. cit.*, p. 100. He translates the former "in seinem Ursprung," the latter "in seiner Vollendung."

⁶⁰ P. A. van den Baar, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-9. To the question: Does *imperium* belong to the pope?, the answer is: Yes, indirectly. Why? There are two reasons: (1) *Christianitas* is above all else in the world, and the pope is above all else in *christianitas*. (2) The function of the emperor is to protect the Church. When he fails in this obligation, the pope may use his right of further transference of the Empire. This is not a *Besitzrecht* but a *Notrecht*. *Ibid.*, p. 109.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 109-11.

⁶² *Regestum* 62, pp. 167-75, ed. F. Kempf, S.J.

⁶³ P. van den Baar, *op. cit.*, p. 148. The doctrine of *translatio* played a more important role, though secondary, in the Decretalists than in the Decretists, who scarcely touch on it because it is not to be found in the *Decretum Gratiani*.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

dignity and power, the consequent rejuvenation of the Church, this is the history of the Reform Papacy of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries.

Leo Santifaller, the renowned diplomatist of Vienna, has brought out as a brochure a study of the Ottonian-Salian *Reichskirchensystem*, delivered on November 4, 1953 to the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.⁶⁴ It forms an excellent summary of the fundamental ideas underlying the structure of the imperial Church of the eleventh century and is a valuable development of the background of the Investiture Controversy from the viewpoint of imperial law rather than of canon law and its theoreticians.

The genius of the medieval world was its creative power in the formation of institutions and systems. The most impressive, the most controversial, and the most influential of all was the imperial Church and its fundamental structure. Concretely, the *Reichskirche* was the official Church of the German Empire—the Catholic Church adapted to Frankish culture and civilization. The *Reichskirchensystem* was “that special, peculiar relation of religion, Church, and state to one another in the age of the Ottos and the first Salians, especially the absorption of the Church into the structure of the Empire—a process gradually evolving since the beginnings of the Frankish Empire and reaching its high point . . . in the second half of the tenth and the first half of the eleventh centuries.”⁶⁵

Basically the *Reichskirchensystem* is rooted in three elements: (1) the Christian: universal religion; (2) the Roman: Empire religion; and (3) the Germanic: priesthood and cult, both public and private, legally constituted.⁶⁶ Santifaller traces in broad outline how these three elements coalesced and, after the acceptance of Christianity by Chlodwig, formed the Christian kingdom of the Frankish nation, in which the king controlled the Church and the Church impregnated the kingdom with religion.⁶⁷

The Ottonian-Salian Empire grew out of the Frankish Empire, whose politics, theology, and ideology it inherited. More strongly than the Frankish king, the German emperor had a sacral character, for he was consecrated, anointed, and crowned in a religious rite. As German king, he possessed Church property and exercised authority over the Church. He gave the diocese to the bishop and the church to the priest.⁶⁸ The act of giving im-

⁶⁴ Leo Santifaller, “Zur Geschichte des ottonisch-salischen Reichskirchensystems,” *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzungsberichte* 229, 1 (Vienna: Rohrer, 1954).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 14: The Germanic element involves “ein öffentlich-rechtliches und ein privat-rechtliches Element,” the political community and the *Eigenkirchenwesen*.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 15–21.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 71–76. This “right” is confirmed by John X in two letters of the year 921.

ports investiture, which entails the obligation of obedience to the king in return for protection. Bishops were bound personally and legally to the king. Under Otto I the bishop becomes an imperial administrator, managing the most important functions of the Empire, but without losing his sacred function in the Church.

By the reign of Henry II, the office of *Reichsbischof*, as an essential official of the Empire, was perfected. The bishop was a creature of the emperor, appointed by him to govern people who were subjects of the Empire and to administer property which was the possession of the emperor. The problematic of the Reform Papacy was to destroy the office of *Reichsbischof* without destroying the Empire—a difficult task indeed, since the bishop was at once prince of the Church and prince of the Empire.

By the *Privilegium Ottonianum* of February 13, 962, which defined that the pope, even after canonical election, could not be crowned until after he had sworn fealty to the emperor of the Germans, the papacy itself was absorbed into the *Reichskirchensystem*.⁶⁹ After the revolt of 963, the Romans swore that they would never elect a pope without the consent of the emperor.⁷⁰ All this was in conformity with the religious atmosphere of the time in which the lay and clerical elements were blended. Otto's empire was conceived as a patriarchal hegemony in which he stood at the head of Christendom. The inclusion of the pope in this system was of the utmost importance from every viewpoint, both internal and external (Slavic and Italian affairs).⁷¹

The first Salian emperors, and even the Ottos before them, sensed the dilemma which the *Reichskirche* posed. The Empire degraded the Church and a degraded Church could not support the Empire. There must be reform; but reform would produce, as it in fact did, a strong Church, free from imperial control. The emperors used the reform movement as an instrument for the purification and rehabilitation of the papacy.⁷² The reformed papacy in the person of Gregory VII demanded the *libertas ecclesiae*. The Empire, ruled at the moment by Henry IV, resisted the demand. The bitter revolu-

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁷⁰ The new order of the papal election was to include *electio principalis* by the emperor followed by *electio publica et generalis* by the Romans. According to this arrangement, the Romans could only *laudare* or *eligere* him whom the emperor by reason of his *primatus electionis* had already elected through the *electio principalis*.

⁷¹ The inclusion of the pope in the *Reichskirchensystem* had dire results. Of the twenty-five popes between 955 and 1057, five were deposed by the German emperor and twelve either installed or elected under his influence.

⁷² Cf. the tendentious remarks of W. Ullmann on the Reform Papacy in his *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1955) p. 262.

tion, the Investiture Controversy, rent Christendom and brought down both Gregory VII and Henry IV.⁷³ The Concordat of Worms in 1122 ended the unilateral authority of the emperor over *christianitas* and terminated the *Reichskirchensystem*, which had endured about one hundred years.⁷⁴

Sylvester II (999–1003), Gerbert of Aurillac, savant, mathematician, administrator, and theologian, is one of the outstanding figures in the history of the pre-Reform Papacy. Recent scholarship has centered on his correspondence, long in need of critical study and a new edition. It is there doubtless that a deeper understanding of his character and his role in the papacy is to be found. The most thorough work in this field has been undertaken by F. Weigle⁷⁵ and M. Uhlirz,⁷⁶ the former concentrating on the manuscript tradition of the letters, the latter on their chronology. This scholarly work, in many respects dry and uninspiring, is the necessary preparation for a critical edition. The appearance at a later date of C. Erdmann's edition of the letters in the *Monumenta Germaniae historica* and H. P. Lattin's promised translation of them for *Records of Civilization* will inaugurate a real advance in our understanding of this celebrated Pope.

Peter Damiani (1007–72), saint, theologian, and canonist, is a key figure in the pre-Gregorian Church. His intellectual and pastoral activity, ever at the service of the Church, have long been recognized as decisive factors in the pre-Gregorian Reform. His share, however, in the formation of pre-Gregorian canon law has not always been fully understood or properly evaluated. In an excellent work on the antecedents of the Gregorian Reform,⁷⁷ J. Joseph Ryan,⁷⁸ Professor of History at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies (Toronto) and at St. John's Seminary (Brighton), has

⁷³ On the drama of these famous antagonists, cf. W. von den Steinen, *Canossa: Heinrich IV und die Kirche* (Janus-Bücher 5; Munich: Oldenbourg, 1957).

⁷⁴ W. Fritz, *Quellen zum Wormser Konkordat* (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 177; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1955), has presented here a small, handy collection of excerpts from the chief sources for the Concordat of Worms.

