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In adopting the Christian faith, medieval people also obtained a tradition within Christianity, that of eschatology. Because of this tradition, there was a receptiveness among some for prophetic visions of the future, visions of widely varied nature. Two very popular themes running through this visionary tradition involved two eschatological figures, the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope, whose advent would right all wrongs and transform medieval society. This thesis will examine elements of medieval political theory as they developed out of contemporary events. It will also trace the growth and development of the figures of the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope, and attempt to demonstrate how the former influenced the latter.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Near the end of his six volume study of medieval political theory, A.J. Carlyle drew the following conclusion regarding the nature of medieval spiritual and temporal authority:

To the Western Church it was in the main clear that there were two great authorities in the world, not one, that the Spiritual Power was in its own sphere independent of the temporal, while it did not doubt that the Temporal Power was also independent and supreme in its own sphere. ... This conception of the two autonomous authorities existing in human society, each supreme, each obedient, is the principle of society which the Fathers handed down to the Middle Ages, not any conception of a unity founded on the supremacy of one or the other of the powers.1

This theory of cooperating powers resulted in a view of society as a Christian Commonwealth. Such a view was not possible before the conversion of the Roman emperor Constantine nor after the supplanting of the universal Empire by national kingdoms and the universal Church by national churches. Yet the time between these two events was anything but placid for the two respective powers. Although the theory of cooperation was generally accepted by both, practical definition of what that cooperation actually meant varied widely throughout the Middle Ages. The two powers, spiritual and temporal, were almost constantly in disagreement and conflict over these issues. Throughout this thesis I will use the terms sacerdotium and imperium. I have purposefully left them without exact definition and will use them in preference to the inelegant "sacred power" and "secular power." Sacerdotium includes within its boundaries the notion of Church, papacy, or the individuals who supported both. Imperium includes the notion of state, empire, kingdom, and the supporters of these entities. Medieval writers referred to this latter idea by a variety of words--basilia, regnum, and imperium--often using these very different words interchangeably. But in the fourth chapter I shall supplant the term imperium with the word regnum, representing the idea of "secular power" defined more precisely in a particular
historical conflict. The conflict of sacerdotium and imperium proved to be both fruitful and destructive. It was fruitful in as much as it stimulated many developments in law and ultimately contributed to the creation of what we today understand as political theory, the systematic method of examining the nature, powers, and limitations of authority, which had been largely absent from earlier thought. The conflict was also destructive in as much as it helped cripple and ultimately change and destroy both powers. In this thesis we shall examine some of the major arguments used by both the sacerdotium and the imperium in their struggle, and trace their development through the Middle Ages.

But the effects of the struggle of sacerdotium and imperium were not felt only in the fields of law and political theory. This thesis is also concerned with eschatology, that is, the study of the end purposes of man and/or the world. Although it is difficult to establish direct causal links (as it is for many developments in history), we can nevertheless notice some strong correlations between developments in the political field and also in eschatology. Eschatology is a notoriously slippery subject to grasp. It incorporates within it apocalypticism, that field of special knowledge which concerns itself with divine revelations, especially regarding the future, and it generally does not pay a prophet to be too specific. In apocalypticism as well as eschatology, sources are nearly always suspect. Backdating is an extremely common technique, whereby an individual purports to be writing his work earlier than he did, enabling him to incorporate subsequent historical developments and thus "authenticate" his prophetic vision. Also, there was a pronounced tendency to pseudonymously attribute later works to earlier, famous authors, for the authentication this backdating brought and also to add a patina of respectability to a work, since it was composed by a "noted" and "respectable" author. Of all the themes running through the corpus of medieval eschatology this thesis will deal with two: (1) the Last World Emperor, and (2) the Angelic Pope. Both of these figures are absent from the early Christian eschatology present in the New Testament. For example, it is absurd to imagine the figure of a holy Roman emperor in St. John's extraordinarily anti-Roman book of Revelation. The catalyst for the change in this area came, as mentioned earlier, with the conversion of
Constantine, when Christianity suddenly found itself the major spiritual power in the Roman Empire. The Empire thus went from persecutor to savior, becoming a powerful ally in the propagation and regulation of Christianity. As the nature and holders of that Empire changed so did Christianity’s expectations of it, and we can observe a parallel change in the nature of the figure of the Last World Emperor. Similar things may be said about the nature of the Angelic Pope. As the papacy became more and more central to European affairs, so, too, it entered eschatology. In this, eschatology played an important double role; it provided a theater in which the importance of the papacy could be recognized, but in which the abuses and shortcomings of the contemporary papacy could be obliquely criticized by a comparison with a future “Angelic” Pope. All of the theorizing about these two figures has several recognizable characteristics. It is usually teleological, dealing with the end of the world and a coming renewal. It is thus usually pessimistic about contemporary events and the proximate future, but optimistic about the more distant future. It is strongly cast as a struggle of good and evil, with the Antichrist appearing as the figure of evil in a re-interpretation of the pattern of events in the book of Revelation. Apocalypticism was thus extremely important and was, in the words of Bernard McGinn: “a way in which contemporary political and social events were given religious validation by incorporation into a transcendent scheme of meaning.” We shall trace the early development of the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope, and note how they are shaped and influenced by contemporary developments in political events and political theory.