⁷⁵ F. Weigle, "Studien zur Überlieferung der Briefsammlung Gerberts von Reims," *Deutsches Archiv* 10 (1953) 19–70; 12 (1955) 393–421; 15 (1958) 149–220. I have not personally consulted this work.

⁷⁶ M. Uhlirz, *Untersuchungen über Inhalt und Datierung der Briefe Gerberts von Aurillac, Papst Sylvesters II* (Schriftenreihe der historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1957). Cf. H. P. Lattin, in *Speculum* 34 (1959) 690–94, for a detailed, critical review.

⁷⁷ I would like to call attention to a very scholarly collection of essays on the eleventh-century papacy, *Studi Gregoriani* 5, ed. G. B. Borino (Rome: San Paolo, 1956). Cf. the review by T. Schieffer in *Historisches Jahrbuch* 78 (1959) 223–25.

⁷⁸ J. J. Ryan, *St. Peter Damiani and His Canonical Sources: A Preliminary Study of the Gregorian Reform* (Studies and Texts 2; Toronto: Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1956).

undertaken a detailed and exhaustive analysis of the canonical sources which underlie the writings of St. Peter Damiani. On the basis of this careful, painstaking analysis, Msgr. Ryan concludes that the following texts are fundamental to the canonical formation of Damiani: the *Decretum* of Burchard of Worms, the *Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana* (pseudo-Dionysian), the *Vita s. Gregorii* of John the Deacon, the *libelli* of Smaragdus and Auxilius, and the Latin versions of the councils by Anastasius Bibliothecarius. The most primary and influential of these several sources are the *Dionysiana* (*Hadriana aucta*) and the *Decretum* of Burchard of Worms. The canonical collection of Anselm of Lucca, the Collection in Seventy-four Titles, and Pseudo-Isidore do not seem to have an important, direct role in the formation of Damiani's ideas.⁷⁹

The principal contribution of this study is its clear demonstration that St. Peter Damiani, as a canonist, holds an important place in the history of canon law, though there is no positive evidence to show that he made his own canonical collection. This study is also a valuable contribution to our understanding of the method which St. Peter employed in the preparation of his own works. It is also of significance for the history of the development of Italian canonical studies in the eleventh century. For a long time, this careful, methodical study of St. Peter Damiani will remain fundamental for the history of the Gregorian Reform, the development of canon law, and the eleventh-century Church. Msgr. Ryan has truly advanced our knowledge of this period.⁸⁰

We note with approval a renewed interest in the economic and sociological aspects of the great popular, religious movements of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Research too often concentrates on the highest level of medieval life, pope and emperor, and neglects the role of the people in creating history. B. Töpfer⁸¹ has taken up once again the question of the *Pax et treuga Dei*—a theme already thoroughly researched—and tries to re-examine it from the aspect of the constituent element, the people. For him the Peace and Truce of God is essentially a popular movement under ecclesiastical direction. The Church was able to succeed where the state

⁷⁹ C. Munier, *Les sources patristiques du droit de l'église* (Mulhouse: Salvator, 1957), presented this work as thesis to the Faculty of Catholic Theology at Strasbourg in 1954. He could not, therefore, have incorporated Ryan's conclusions into his work.

⁸⁰ Cf. the reviews of Ryan's work by C. N. L. Brooke, in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 8 (1957) 237-38; by G. Fransen, in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957) 540-42; and by E. Delaruelle, in *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 59 (1958) 52-53.

⁸¹ B. Töpfer, *Volk und Kirche zur Zeit der beginnenden Gottesfriedensbewegung in Frankreich* (*Neue Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft* 1; Berlin: Rütten and Loening, 1957).

failed, for she had the correct method (direct approach to the people), the apt means (the external props of religion), and noble purpose (protection of both life and property). Töpfer's work is somewhat lopsided. His judgment is colored by overstress on the economic aspects of history, and his conception of the Church is highly materialistic. One even detects a certain cynicism in his disregard for the perennial charity of Christianity. E. Werner's⁸² work on the *pauperes Christi* is an attempt to interpret history from the viewpoint of economics and sociology, actually from the viewpoint of dialectical materialism. His theme is the eleventh- and twelfth-century religious movements, which he sees somewhat in the light of social and economic revolution. Sainly preachers such as Robert d'Arbrissel, who stressed the poverty of Christ and the betterment of the lower classes, were displaced by the hierarchy, which detected in these popular preachers the seeds of heresy. According to Werner, the Reform Papacy tried to use these movements. At times she succeeded, e.g., with Hirsau in Germany, with the Cistercians in France, with St. John Gualbert in Italy. At times she failed, e.g., the Pataria in Milan,⁸³ Henry of Lausanne, and others, who deviated from the Church. These are supposed to be the true *pauperes Christi*, lovers of Christ and lovers of the poor, but stifled by the Church through her orthodox preachers. The religious movements of these two important centuries still await a competent study from the angle of sociology and economics. The works of B. Töpfer and E. Werner simply do not pass the test of objective scholarship.⁸⁴

In studying medieval papal history, account must always be taken of papal documents, of which unfortunately only a relatively small number have been edited. We have, however, first-rate editions of the *Regesta* of both Gregory VII⁸⁵ and Innocent III.⁸⁶ But the archives of Europe are still

⁸² E. Werner, *Pauperes Christi: Studien zu sozial-religiösen Bewegungen im Zeitalter des Reformpapsttums* (Leipzig: Koehler-Amelang, 1956). In a review in the *Historisches Jahrbuch* 78 (1959) 237-38, J. Sydow takes Werner to task sharply for his pronounced Marxism. The criticism is well founded. R. Aubert, despite his qualified praise of the work, also censures the tendentious character of it; cf. *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957) 982.

⁸³ For a more objective interpretation of the Pataria movement, cf. the recent work of C. Violante, *La Pataria milanese e la riforma ecclesiastica 1: Le premesse (1045-1057)* (Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano, 1955). Cf. H. M. Klinkenberg, in *Historisches Jahrbuch* 78 (1959) 226-28.

⁸⁴ The reader is reminded that both books, Töpfer's and Werner's, are the work of East German scholars.

⁸⁵ *Gregorii VII Registrum*, 2 vols., ed. E. Caspar in *MGH: Epist. selectae* 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1920; reprinted in 1955).

⁸⁶ Cf. *supra* n. 55.

filled with literally thousands of unpublished papal letters, *privilegia*, and briefs—documents directed by the papal chancery to every corner of the Western world and of the utmost importance for supplementing the known history of Europe. L. Santifaller, the renowned specialist in papal diplomacy, has edited a series of documents pertaining to the pontificate of Gregory VII⁸⁷ and previously scattered through a number of different editions, accessible only with difficulty. Santifaller's work, intended as a supplement to the documents in the *Regestum* of Gregory, contains valuable material for the history of the papal chancery and the administration of the Church under this famed Pontiff.

Nothing new has appeared to deepen our understanding of *sacerdotium* and *imperium* in the contest between Gregory VII⁸⁸ and Henry IV.⁸⁹ The works of H. X. Arquillière and A. Fliche still hold the first place. In a chapter on Gregory VII in his recent work on papal government, W. Ullmann⁹⁰ characterizes the Gregorian conception of the Church as an absolute theocracy or monistic hegemony in which the pope is at the apex of all. No room is left for dualism. As far as Ullmann's synthesis of the medieval politics is concerned, this learned book, filled with citations from the sources, offers nothing new. It should be pointed out that the author introduces too much disparate evidence without critical evaluation or systematic presentation. In interpreting Gregory, he does not distinguish carefully the ideas of Gregory from the actions of Gregory. There is a certain real duplicity between his thought and action. It is one thing to reject as unreal the Gregorian concept of *christianitas*; it is another thing to overlook the concrete ecclesiastical problem which Gregory and the Gregorian Church faced, the removal of the secular from the sphere of the religious, the obliteration, if possible, of caesaropapism in its worst form. If it is true to say—and it seems to be—that the Gregorian theory was offensive to the imperialists, it is

⁸⁷ L. Santifaller, *Quellen und Forschungen zum Urkunden- und Kanonwesen Papst Gregors VII 1: Quellen: Urkunden, Regesten, Facsimilia* (*Studi e testi* 190; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica, 1957). Cf. J. Sydow, in *Historisches Jahrbuch* 78 (1959) 225–26.