For the sake of clarity, I have divided the conflict of imperium and sacerdotium and the concurrent development of the figures of the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope into four phases. Because of the inexact nature of eschatology concrete dates for these phases cannot be fixed—eschatology tended to follow the conflicts of imperium and sacerdotium thematically rather than chronologically. Furthermore, as political events are both profoundly conditioned by and reflected in concurrent developments in political theory, for the purposes of this thesis we will extensively examine the relevant political literature for any period. Similarly, where the sources were available to me, I have striven to include in
the endnotes copies of any quotation I have made in the original language, for the sake of completeness. Sources that are mentioned in the rest of this introduction will be cited more fully in the chapter in which they appear.

We shall begin with the period of Caesarpapism, in which Romano-Byzantine emperors, best typified by the emperor Justinian, rose to central positions in the affairs of the Church. The initial reaction of the members of the sacerdotium to this intervention was initially quite positive, but we shall explore the turn of opinion under Pope St. Leo I, the crucial theorizing of St. Gelasius I, and the gradual shift of papal focus from East to West by St. Gregory the Great. We shall consider briefly two intangibles—the forged Donation of Constantine and the idea of the translation of empire, the letter best observed in the coronation of Charlemagne by Leo III. Finally, we shall observe the birth of the Last World Emperor in the writings of pseudo-Methodius, and his development and elaboration in the reworked Tiburtine Sibyl and the letters of the monk Adso.

The conflict of imperium and sacerdotium shifted from the East to the West for the second phase, the Investiture Controversy between the newly-reformed papacy and the contemporary recipients of the idea of the Empire, the Germans. This conflict was critical for the development of Western political thought, yet the two powers were still finding their feet, as it were, and so minimal use of eschatology was made. The whole Controversy was born out of a peculiar set of circumstances, since it was the German imperium that had been acting as the agent of reform for the sacerdotium. The conflict came during the last phases of that reform, when the sacerdotium reasserted the right to control itself. We shall begin by examining briefly the writings of St. Peter Damian, Humbert, and Nicholas II. From this beginning we shall turn to inspect in more detail the struggle between St. Gregory VII and Henry IV, ostensibly over the issue of episcopal investiture, with particular attention to the events at Canossa and the birth of the extremely important two-swords metaphor. Following this, we shall consider relevant political developments in the birth of political thought generated by the various partisans of imperium and sacerdotium: the Norman Anonymous, the author of the Liber De Unitate Ecclesia Conservanda, Manegold of
Lautenbach, Ivo of Chartres, and Hugh of Fleury. Finally, we shall examine the rather unique compromise worked out by Paschal II and the actual compromise of the Concordat of Worms. Prophecy was somewhat limited at this time, but we shall briefly examine the Last World Emperor figure in the works of Benzo of Alba and Ekkehard of Aura.

The third phase of conflict of sacerdotium and imperium was between the papacy and the imperial house of Hohenstaufen, in many ways just a continuation of hostilities generated during the Investiture Controversy. We shall witness the flowering of new political ideas in the works of writers such as Hugh of St. Victor, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, and John of Salisbury. Then we shall consider the first major disagreement of this phase, between Frederick I and Alexander III over the events at the Diet of Besançon. We shall regard the birth of the Decretists in the persons of Alanus and Huggucio, and go on to witness Frederick's continuing conflicts with Alexander III. From there we shall proceed to the reign of one of the most inimical opponents the sacerdotium ever faced, Frederick II, and examine his conflicts with Innocent III, Gregory IX, and Innocent IV. In this exceptionally savage struggle we shall inspect relevant documents from the sacerdotium, Frederick's Liber Augustalis, and the intriguing willingness of both parties in the conflict to use both very strong language and even apocalypticism against each other. Finally, we shall witness the ultimate triumph of the papacy over the House of Hohenstaufen, and also examine the reflections of this victory in the very partisan writings of Hostiensis. In prophecy we shall trace the figure of the Last World Emperor through the works of Otto of Freising, the Play of Antichrist, the Erithraean Sibyl, and the reworked Tiburtine Sibyl. From there we shall move on to consider what would become three new traditions in prophecy. In the first, the Joachite, we will finally meet with the figure of the Angelic Pope in the writings of Joachim of Fiore and his later followers and imitators. In the second, the Franciscan, we will again see the Angelic Pope in the writings of Salimbene and Roger Bacon. In the third, the Merlinite, we will discover a most unusual view of the Last World Emperor in writings attributed to Merlin, the legendary British seer, companion of King Arthur, and political
prophet par excellence. Finally, we shall conclude with a few minor Last World Emperor prophecies.

Our last phase of conflict between the sacerdotium and the imperium pits the papacy against the growing power of the French monarchy—more a conflict of sacerdotium and regnum than sacerdotium and imperium. We shall begin with an examination of the growth of national sentiment in the works of several glossators and in the more elaborate writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, who reintroduced to Western thought the concepts of natural law and the national state, and who changed the course of Western political theory forever. We shall inquire into the political events surrounding the pontificate of Celestine V as well as the disagreements between his successor Boniface VIII and King Philip IV of France, first over the issue of clerical taxation and then over the independence of clergy from secular jurisdiction. This conflict culminated both in the decretal Unam Sanctam and in the assault at Anagni. From there we shall briefly consider the pontificate of Clement V, which yielded to the interests of the French regnum and ushered in the Avignonese papacy. Finally, we shall consider the changes in later political theory, from pro-sacerdotium writers such as Giles of Rome, to moderates like John of Paris, and at last to anti-sacerdotium writers such as the author of the Disputatio inter Clericum et Militem, Pierre Dubois, Dante Alighieri, and Marsilius of Padua. In prophecy we shall inspect the continued growth of the figure of the Angelic Pope in the Oraculum Cyrili, Robert of Uzès, the Vaticinia, and the Liber de Flore. We shall regard the continuing prophetic focus of the Franciscans, both the Spirituals and the Fraticelli, their descendants. From there we shall examine the strange, savage sect of the Dolcenites, who united the Angelic Pope and the Last World Emperor in their prophetic beliefs, and also take a look at John of Winterthur’s version of the Last World Emperor. We shall observe the continuing linkage of the Angelic Pope with the Last World Emperor in the writings of Cola de Rienzo and Jean de Roquetaillade. And on a final note, we shall conclude with the works of Telesphorus of Cosenza, who synthesized nearly all of the preceding prophetic traditions into a unified whole and charted a new direction for prophecy in the future.
CHAPTER II

CAESAROPAPISM

When I Constantine Augustus and I Licinius Augustus had come under happy auspices to Milan, and discussed all matters that concerned the public advantage and good, among the other things that seemed to be of benefit to the many—or rather, first and foremost—we resolved to make such decrees as should secure respect and reverence for the Deity; namely, to grant both to the Christians and to all the free choice of following whatever form of worship they pleased, to the intent that all the divine and heavenly powers that might be favorable to us and all those living under our authority.¹