⁸⁸ A. Becker's *Studien zum Investiturstreitproblem in Frankreich: Schriften der Universität des Saarlandes* (Saarbrücken: West-Ost, 1955), a rigorously methodic and precise work, is a contribution to the history and literature of the Investiture Controversy in France (1049–1119). It is a useful reference book.

⁸⁹ H. F. Haefele, *Fortuna Heinrici IV imperatoris* (*Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 15; Graz-Cologne: Böhlau, 1954), investigates the *Vita Heinrici IV* from three aspects: *literarisch, motiugeschichtlich* (*Fortunamotiv*), and *historisch-psychologisch* (*Fidesmotiv*). It is a valuable study in historiography.

⁹⁰ W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1955).

equally true that the imperialistic theory was offensive to the papalists. Gregory's theory may have been wrong; his action was right.⁹¹

A. Fliche's *La réforme grégorienne* remains the most authoritative and complete history of the reform movement of the eleventh century. Nothing recent either surpasses or equals its thorough scholarship. In the past years historical scholarship had centered on the reform movement on the Continent. Recently it has shifted towards England. N. Cantor's study of the Investiture problem in England (1089–1135),⁹² originally presented as a doctoral dissertation at Princeton University, is a sign of this new shift of interest. "Very much indebted to the work of Tellenbach," he aims "to provide a comprehensive history of the controversies over church-state relations in England during the crucial period from the death of Lanfranc in 1089 to the end of the reign of Henry I in 1133."⁹³ Unfortunately the author promises far more than his book offers; and what the book offers is open to most severe censure.⁹⁴ One wonders whether Cantor has grasped the meaning of Investiture. Until something more solid, more critical, and more comprehensive is produced on the problem of Church-State in eleventh-century England, H. Böhmer's older work⁹⁵ will still hold the place of authority in this matter.

EUGENE III (1145–53)

The *Memoirs of the Papal Court*, a translation by M. Chibnall⁹⁶ of the *Historia pontificalis* of John of Salisbury⁹⁷ (d. 1180), is the first English rendition of this precious historical work. The very readable translation is

⁹¹ Cf. the reviews by R. Reul, in *Revue bénédictine* 66 (1956) 327; by C. Jenkins, in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 7 (1956) 98–99; and by G. Post, in *Speculum* 32 (1957) 209–12.

⁹² N. Cantor, *Church, Kingship, and Lay Investiture in England (1089–1135)* (Princeton: Princeton Univ., 1958).

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 10–11.

⁹⁴ C. Cheney, in *Speculum* 34 (1959) 653–56: "One regretfully concludes that this book promises much more than it performs . . . it is not accurate enough, in things great or small, to be trustworthy."

⁹⁵ *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im XI. und XII. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1899).

⁹⁶ *John of Salisbury's Memoirs of the Papal Court*, tr. M. Chibnall (London: Nelson, 1956).

⁹⁷ On the life of John of Salisbury, especially on his presence at the papal *curia*, cf. the excellent edition of his letters in the Nelson Medieval Texts: *The Letters of John of Salisbury 1: The Early Letters (1153–1161)*, ed. W. J. Millor, S.J., and H. E. Butler, rev. C. N. L. Brooks (London: Nelson, 1955). Review in *Revue bénédictine* 66 (1956) 145.

built on the critical edition of R. L. Poole⁹⁸ (Oxford, 1927) with some small textual corrections based on the Fleury manuscript now in Berne (MS 367). The text is introduced by an excellent commentary on John of Salisbury, his times, his historical scholarship, and the manuscript transmission of his *Historia*. Some very special technical questions are relegated to the Appendix. The Church historian is grateful to find here not only an accurate translation and impartial interpretation of the *Historia*, but also the skilful presentation of much erudition.

The *Historia pontificalis*, written about 1164, is a collection of memoirs of the papal curia in the years 1148–52, four of the most significant years of the pontificate of Eugene III. "The world [John] describes in the *Historia Pontificalis* is western Europe during and after the Second Crusade." His "memoirs deal with the papal court at the period when Eugenius was holding his general council at Rheims, maintaining Church authority in England and Germany, sending his legates to the north, struggling to establish a *modus vivendi* with Roger of Sicily and working to restore the authority of the Church and the Christian kingdoms against the threat of the growing power of Nur-ed-Diu."

This first Cistercian Pope is pictured here as a competent administrator, an independent prelate, "holding the reins of ecclesiastical authority firmly in his own hands"—certainly not as the mere figurehead and creature of St. Bernard. The historical-minded theologian will also find in this work a valuable narrative source for the affairs of Gilbert de la Porrée (d. 1154).⁹⁹

BESANÇON, 1157

The circumstances of the meeting at Besançon in October, 1157 between Frederick Barbarossa, German Emperor, and Roland Bandinelli, cardinal priest, are well known from Rahewin's continuation of Otto of Freising's *Gesta Friderici I*.¹⁰⁰ Of significance for the history of the medieval papacy and the theory of its relation to the Empire are the following documents, contained therein, which are basic to the discussion at Besançon and the subsequent historical development: (1) the letter of Pope Hadrian IV (Nicholas Breakspear)¹⁰¹ to Frederick Barbarossa occasioned by the ill-

⁹⁸ A. Saltman, *Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury (University of London Historical Studies 2)*; London: Athlone, 1956) pp. 165–77, revises some of L. Poole's conclusions.

⁹⁹ Cf. *Revue bénédictine* 66 (1956) 330–31.

¹⁰⁰ *Ottonis et Rahewini gesta Friderici I imperatoris*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH: In usum schol.* (Hanover, 1884), tr. C. C. Mierow, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa by Otto of Freising and his Continuator, Rahewin* (New York: Columbia Univ., 1953). Citations below are taken from this translation.

¹⁰¹ *Gesta* 3, 9.

treatment at the hands of imperial agents of Eskil, the Archbishop of Lund; (2) the letter of Frederick Barbarossa¹⁰² addressed to the German nation after the Diet of Besançon; and (3) the subsequent letter of Pope Hadrian IV,¹⁰³ the so-called *littera excusatoria*, to Frederick Barbarossa, in which he clarified the sense of his first letter. Before discussing some recent interpretation of these proceedings, let us briefly survey the contents of these important documents.

The first letter of Pope Hadrian, read and interpreted by Rainald of Dassel¹⁰⁴ before the German Emperor and princes at the Diet of Besançon, caused a stormy outburst against the papal legates because of two "insolent" assertions which it contained: (1) "that the fulness of dignity and honor had been bestowed upon the emperor by the Roman pontiff, that the emperor had received from his hand the imperial crown;" and (2) "that he would not have regretted conferring even greater benefits [*beneficia*]."¹⁰⁵ In the midst of the uproar which these words caused, Master Roland posed the famous question to the German princes: "From whom then does he [i.e., the emperor] have the Empire, if not from our lord the pope?"¹⁰⁶

Shortly after the Diet, Frederick addressed the German nation in a letter which is of deep significance for the constitutional history of the German Empire. Writing in fear of a schism which might arise "between the temporal and spiritual realms" because of the discord caused by the Pope's letter, Frederick asserts that the Empire finds its origin in God and denies that it is a papal *beneficium*. "Through the election of the princes, the kingdom and the Empire are ours from God alone." And to avoid all misunderstanding, he qualifies the term *imperium*. It is the Empire "which has stood, glorious and undiminished, from the founding of the City and the establishment of the Christian religion." Thus the papacy is rejected as the creative instrument bringing Empire and emperor into existence.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰² *Gesta* 3, 11. ¹⁰³ *Gesta* 3, 23.

¹⁰⁴ On this renowned diplomat and imperial chancellor, cf. K. Hampe, *Das Hochmittelalter* (Münster: Böhlau, 1953) pp. 247-48. Perhaps the confusion resulting from Hadrian's letter is to be ascribed to the tendentious translation (*interpretatione*) of it made by this crafty churchman. It is inconceivable to me that Rainald's interpretation did not take into account the possibility of translating *beneficium* as favor.

¹⁰⁵ The word *beneficia* was taken in a technical, legal sense of *feuda* or fiefs. It is quite possible that Rainald deliberately translated it in this offensive sense. Naturally the Emperor refused to admit that he, as a liegeman of the Pope, held the empire as fief of the Holy See.

¹⁰⁶ "A quo ergo habet, si a domno papa non habet imperium?" (*Gesta* 3, 9).

¹⁰⁷ Frederick's knowledge of both history and law must have been very shabby for him to have missed the significance of the papacy's share in the coronation of Charles the Great by Leo III and Otto the Great by John XII.

In another letter,¹⁰⁶ sent somewhat later to the German bishops and subsequently forwarded by them to Pope Hadrian, Frederick makes it clear that the Empire is governed by the imperial law and by national custom, and that besides these laws there is no other. Thus the power of canon law is liquidated in his conception of the imperial constitution. Whom the German princes elect king, the Archbishop of Cologne anoints king, and the pope anoints emperor. But "the free crown of the Empire we ascribe solely to the divine beneficence."¹⁰⁹

Hadrian's *littera excusatoria* reached the Emperor at Augsburg in June, 1158. The Pope's "excuse" is a simple lesson in philology. The word *beneficium*, understood by Frederick and Rainald in the sense of "fief," is derived from *bono* (good) and *facto* (deed) and indicates nothing more than that the imperial coronation is a good deed, a *beneficium*. Further, the expression "contulimus tibi insigne imperialis coronae" is not to be understood in a technical, feudal sense, but in the normal, natural sense: "dignitatis insigne tuo capiti imposuimus."

Thus, though peace was once again restored between *sacerdotium* and *imperium*, the seeds of bitter discord were sown which would develop into a twenty-two-year controversy between pope and emperor. For Master Roland, the papal legate at Besançon, was destined soon to be elected Alexander III (1159-81).

W. Ullmann¹¹⁰ accepts the second letter (*littera excusatoria*) of Pope Hadrian at its face value. According to him, it says exactly what it means; and it means that "the distinction of imperial dignity and honor was a *beneficium* in so far as the pope has no duty to confer this distinction and the emperor no right to expect this 'good deed' from the pope."¹¹¹ That the pope is an instrument in the hands of God and a free agent in conferring the plenitude of imperial dignity and honor is proved by the historical and theological genesis of the Empire. The only reason the pope crowns the emperor is to make him the protector and defender of Christendom. When, therefore, the pope puts the crown on the emperor's head and raises him to this sacred responsibility, the emperor has received a favor, a true *beneficium*, from the Holy See.

¹⁰⁶ *Gesta* 3, 17.

¹⁰⁹ At a later date the papacy would teach Barbarossa's grandson, Frederick II Hohenstaufen, in what sense the emperorship is a *beneficium*, granted to the German king by the Apostolic See.

¹¹⁰ W. Ullmann, "Cardinal Roland and Besançon," *Sacerdotio e regno da Gregorio VII a Bonifacio VIII (Miscellanea historiae pontificiae* 18; Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1954) pp. 107-25.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

Master Roland's question, posed to the German Emperor and princes at Besançon, was, therefore, neither naive nor brazen. It was unanswered because under the circumstances it was unanswerable, for in very truth "how else but through the agency of the pope could Roman emperorship, which on Frederick's own admission was a *divinum beneficium*, be obtained?"¹¹³ According to Ullmann, therefore, the second letter is only a clear interpretation of the content of the first letter of Pope Hadrian. It is neither an excuse nor an apology.

M. Pacaut¹¹³ presents another interpretation of the incident at Besançon and its sequel. For him the two letters represent statement and retraction.¹¹⁴ Why? In the first letter, Pope Hadrian says that in the interest of the Church he has the power to give the emperor all the *beneficia* he wishes. Among these *beneficia* is the plenitude of dignity and honor which the emperor receives by the imperial coronation alone. The emperor must act for the advantage (*incrementa et commoda*) of the Church, for between the Church and Empire there is "a contract of an obligatory and imperative character."¹¹⁵ The emperor must help the Church. If he does, he receives *beneficia*. If he does not, he is condemned by her. The limits of the contractual obligation are determined and controlled by the pope, who is thus superior to the emperor as the spiritual order is pre-eminent over the temporal.

Further, M. Pacaut finds that the implications of Roland's question at Besançon confirm the doctrine of the first letter rather than that of the second. Implied in Roland's question is "the proclamation of a total pre-eminence of the Sovereign Pontiff and of the dependence of the emperor with respect to the papal power." It is indeed a great doctrinal proclamation but not of great doctrinal significance. "Unfortunately this proclamation is very indetermined by the fact that it is impossible to express in a single formula the pre-eminence of the spiritual power."

The second letter of Pope Hadrian is more than a *littera excusatoria* for M. Pacaut. It is a veritable retraction of the essential message contained in the letter of Besançon. First, it takes back the sense of *beneficium*, interpreting it as "benefit" rather than as "fief."¹¹⁶ Second, the papacy's role in making the emperor seems to be diminished, if the imperial coronation is

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

¹¹³ M. Pacaut, *Alexandre III (L'Eglise et l'état au moyen âge 11; [Paris: Vrin, 1956])* (hereafter: M. Pacaut, *Alexandre III*).

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 88-99. ¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

¹¹⁶ M. Pacaut's interpretation of the key word, *beneficium*, is not altogether clear. According to him, it seems to make no essential difference whether the word be translated "benefit" or "fief." In either case the imperial obligation, based on an imperative contract with the Apostolic See, remains the same.

only a "favor" or "benefit" granted by the Church. For if this be true, one might argue that it is the imperial election which constitutes the emperor, and that the coronation, which the pope would be obliged to perform, is only a ceremony. This is confirmed by Hadrian's alteration of the first letter. "Imposuimus" is substituted for "contulimus"—"a simple placing of the emblem of imperial dignity on the emperor's head" for "conferring upon the emperor the imperial crown." Roland rejected this drift of thought by affirming that the emperor has the plenitude of his power not because of the election by the princes, but only by the coronation by the pope.

At almost the same time that M. Pacaut brought out his work on Alexander III, P. A. van den Baar's book on the doctrine of *translatio* appeared.¹¹⁷ He believes that Roland in posing his famous question was thinking of the origin of *imperium*, concretely the imperial coronation by the pope. He did not intend to confirm Rainald's legalistic interpretation of *beneficium*. Rahewin's report of the Synod seems to confirm this, for at the time there were Romans who boldly asserted that the German kings held the "Imperium Urbis et Regnum Italicum donatione Pontificum."¹¹⁸ Rahewin's interpretation of the question relates it ultimately to the *Donatio Constantini*, though it would seem that Roland himself thought more of *translatio* than *donatio*, if his mind can be deduced from the doctrine which he expressed some years before in his *Summa*.¹¹⁹

ALEXANDER III (1159-81)

M. Pacaut's¹²⁰ doctrinal study of Alexander III's conception of the papacy is probably the most important comprehensive treatment of this Pope to appear in the past one hundred years.¹²¹ This work has, therefore, attracted considerable attention. Some adverse, even sharp criticism has been leveled against it, though most scholars agree that Pacaut has done a real service to the history of the medieval papacy. The subject of his work, Alexander III, is difficult, enigmatic, recondite, a veritable puzzle. We are, therefore, grateful to M. Pacaut for his study of this complicated personality.