The reign of the Roman Emperor Constantine (312-327) changed the nature of Christianity forever. The so-called Edict of Milan (313), a portion of which has been quoted above, transformed the status of Christianity from a persecuted minority religion to an imperially accepted one. Constantine's reign also paved the way for the future conflicts between imperium and sacerdotium, for with imperial recognition came imperial involvement in ecclesiastical affairs. It was Constantine who called the first great Church Council at Nicea in 325, Constantine who presided over it, and Constantine who there promulgated the final decision against Arius and his followers. Furthermore, during the Council, he referred to himself as "bishop of those outside the Church," a strange title which has been interpreted several ways by history.³ His correspondence displays a lively interest in Church matters.⁴ He endowed Pope Silvester I with his palace at the Lateran for use as a church, and in 330 had construction begun on a new church on the supposed site of the martyrdom of St. Peter. And in 331 he changed the nature of affairs of Church and state in the Roman Empire forever by having the seat of Empire transferred to Constantinople, a move to save the Empire which ultimately wound up splitting it and would later cause division in the Church as well.

The ultimate development of this imperial intervention in Church affairs was the system which has been termed "Caesaropapism." This term may be somewhat inexact, as no Emperor ever exercised absolute control over the Church⁵ or ever claimed sacerdotal
powers, but nonetheless it is used to describe how the Byzantine emperors combined the offices of imperium and sacerdotium within their own persons. Justinian I (527-565) through his actions and his writings provides us with an excellent example of how imperium defined itself in its earliest stage.

Although Justinian did not set out his political views in a single treatise, they can be extracted from his personal, legal, and theological writings. First and foremost, Justinian was convinced that imperium came from God. He opens the Digest with "As by the will of God we govern an empire which as come to us from His Divine Majesty, so we wage wars with success, maintain peace, and keep the state prosperous." Furthermore, he opens Nov. CXLVII with "We look after the republic which God has entrusted to us." Secondly, Justinian felt that the Emperor was essentially the representative of God on Earth. He notes, "After God, we call the head of the imperium the common father of all." He tends to prefix his statements with "in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ" as though he ruled in His name. Thirdly, Justinian thought an emperor ought to imitate God's perfection, in many areas, viz., "nothing is more characteristic of imperial majesty than humaneness, by which alone the imitation of God is effected," or "whatever either God or the emperor who follows Him imparts to man is good." This brings us to our fourth and final element in Justinian's imperial thought, legislation. This was the Emperor's primary field of activity and reason for ruling: "For this reason God has imposed imperial power on men: that is shall complete wherever necessary what is lacking in human nature and fence it round with fixed laws and regulations." Furthermore, legislation was the provenance of the emperor alone: "the emperor shall be regarded as the sole creator and interpreter of the laws." Finally, the emperor himself was above the law: "The imperial station, however, shall not be subject to the rules which we have just formulated, for to the emperor God has subjected the laws themselves by sending him to men as the living law." With the presentation of the emperor as servant of God and as living law, we can clearly see that Justinian intended him to be the primary force of the imperium.
This brings us to the question of the position of the sacerdotium in such a scheme. Justinian's prefix to Novel 6 seems to accord it a great deal of respect:

The greatest of the gifts of God to men, granted by the heavenly mercy, are the sacerdotium and imperium: the one serves divine ends, the other rules over and cares for human affairs; and each of these springs from one and the same source and each adorns the life of man. ... For if the sacerdotium be blameless in every respect and full of faith before God, and if the imperium duly and rightly adorn the state which is entrusted to it, then there will result a fair harmony which will furnish every good thing to the human race. We are therefore concerned in the highest degree for the true doctrines inspired by God and for the integrity of the sacerdotium.17

This very famous passage argues for a harmony between sacerdotium and imperium, and furthermore is written with the realization that there is indeed a difference between these powers. However, it must be noted that Justinian really didn't see that much difference between the two, viz., "the sacerdotium and imperium do not differ so very much, nor are sacred things so very different from common and public things."18 Thus, as noted above, he felt it was the duty of the imperium to purify the sacerdotium, and that the social needs of his subjects warranted his intervention into their spiritual needs:

If we try so hard to enforce the civil laws, whose power God in His goodness has entrusted to us for the security of our subjects, how much more keenly should we endeavor to enforce the canons and divine laws which have been framed for the salvation of our souls!18

Under this scheme heresy became a social crime, to be punished by the imperium; his reconquest of the western portion of the Empire was not merely for territorial expansion or gain, but also to punish the largely Arian West. His writings seem to indicate that he was largely content to let the sacerdotium generate the rules of faith that the imperium was to enforce, but as the spiritual health of his subjects was also his concern, he also intervened periodically in theological areas, writing treatises on the Monophysites20 and the so-called Three Chapters.21 In addition, he was popularly perceived to have a pronounced spiritual character, as Innocent, bishop of Maronia, notes, recording an audience with him in 531:

Amidst the deepest silence, His Piety spoke such grave and earnest words, so gently and so quietly that, had I been told they were spoken by His Piety, I would scarcely have believed it had I not heard them with my own ears. But by the great grace of God, they came from his blessed lips. I looked at him as at the very image of David's gentleness, Moses' patience, and the apostles' charity. The words differed from those of St. Paul, yet they were in the very same spirit in which Paul wrote to the Holy Church.22
Innocent's words demonstrate the strong quasi-religious character that the emperor had assumed. This spiritually elevated position was later reinforced by elaborate ceremony and symbolism surrounding the emperor's actions.23 Clearly then, we can see that the words of D.M. Nichol apply well to Justinian: "He was the defender of the faith and the terror of its enemies, but also its organizer and director."24

How did the members of the sacerdotium respond to these actions on the part of the imperium, which Justinian typifies? Initially, it seems, they responded quite well. The early Christian reaction was set by Eusebius (fl. 4th cent.). Constantine's conversion provided Eusebius with the opportunity to see the establishment and growth of the Roman empire as providential, providing a place in which Christianity would be nurtured and disseminated:

Who should not wonder, considering that it was not by mere human accident that most of the nations were never under the one Empire of Rome until the days of Jesus? For His wonderful sojourn among men synchronized with Rome's attainment of supreme power, when Augustus was for the first time supreme ruler over most nations.25

This religious view of the Roman Empire and the Pax Romana became very popular with early Christian thinkers. F. Dvornik points out how Eusebius' schema was adopted in varying degrees by Sts. John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzus, Diodorus, Theodoret, Prudentius, Ambrose, and Jerome.26 Furthermore, there seems to have been early papal acceptance of the Imperial program. Pope St. Leo I (440-461), writing to the Emperor Theodosius II (408-450), noted, "It gives us joy to find in you a soul that is not only royal, but priestly."27 In a later letter to the Emperor Leo I (457-474), he refers to the fact that the Emperor is not in need of any human explanations, since he had received "the purest faith from the fullness of the Holy Ghost."28 Pope Leo I was also willing to allow the Emperor a hand in the internal affairs of the Church, as another letter to Emperor Leo I attests:

For the priestly and apostolic soul of Your Piety should be roused to the justice of retribution by the evil which so disastrously dims the purity of the Church of Constantinople, where some clerics are found to favor heretical tenets and to help the heretics with their assertions in the very heart of the catholic community. If my brother Anatolius is found to be remiss and too indulgent to restrain those men, be so good in virtue of your faith to administer to the Church even the remedy of removing such men, not only
from the clerical ranks, but from the territory of the city, lest the holy people of God be further infected by the contagion of their perversion. 18

This is a serious concession of power; Leo here allows the Emperor to act to remove clerics from their stations, a responsibility that by rights ought to belong to the bishops. But Leo allows this intervention because of necessity, and that necessity was based on the threat of heresy. Earlier in the letter, Leo states his view of the function of the Emperor:

Since the Lord had enriched Your Clemency with the great light of His sacrament, you must unhesitatingly realize that the royal power has been bestowed on you, not merely to rule the world, but chiefly to protect the Church; so that by bravely putting down wickedness, you preserve what has been wisely laid down and restore true peace wherever it has been disturbed. 30

Essentially the domination of sacerdotium by imperium is a marriage of convenience for Pope Leo; the threat of pollution by heresy was greater than the threat of domination by imperium. The actions of the Council of Chalcedon (451) demonstrate this well; for the triumph of orthodoxy Leo was willing to endure having the Council called and presided over by the Emperor, and willing to endure the official reduction in the status of Rome (from pre-eminence to a mere equal of Constantinople) that was a by-product of that Council. The nature of the imperium at this time is well stated by F. Dvornik:

The monarchic principle, so forcefully applied to the first Christian emperors by Eusebius, is, therefore, still in favor in the fifth century: one God in Heaven, one emperor on earth, His sole representative and the lineal descendant of the great King David. 31

But as time went on, the sacerdotium would not always be content with such a state of affairs.