The first two chapters situate Roland Bandinelli, the future Alexander III, in the intellectual atmosphere in which he was formed as a canonist and the political atmosphere in which he developed as a diplomat. Educated at

¹¹⁷ P. A. van den Baar, *op. cit.*

¹¹⁸ *Gesta* 3, 9 ff.

¹¹⁹ P. A. van den Baar, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-75.

¹²⁰ M. Pacaut, *Alexandre III.*

¹²¹ H. Reuter, *Geschichte Alexanders des Dritten und der Kirche seiner Zeit*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1860).

Bologna in the tradition of Gratian¹²³ and trained in the papal chancery of Hadrian IV, Roland came to the Chair of St. Peter with learning and experience such as few popes before him had enjoyed. His long pontificate was occupied with perhaps the most bitter struggle between pope and emperor of the entire Middle Ages. It lasted twenty-two years and terminated without a definitive solution. The history of this pontificate, characterized by duplicity of thought and action, has bequeathed to us a series of problems of the first order which have never been satisfactorily solved.

Chapters 3 and 4 describe the term towards which Alexander's theory and action tend, the defense and promotion of *libertas ecclesiae*,¹²⁴ to be gained by the active, close co-operation of the spiritual and temporal powers, both autonomous and distinct, but not totally independent and separate.¹²⁴ According to Pacaut, Alexander was in a unique sense a dualist. But according to F. Kempf, S.J.,¹²⁵ it is highly problematic whether he was hierocratic or dualistic. Probably he was dualistic in action, choosing the more prudent, the more reasonable course in each determined set of circumstances, without, however, having worked out a well-conceived theory.

The central difficulty in interpreting Alexander's political theory is that his actions do not always correspond to his thought. He believed that the power of the pope is pre-eminent, spiritual in essence, extending to the temporal order indirectly and with limitation. He titled himself *vicarius Petri* rather than *vicarius Christi*, for the latter term according to Pacaut opens the way to unlimited power for the papacy in the temporal order, whereas the former restricts its competence to the purely spiritual.¹²⁶ Three historical events, the confirmation of Alphonso Henriques as King of Portugal, the absolution of Henry II at Avranches, and the conquest of Ireland by the Bull *Laudabiliter*—all affairs of the purely temporal order—in which Alexander played a decisive role, seem to indicate that he appropriated to himself universal political authority. How can this be reconciled

¹²³ For an interpretation of the role of the school of Bologna and Gratian in the formation of Roland different from that of Pacaut, cf. F. Kempf, S.J., in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957) 936–37, and Y. M.-J. Congar, O.P., in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 41 (1957) 45–47.

¹²⁴ E.g., Alexander's letter to Artaud, Carthusian Prior of Alveria: "Non enim amor propriae excellentiae . . . nos ad fastigium huius dignitatis adduxit. Sed sola libertas Ecclesiae compellit nos. . . ." M. Pacaut, *Alexandre III*, p. 123.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁵ F. Kempf, S.J., in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957) 937.

¹²⁶ M. Pacaut, *Alexandre III*, pp. 189 ff., especially p. 192. Cf. Y. Congar, *op. cit.*, p. 46, who disagrees: "*Vicarius Petri* can equally imply authority over the temporal."

with his theoretical position that the temporal order is autonomous and distinct from the spiritual?

Here Pacaut presents an interpretation of Alexander's doctrine which is probably the most original part of his work. It rests on a distinction between *administratio* and *auctoritas*. *Administratio* involves two elements: *exercitium spirituale*, transmitted directly to the Church, and *exercitium temporale*, transmitted directly to the Empire. The direct source of both is God. The pope presides over the supreme administration of the Church, but not of the Empire. *Auctoritas*, which the theologians call *substantia*, is the juridical foundation of power. It is power founded on right. The pope alone possesses *auctoritas*, which he holds from God and which has a character at once spiritual and temporal. He cannot delegate it, because it is bound to the essence of his apostolic office. It gives him absolute pre-eminence, permitting him to intervene in the temporal affairs in the name of the spiritual and forbidding him to be judged by any prince whom God has placed at the head of the secular administration of the state, because the *exercitium temporale* can never control *auctoritas*.¹²⁷

In the purely spiritual order, the pope acts now with his *auctoritas* (e.g., when he proclaims that a political act has a sacred character, precisely because it is useful to the Church), now with his *exercitium spirituale* (e.g., when he excommunicates a king for having transgressed the divine law). The pope may intervene in the temporal order by reason of his *auctoritas*, which is both spiritual and temporal. He may invoke his *auctoritas* when necessary for the free exercise of his spiritual jurisdiction in the temporal order. When may the pope do this? In those exceptional cases when no other established power can act, that is, in those cases which depend not on the exercise, but on the substance, the essence of power.¹²⁸ By this distinction, Pacaut thinks, the opposition between Alexander's theory and practice can be reconciled. The two powers, temporal and spiritual, are separate in exercise, in *administratio*, but not in *auctoritas*, which resides in the pope alone.¹²⁹

Fr. Kempf has dealt harshly but justly with Pacaut's distinction between *auctoritas* and *administratio*.¹³⁰ He rightly points out that no single direct pronouncement of Alexander's can be brought forth to demonstrate this

¹²⁷ M. Pacaut, *Alexandre III*, pp. 240-45. ¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 241.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 242: "This distinction between *auctoritas* and *administratio* is not artificial. It corresponds, in another order, to the difference between *possessio* and *usus*." If this is so, then in Pacaut's interpretation of Alexander's doctrine there is no room for the state.

¹³⁰ F. Kempf, S.J., in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957) 934, 936.

hypothesis. Aware of this possible criticism,¹³¹ Pacaut approached the problem indirectly, by situating Alexander in the intellectual milieu in which he was formed, specifically the contemporary canonical thinking of the school of Bologna. It is in the thought of this school, expressed with varying degrees of clarity by Gratian, his pupil Paucapalea, Rufinus, Simon of Bisignano, and later Huguccio, that the true doctrine of Alexander is to be found.¹³² Fr. Kempf simply refuses to accept the conclusions of Pacaut's analysis of the canonical teaching of Paris and Bologna.¹³³ His distinction: Paris—hierocratic and theoretic, Bologna—dualistic and realistic, is oversimplified and inadmissible. In fact, Pacaut's interpretation of the school of Bologna, the key to his solution of Alexander's thought, is also invalid, for Fr. Kempf finds here no unified, unanimous stream of dualistic thought leading to the distinction between *auctoritas* and *administratio*, but rather a double tradition, hierocratic and dualistic, in no wise characterized by the distinction of Pacaut. Which of these two opposite tendencies Alexander held as a conviction, it is impossible for us to know. What, then, does Fr. Kempf believe is the ultimate answer here? *Ignoramus et ignorabimus*.¹³⁴ The consequence of this careful criticism of the great German scholar is that M. Pacaut is left without certain proof for one of the major themes of his work, the distinction in the thought of Alexander between *administratio* and *auctoritas*, the solution to the problem of Alexander's duplicity.¹³⁵

In 1955 Prof. Cheney took as his theme for the Ford Lectures English Church government (1170–1213) from Thomas à Becket to Stephen Langton.¹³⁶ It is a highly interesting study in the growth of papal control over England and forms an interesting counterpart to a study published some years ago by John Tracy Ellis.¹³⁷ The fourth lecture, on Church and state, is especially commendable, since it shows, contrary to the impression of much historical writing, that these two powers were not engaged in constant

¹³¹ M. Pacaut, *Alexandre III*, p. 401: Pacaut seems to have been aware of the difficulty when he concludes that the different ideas used by the Pope present a puzzle whose elements we can reduce to order by calling upon the doctrine, poorly expressed by Alexander III, of *auctoritas* and *administratio*.