The position of the early Byzantine emperors was based on facts of empire; they ruled, and that was all there was to it. They issued laws concerning their rule, they determined the ceremonials concerning their rule, but what they did not do was define their rule. As W. Ensslin noted, "The Byzantines themselves accepted the Empire as sui generis, because it was sent from God, and any idea of theorizing about it never entered their minds." 32 What the Byzantines did not have was much in the way of political theory; indeed, D. Nicol notes "it has been argued that there was none." 33 In this age, imperium remained dominant over sacerdotium, and we should keep this in mind, but what the forces of sacerdotium began to
do, also at this time, was to consider the sources, nature, and extent of their powers; in short, they took the first steps toward political theory. In the long run, systematic political theory would help the sacerdotium turn the tables on the imperium, and change the situation between the two powers. And the first pope to begin a consideration of the nature of the power of sacerdotium was none other than Leo I.

We have seen above the deferential position Leo held toward the Emperor during his pontificate. But he also began considering the nature of the papacy, and derived several interesting conclusions about it by considering his position vis-à-vis St. Peter. He began by examining the role Peter had in the Church:

From so great a people one Peter is chosen, that he might be put in charge of the calling of all peoples and fathers of all the Church, so that although there might be in the people of God many priests and many pastors, nevertheless Peter might properly rule them all, whom Christ rules as prince.34

Peter's powers of binding and loosing were personally given to him and him alone by Christ, powers which Peter later passed on.35 Leo referred to himself as "unworthy heir of St. Peter,"36 and since in Roman law the heir had the same legal identity as the deceased, by this argument Leo had the authority of St. Peter himself. As Walter Ullman notes,

Because he is the bishop of the same see that was Peter's, the "apostolica sedes", he succeeds St. Peter; and since St. Peter was made prince of the whole Church--"quem totius ecclesiae fecit"--so is he now prince of the Church.37

Leo was fully conscious of the fact that he succeeded Peter, and indeed spoke for him, as his words attest, "it is not from us, but he who precedes us, who operates in us."38 Furthermore, in Leo's theory he succeeded Peter directly, without the aid of intermediaries. Finally, Leo drew a distinction between the office and power of Peter, as he wrote to one of his vicars, "for we have so entrusted our succession to your charity that you might be called into a portion of concern, not into the fullness of power."39 This was a crucial idea; by it Leo meant that while other churchmen might hold the same office of bishop, nonetheless they did not share in the same "fullness of power" Leo did by being bishop of Rome and successor of St. Peter. Although Leo never was the dominant power in the Church of his day, the ideas he laid down were extremely important for his successors.
The next pope we shall consider developed theories that were absolutely crucial in the later struggles between imperium and sacerdotium. He was St. Gelasius I (492-496), and with him we will consider some of the thoughts and actions of his predecessor St. Felix III (483-492), for when Gelasius was a deacon he was a member of Felix's chancery and was responsible for Felix's correspondence. Gelasius began the first major intellectual attempt by the sacerdotium to wrest control from the imperium, and the occasion came during the Acacian Schism (484-519). The schism was prompted by the publication of the imperial edict Henoticon by the Emperor Zeno (474-491). The Henoticon attempted to find a compromise between orthodox Christianity and the Monophysite heresy, but what made it controversial was that it was the first time an Emperor had attempted to decree a point of faith for the whole empire without calling a church council. In formulating the Henoticon Zeno had sought the advice of Patriarch Acacius of Constantinople (471-489), and it was upon Acacius that the wrath of Felix fell. The two did not begin on good terms: the patriarch had been enhancing his position by referring to himself with the title "ecumenical patriarch," which had occasioned an angry letter from Felix in 483. He excommunicated Acacius and in so doing ushered in the first of the great schisms between Western and Eastern Churches, demonstrating a rift that would eventually become permanent. The schism prompted several tracts from Felix and Gelasius, one of which read, in part:

If you say: But the Emperor is catholic, I shall answer, with all due respect: He is son, not ruler of the Church; as regards religion, it behooves him to learn, not to teach; he has the privileges of his power, which he has received from God for the administration of public interests. Grateful for these benefits, he must not usurp powers in contravention of the supernatural order, for God has settled that what concerns the Church should be in the hands of the priests, not of the secular powers. He [the Emperor] must not claim rights that are not his, nor a ministry that belongs to others.

The idea that the head of the imperium ought "to learn and not teach" is an important one that becomes a recurring theme in later writers. Furthermore, the reference to Zeno as a "son" is also important in the same way. This form of address was an almost revolutionary one, and comes into use by popes at about this time. Felix also continues the ideas of Leo I before him by stressing his relationship as the "vicar of St. Peter."
But the most significant developments were made by Gelasius on his own. Zeno's successor Anastasius II (491-518) remained favorable to the Monophysite heresy, and Gelasius wrote him several letters defining the relationship of *sacerdotium* and *imperium* that were to prove enormously influential and critically important in the thought of later writers. In 494 he wrote:

> Two there are, august emperor, by which this world is chiefly ruled, the sacred authority [auctoritas] of the priesthood and the royal power [potestas]. Of these the responsibility of the priests is more weighty in so far as they will answer for the kings of men themselves at the divine judgment. You know, most clement son, that, although you take precedence over all mankind in dignity, nevertheless you piously bow the neck to those who have charge of divine affairs and seek from them the means of your salvation, and hence you realize that, in the order of religion, in matters concerning the reception and right administration of the heavenly sacraments, you ought to submit yourself rather than rule, and that in these matters you should depend on their judgment rather than seek to bend them to your will.4

The legal ability of Gelasius is well demonstrated by his use of *auctoritas* and *potestas* to describe the powers of the *sacerdotium* and *imperium*. *Auctoritas* was the power of the Roman Senate, power to shape and to bind which came from tradition. *Potestas* was the power of the Roman Magistrate, power to carry out what *auctoritas* had decided; it was power which came from the Roman people who delegated it to the Magistrates in the Republican period, who in turn delegated it to the *princeps* in the Imperial period. As Francis Dvornik notes, "The moral prestige of *auctoritas* was higher than that of *potestas*, but effective power lay with the *potestas".*4 Precisely what Gelasius meant by this Gelasian formula of *auctoritas* and *potestas* would be interpreted in different ways by succeeding generations (our own included), but it seems fairly clear that Gelasius made his distinction not to give *sacerdotium* control over *imperium*, but rather, to stop the converse from occurring. Gelasius sought a kind of balance, as can be seen in a letter he wrote in 496. His argument is somewhat complex, so it will be quoted at length:

> It happened before the coming of Christ that certain men, though still engaged in carnal activities, were symbolically both kings and priests, and sacred history tells us that Melchisedek was such a one (cf. Genesis 14:18). The Devil also imitated this among his own people, for he always strives in a spirit of tyranny to claim for himself what pertains to divine worship, and so pagan emperors were called supreme pontiffs. But when He came who was true king and true priest, the emperor no longer assumed the title of priest, not did the priest claim the royal dignity—though the members of Him who was true king and true priest, through participation in His nature, may be...
said to have received both qualities in their sacred nobility so that they constitute a race at once royal and priestly.47

Gelasius is a bit mistaken here; Christian emperors did not give up the title pontifex maximus until Gratian (367-383), nor did they all abandon a priestly character, as we have seen above with Justinian as our example. Furthermore, the inclusion of Melchisedek here is rather significant, for his example would be later used by members of the imperium as well as those of the sacerdotium. But Gelasius continues:

For Christ, mindful of human frailty, regulated with an excellent disposition what pertained to the salvation of His people. Thus He distinguished between the offices of both powers according to their own proper activities and separate dignities, wanting his people to be saved by healthful humility and not carried away by human pride, so that Christian emperors would need priests for attaining eternal life and priests would avail themselves of imperial regulations in the conduct of temporal affairs. In this fashion spiritual activity would be set apart from worldly encroachments and the "soldier of God" (2 Timothy 2:4) would not be involved in secular affairs, while on the other hand he who was involved in secular affairs would not seem to preside over divine matters. Thus the humility of each order would be preserved, neither being exalted by the subservience of the other, and each profession would be especially fitted for its appropriate functions.48