¹³² *Ibid.*, pp. 303 ff.

¹³³ F. Kempf, S.J., in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957) 935–36.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 937.

¹³⁵ Cf. the review by R. Folz in *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 39 (1959) 46–50.

¹³⁶ C. R. Cheney, *From Becket to Langton: English Church Government 1170–1213* (Manchester: University Press, 1956).

¹³⁷ J. T. Ellis, *Anti-papal Legislation in Medieval England* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University, 1930).

warfare against one another.¹³⁸ For almost the same period (1187–98), there is a work, also worthy of mention, by P. Zerbi,¹³⁹ which treats the pontificates of Clement III (1187–91) and Celestine III (1191–98), the forerunners of Innocent III (1198–1216). The chief value of this work is that it fills a lacuna in papal history and at the same time shows that these two Pontiffs though overshadowed by the greatness of their successor, were in their own right personages of ability, insight, energy, and character. The work forms a valuable introduction to the pontificate of Innocent III.¹⁴⁰

INNOCENT III (1198–1216)

Almost from the very day that the young Lotario Cardinal di Segni¹⁴¹ was elected to the papacy as Innocent III, opinion has been divided on the just evaluation of his personal character, his political objectives, and his papal administration. The history of his pontificate has been handled before,¹⁴² but not with more penetration, sympathy, and understanding than H. Tillmann¹⁴³ brings to her study. The work is a well-balanced presentation of this illustrious Pope, whose personality dominated the Middle Ages. In ten chapters Tillmann offers a careful, critical examination of Innocent as priest, cardinal, pope, lawyer, politician, and warrior. It is not a hero story that she writes, but solid, objective history recounting the good with the bad. According to Tillmann, Innocent's political thinking was dualistic,¹⁴⁴ solidly in the tradition of the Gelasian formula, a conception of Church and state which Innocent doubtlessly inherited from his famed professor at Bologna, Huguccio. It is interesting to note that Innocent was the first pope to take the title *vicarius Christi*,¹⁴⁵ a title of the deepest significance for the subse-

¹³⁸ Cf. the review by A. L. Poole in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 8 (1957) 104–6.

¹³⁹ P. Zerbi, *Papato, impero e 'Repubblica cristiana' dal 1187 al 1198* (*Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica del S. Cuore*, n.s. 55; Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1955). I have not seen this work.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. the reviews by C. N. L. Brooke in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 8 (1957) 230–40; by D. M. in *Revue bénédictine* 66 (1956) 327–28; and by H. Farmer in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957) 135–37.

¹⁴¹ Cardinal di Segni was only thirty-seven years old when elected pope. No lesser figure than Walther von der Vogelweide was horrified at this and bemoaned the fate of Christendom: "Owe der babest ist ze junc! Hilf, herre, diner kristenheit."

¹⁴² E.g., A. Luchaire, *Innocent III*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1904–8)—a more detailed but not necessarily better work.

¹⁴³ H. Tillmann, *Papst Innocenz III* (*Bonner historische Forschungen* 3; Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1954).

¹⁴⁴ F. Kempf, S.J., *Papsttum und Kaisertum bei Innocenz III* (*Miscellanea historiae pontificiae* 19; Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1954), handles this theme thoroughly.

¹⁴⁵ H. Tillmann, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

quent development of the papal claims to universal supremacy. In a review of Tillmann's work, Fr. Mols¹⁴⁶ aptly describes her treatment of Innocent III as "a portrait of a great medieval pope drawn in human dimensions and not an hieratic caricature."

Under the direction of Leo Santifaller,¹⁴⁷ the Österreichisches historisches Institut of Rome¹⁴⁸ has undertaken the monumental work¹⁴⁹ of making a diplomatic edition of all the *Regesta* of Innocent III,¹⁵⁰ an undertaking which Catholic scholars first projected over four hundred years ago, in the time of Paul IV (1555–59). The first extant *Regestum* (R. V. 2) is that of Gregory VII (1073–85). For the years between 1085 and 1198, no *Regestum* exists, but with Innocent III the unbroken series of *Regesta* begins. The enormity of the work that still remains to be done on papal *Regesta* can be grasped from the fact that there are over two thousand volumes preserved in the Vatican Archives for the period between Innocent III (1198–1216) and Sixtus V (1585–90). We have already mentioned the diplomatic editions of the *Regestum* of Gregory VII¹⁵¹ and the special *Regestum* of Innocent III¹⁵² which have been published. In addition to this edition of his special *Regestum*, various editions have appeared throughout the centuries. None of them save that of F. Kempf is satisfactory. The proposed edition of the Vienna school will doubtlessly be definitive.¹⁵³

Of all the works¹⁵⁴ on the political thought of Innocent III published in the course of the past ten years, by far the most significant is that of F. Kempf, S.J., of the Gregorian University.¹⁵⁵ It is distinguished not only for

¹⁴⁶ R. Mols, S.J., in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 51 (1956) 979–82.

¹⁴⁷ L. Santifaller, "Studien und Vorarbeiten zur Edition der Register Papst Innocenz' III," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 65 (1957) 237–41.

¹⁴⁸ The Historisches Institut is actually working in Vienna in conjunction with the Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung.

¹⁴⁹ Two other projects of the Institut in Rome are the editing of the historical sources of the Baroque period and the publishing of the reports of the papal nunciatures from Germany and the Austrian Court in the time of Josephinism.

¹⁵⁰ For a conspectus of the *Regesta* of Innocent III, cf. *Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III*, ed. C. R. Cheney and W. H. Semple (London: Nelson, 1953) pp. xxvii ff.

¹⁵¹ *Op. cit.*, supra n. 85. ¹⁵² *Op. cit.*, supra n. 55.

¹⁵³ For a conspectus of the manuscripts and editions of the *Regesta* of Innocent III, cf. H. Feigl, "Die Überlieferung der Register Papst Innocenz' III," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 65 (1957) 242–95.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. the survey of recent literature on the political thought of the medieval papacy by P. A. van den Baar, "Sacerdotium en Regnum rond de tijd van Innocentius III (1198–1216)," *Studia catholica* 33 (1958) 189–208, and by A. Walz, O.P., "'Papstkaiser' Innocenz III: Stimmen zur Deutung," in *Sacerdotio e regno* (*op. cit.*, supra n. 110).

¹⁵⁵ F. Kempf, S.J., *Papsttum und Kaisertum* (*op. cit.*, supra n. 144). For a brief handling of Innocent's political thought, cf. F. Kempf, S.J., "Weltherrschaft des mittelalterlichen

the soundness of the scholarship on which it is built but also for the logical coherence with which it develops the central thesis, that Innocent III was dualistic in his political thinking.¹⁵⁶ Kempf's study is centered on the Throne Controversy and its principal papal source, the *Regestum super negotio Romani Imperii*, which expresses Innocent's ideas more clearly than any other source which we have. In order to present the thesis which Kempf proposes, I will try to synthesize the following principal themes from his work: (1) Throne Controversy; (2) pope and emperor; (3) *christianitas*; and (4) Innocent's dualism.¹⁵⁷

"Imperium principaliter et finaliter ad sedem apostolicam pertinet."¹⁵⁸ This expresses in a precise formula the relationship of the Empire to the papacy. It also presents the foundation of Innocent's right to interference in the Throne Controversy, a right belonging to the Apostolic See *principaliter*, because of the fact of *translatio*, and *finaliter*, because of the fact of coronation.¹⁵⁹ The Empire does not "pertain" to the pope in the sense that it belongs to him, but rather in the sense that it is his obligation to care for it, to provide for it, to direct it in its hour of need.¹⁶⁰ Innocent's doctrine of interference and all that it implies is at once an affirmation of the ancient ecclesiastical, curial idea and a rejection of the newer conception of the Staufen emperors which diminished the significance of the papacy's role in the creation and maintenance of the Empire.¹⁶¹

The Throne Controversy was a contest between Otto IV and Philip of Swabia, in which the identity of the true imperial candidate was buried under conflicting claims. For Innocent, this was a concrete case in which the papacy could lawfully interfere in imperial questions. The general right to provide for the Empire was implemented by two special rights:¹⁶² *examinatio* and *favor apostolicus*. The *examinatio* is orientated to and derives its meaning from the fact that its chief purpose is to discover the worthy (*approbatio*) or the unworthy (*reprobatio*) candidate for the imperial consecration. The *examinatio* is followed by *confirmatio* (jurisdictional order) and *consecratio* (sacramental order).¹⁶³ The *favor apostolicus* was the actual insertion of the

Papsttums?", *Stimmen der Zeit* 158 (1956) 13-23, and "Caput christianitatis: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des mittelalterlichen Papsttums," *Stimmen der Zeit* 158 (1956) 91-100.

¹⁵⁶ W. Ullmann opposes this conception of Innocent's political thinking; cf. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 6 (1955) 233-36 and *The Growth of Papal Government* (*op. cit.*, supra n. 72). Cf. L. Falkenstein's important review of Kempf's work in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 78 (1956) 455-69.

¹⁵⁷ F. Kempf, S.J., *Papsttum und Kaisertum*, pp. 63-66, esp. p. 64. ¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 59: The words "principaliter" and "finaliter" are to be taken in a temporal rather than a logical sense; cf. supra n. 58.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 84: "Provisio imperii finaliter ad sedem apostolicam pertinet."

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 95 ff. ¹⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 165. ¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 107-8.

apostolic authority within the imperial sphere to accept the duly elected, examined, confirmed candidate.¹⁶⁴

Innocent's claim to the right of *examinatio* in the Throne Controversy belonged to the sacramental order (*consecratio*), not the jurisdictional order (*confirmatio*).¹⁶⁵ The German princes could elect him whom they would, but it remained Innocent's right to decide on whom he would place the imperial crown. Theoretically, only he could be elected German king who could ultimately be crowned German emperor.¹⁶⁶ The coronation as a religious rite belonged to the pope alone. It was a free act, based on a free decision to confer a universal dignity, imperial insignia, and the sacred office of defender and protector of the Church. In its essence it did not confer temporal power, but it constituted the emperor at the apex of the temporal order.

For Innocent, the pope is Vicar of Christ as Priest and King. He is, therefore, both kingly priest and priestly king. His supreme primatial power, in essence spiritual, is the foundation of his priestly power, from which his kingly power radiates and flows.¹⁶⁷ Through the possession of the *plenitudo potestatis ecclesiasticae*, the pope is set over the universal Church conceived as a hierarchy, pyramidal in structure. The kingdoms of this world are aggregated to *imperium* as the churches of Christendom are aggregated to *sacerdotium*. Above *imperium* is *sacerdotium*, and at the head of *sacerdotium* is the pope, in the truest sense at the apex of this world.¹⁶⁸

The pope's authority, directly operative in the spiritual order, remains spiritual, even when indirectly applied in the temporal order. For the pope's title to action in this sphere is rooted in his priestly supremacy, his headship of the universal Church, which confers on him supreme authority over the *populus christianus*.¹⁶⁹ It is the papacy, as the cornerstone of the Church, which has gathered all men into *christianitas*,¹⁷⁰ a sociological collectivity, bound together spiritually and juridically by faith and obedience to the Roman pontiff. This *christianitas*, this solidarity of the Christian people, is the key to understanding the depth of Innocent's *Weltanschauung*, at once dualistic and monistic. The temporal order and authority are left essentially independent, for the submission to *sacerdotium* which the idea of *christianitas* demands is purely in the spiritual order. And yet there is room here for monism, for within the framework of *christianitas* the pope occupies the unique position of leader over kings and emperor, over *regna* and *imperium*.^{170a}

In Innocent's conception of the two powers, we find a unified picture of

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 139. ¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 110. ¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 117, n. 30; p. 130.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 298. ¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 281. ¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 298, 299, 303.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 302, 308. ^{170a} *Ibid.*, p. 309.

the world, *christianitas*, into which both the spiritual and the temporal flow and in which they find their crowning head, the *vicarius Christi*. It is an organism pulsating with religious energy, uniting *regnum* and *sacerdotium* as independent members of this one vast world society. The pope, supreme in both orders, unites them into a spiritual hegemony which he heads and which he suffuses with his spiritual authority, flowing directly into the spiritual order and indirectly into the temporal. It is the fullest, most perfect expression of the unity and the duality of the Catholic medieval synthesis of Church and state.¹⁷¹

SOL ET LUNA

The use of the "sun and moon" simile for expressing the character of the relations between *sacerdotium* and *imperium* is first employed by Innocent III in a letter addressed to Acerbo Falseronis, Consul of Florence.¹⁷² In the subsequent correspondence of Innocent the same theme reappears, and it constitutes a problem. It might seem to destroy Innocent's dualism, for it seems to subordinate *imperium* to *sacerdotium* by affirming that the former receives its authority from the latter.

Both H. Tillmann¹⁷³ and F. Kempf¹⁷⁴ have re-examined the meaning of this famous medieval symbol. For them the simile turns on the notion of dignity, not on authority. There are two spheres in the firmament, as there are two powers on earth. The sun, the greater light, is the papal power; the moon, the smaller light, the imperial power. The former rules the souls of men, the latter their bodies. The idea is dualistic in this sense. The moon receives its light from the sun as the emperor receives the splendor of his dignity from the pope. The more the emperor adheres to the pope, the more splendidly his dignity shines. The further he separates, the more deeply his dignity dims. There are two celestial bodies, sun and moon, as there are two terrestrial powers, *imperium* and *sacerdotium*. From and through the latter the former receives its imperial dignity, but not its royal power.¹⁷⁵

O. Hageneder¹⁷⁶ has taken up the question of the text itself of the sun-moon symbol as it appears in the above-mentioned letter of Innocent. There are

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 309-10.

¹⁷² *PL* 214, 377A-378A; S. Baluzius, *Epist. Innocentii III* 1 (Paris, 1682) 235-36. The letter is dated October 30, 1198.

¹⁷³ H. Tillmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 266-67.

¹⁷⁴ F. Kempf, S.J., *Papsttum und Kaisertum*, pp. 284-85.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Frederick II's understanding of the symbol, H. Tillmann, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

¹⁷⁶ O. Hageneder, "Das Sonne-Mond-Gleichnis bei Innocenz III," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 65 (1957) 340-68.

two different versions: (1) Original:¹⁷⁷ “cuius [solis] conspectui quanto magis [luna] inheret, tanto maiori lumine decoratur, et quo plus [luna] ab eius elongatur aspectu, eo plus deficit in splendore.” This reading, found in Rainer of Pomposa, represents the uncorrected text of the *Regestum* of Innocent. (2) Corrected: The manuscript of the *Regestum* has the corrections “tanto maiori” for “tanto minori,” and “plus deficit” for “plus proficit,” which alter essentially the meaning of the text. According to the original, the more the moon separates from the sun, the more it decreases in brightness, while the corrected version says that the more the moon separates from the sun, the more it increases in brightness.

Hageneder presents a solid interpretation of the two versions and offers a probable explanation of the motives behind the emendations in the corrected version. According to him, the original version describes the ideal relation between *sacerdotium* and *imperium*. The pope is thinking of sun and moon in a perfect state of celestial opposition. The moon is full and receiving the fulness of light from the sun, for the two spheres, at a maximum distance from one another, stand face to face. The more the moon wanes from this state of opposition, the dimmer its light becomes. Thus it is in Christendom. The two powers, papacy and empire, face one another as the sun and the moon. The emperor receives the splendor of his dignity from the pope, as the moon receives the splendor of her light from the sun. A deviation indicates a diminution of splendor. Hageneder¹⁷⁸ believes that this version harmonizes perfectly with the medieval conception of the sun-moon symbol, which symbolizes the general conditions under which the emperor may enjoy the favor and good will of the pope or lose it.

According to the corrected version, the more the moon separates from the sun, the more it increases in brightness. This version must be interpreted from a different frame of reference. Whereas in the original version “conspectui” and “aspectu” designate the state of opposition of the two spheres, in the corrected version they designate the state of conjunction, when there is not a full but a new moon. In this case, the further the moon moves from the sun, the brighter its light becomes. It is in act of passage from new to full moon. The more the moon adheres to the state of conjunction, the less brilliant it is.

Hageneder explains this change in the original text by offering four explanations, of which the following seems the most convincing. The original was corrected to give the letter a more logical construction, for in this version the sun-moon symbol was left hanging. The correction brings it into harmony

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 341.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 348.

with the context of the whole letter. Briefly, it is the intent of the Pope to tell the secular power that though both *sacerdotium* and *imperium* should be in harmony, at times the temporal power gains in glory by separating from the spiritual power. Concretely the reference is to the *patrimonium sancti Petri*, which the Pope wants free of all interference from the emperor. If the emperor (new moon) leaves the pope's (sun) possessions in Italy alone, he will gain in splendor.¹⁷⁹

EVALUATION

The history of the medieval papacy and its manifold relations to the medieval world which it helped to create must appear even to a superficial observer to be of enormous proportions. Historical scholarship is far from having solved every problem or written every word about it. Much important work remains to be done. There is need of scholarly monographs and books on individual popes combining the biographical with the doctrinal. Especially needed is a new study of the papacy from the viewpoint of the ecumenical councils held in the course of the Middle Ages.¹⁸⁰ This is a research problem in which the efforts of historian, theologian, canonist, and sociologist can combine. At the same time, we must be ready to take one more look at the problem of the Inquisition, an area too long neglected by Catholic scholars. Certainly since H. C. Lea's time there has been sufficient advance in research to justify a rewriting of its history. Modern scholars, aware of governmental attempts to repress undesirable ideologies, might be more inclined to sympathize with the desperate attempts of medieval civilization to save itself from the forces of disintegration. The study of this problem, if handled without partisan prejudice and within the framework of the medieval system, will certainly further enrich our knowledge of the medieval papacy.

Over the past five or ten years, historians have worked with diligence on the problem of Church and state. The theoretician is now in a better position to deepen his understanding of the politico-religious synthesis of *sacerdotium* and *imperium*. I doubt that any significant alterations will be made in our present construction of the system, but further research will bring us to a profounder realization of its meaning. It was an edifice almost totally suited to the people who dwelt within it, tolerably comfortable and economical in terms of the world-structure, reasonably maintained with a

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 367.

¹⁸⁰ I would like to propose Fr. J. Gill, S.J., *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1959), as a model for future research in this field.

minimum of friction between the occupants, pope and emperor.¹⁸¹ In many respects it deserves our sympathy and admiration.

The medieval Church-State construction is a burning issue to certain secularists, who fear that it might return, and to certain theologians, who think that it should return. Neither position is realistic, for the return of *sacerdotium* and *imperium* to the modern world is as real as the reappearance of the great glacier over the North American continent. Both positions are rooted in the unfounded premise that the historical past can return to plague the present. The glacier, like *sacerdotium* and *imperium*, is gone. It simply melted out of existence with the changing climate. Neither will or can return.

But serious questions do present themselves to the theologian. What legacy have we inherited from the conflict between *sacerdotium* and *imperium*? A specific Church-State theory? A definitive political *Weltanschauung*? Of what theological value are the bulls of Gregory VII against Henry IV and the pronouncements of Innocent III on the Throne Controversy? The ultimate answer lies in the concrete historical circumstances of "then" and "now," for it is axiomatic to say that every document must be interpreted in light of its own history. The medieval world was *christianitas*, one vast corporate society, embracing *sacerdotium* and *imperium*, with pope and emperor at the head of it, and at the head of the emperor was the pope. Nobody, least of all the emperor, denied the historic role of the Holy See in the creation of the Empire, founded on the events of Christmas Day, 800. Throughout the High Middle Ages the emperor received the imperial crown from the pope, and with it a special temporal relation to all other crowned heads in the Western world and a special spiritual relation to the Church, whose protector and defender he became. No matter how radical the ideas which the imperialist theoreticians proposed, it was ultimately admitted: no pope, no emperor.

Every pronouncement of Gregory VII and Innocent III that has come down to us rests solidly on the notion of *christianitas*, a partly spiritual, partly temporal society. The presupposition of the *Regesta* of both Popes is that there is one pope and one emperor, one Church and one Empire, forming one *christianitas*. Within this framework, the popes held dialogue with the emperor as *caput spirituale* with *caput temporale*. It was *christianitas* speaking to itself rather than Church speaking to state as two separate, distinct, independent societies. Gregory VII and Innocent III spoke for Empire and emperor under special conditions, but not for all states under all conditions.

¹⁸¹ Cf. R. Cheney's work mentioned in n. 136 supra.

Their dialogue was carried on within a special system whose rules freely allotted the last word to *sacerdotium*.

The Protestant Revolt destroyed the universality of *imperium* and diminished the influence of *sacerdotium*. On August 6, 1806, Francis II laid aside the venerable honor of German-Roman emperor and the *Sacrum Imperium Romanum* came to an end after more than one thousand years of history. The past centuries have seen enormous national, political, and social developments which have displaced the medieval system of life. Society has become pluralistic and secularistic. A new world has come into existence in which there is no emperor, no Empire, no *christianitas*. In these new circumstances it is scarcely possible to recognize in Gregory's and Innocent's specific norms for the relations between *imperium* and *sacerdotium* universal principles relevant to our modern problem of Church-State.

Boniface VIII, more than any other pope, is representative of the extreme papal position vis-à-vis the Empire. His pronouncements in this matter form an embarrassing heritage. Even when sympathetically interpreted, they remain problematic.¹⁸³ In an Allocution on September 7, 1955, addressed to the Tenth International Congress of Historians in Rome, Pius XII said in speaking of Boniface VIII's conception of the Church's role in temporalities:¹⁸⁴ "Cette conception médiévale était conditionnée par l'époque. Ceux qui connaissent ses sources, admettront probablement qu'il serait sans doute encore plus étonnant qu'elle ne fût pas apparue." This does not propose a new viewpoint, for even the medieval popes were aware that papal political thought changed and was changing with historical development. It does, however, suggest that ideas are conditioned by the historical circumstances in which they are born—a suggestion well made to Catholic historians of the Middle Ages.

Woodstock College

ROBERT E. McNALLY, S.J.

¹⁸³ F. Kempf, S.J., *Papsttum und Kaisertum*, p. 300.

¹⁸⁴ Allocution of Pius XII on September 7, 1955; *AAS* 47 (1955) 678.