Clearly Gelasius is striving for a kind of balance here, a balance that is really not unreasonable. Both sacerdotium and imperium have divine origins and divine duties, and both are instituted by Christ, the last individual truly both king and priest. Each of the powers is to be motivated by humility and cooperation, and to operate in its own separate sphere. Gelasius' vision is impressive and utterly unworkable, as later conflicts between sacerdotium and imperium would demonstrate, for throughout the Middle Ages, there never was consensus on a definition of what precisely belonged to the secular and what to the sacred.

The last political theorist we shall consider in this period is a little different than our previous writers insofar as his writings have very little to do with political thought. Rather, his significance in the continuing struggle between imperium and sacerdotium is based upon his actions rather than his theories. Pope St. Gregory the Great (590-603) was a remarkable man in many ways, but his effects on the office of the papacy are impossible to overstate. His relations with the Byzantine Emperor were remarkably restrained; he waited patiently for Maurice (582-602) to confirm his election as pope before assuming the duties of
his office, and always referred to him as "dominus" in his writings. When disagreement came with the East, it came over the use by Patriarch John IV (the Faster) of the term "ecumenical patriarch." Gregory protested this usage very sharply in a letter of June, 595, which was also significant because it was the first place where a pope used the spurious statement of Constantine to the bishops at the Council of Nicea, "You are gods, constituted by the true God; it is not right that we sit in judgment over gods"; this idea would be picked up by later writers. Nonetheless Gregory remained on good terms with John IV; they had met when Gregory was apocrisarius in Constantinople, and he later dedicated his Regula Pastoralis to him. But despite this deferential attitude to the imperium, nevertheless Gregory was a very strong leader of the sacerdotium; he always remained very much the abbot and had very firm ideas about order and obedience in his subordinates.

Furthermore, he helped build the prestige of the papacy in the minds of the Roman people by his actions towards the Lombards. When the Lombard King Agilulf (590-616) invaded in 594, bent on destroying Rome, it was Gregory who rallied the defenders and Gregory who single-handedly obtained peace by promising to pay tribute to Agilulf. People remembered his success and the Byzantine exarch's failure as an example of how weak the Imperial rule had become in the West, and how the only power that guaranteed stability in Rome was the Papacy. These events were not lost on Gregory, and he set out to resolve the conflict between sacerdotium and imperium in an unusual way, a way that was not present in his writings but is obvious from his actions. It was clear that the Byzantine Emperor was powerless in the West, yet supreme in the East, where imperium still dominated sacerdotium. Gregory could do nothing there. So he turned his focus westward. In 595 he sent out the missionaries who would prepare to evangelize England. Furthermore, he took great pains to maintain good relations with the new kings of the West. He praised the Franks for their orthodoxy and fidelity: "Just as royal dignity surpasses all individual men, in the same way the Frankish kingdom excels all other peoples." The Byzantine Emperor was always "dominus" in his writings, but the new Western kings were "filii"; they would obey him, and not the other way around. What Gregory sought was a "Christian
commonwealth," where things would be quite different than they were in the Byzantine Empire, and to do that he had to create it himself. In a very real sense, then, Gregory is the "father of Europe."

Gregory provides us with an interesting paradox and a chance to consider prophecy in this first period of major conflict between sacerdotium and imperium. Although he did more than any other pope before him to shape the political destiny of his age, nonetheless he was a firm believer in the imminent end of the world, as his June, 601 letter to Ethelbert, King of the Angles (560-616) attests:

Further, we also wish Your Majesty to know, as we have learned from the words of Almighty God in Holy Scripture, that the End of the present world is already near and that the unending kingdom of the Saints is approaching. As this same End of the world is drawing nigh, many unusual things will happen—climatic changes, terrors from heaven, unseasonable tempests, wars, famines, pestilences, earthquakes. All these things are not to come in our own days, but they will all follow upon our times.

Given these beliefs, Gregory's successes were much like those of the Apostles; while they, too, expected the imminent end of the world, nonetheless they wound up creating one of its most enduring institutions. Although in the preceding pages the words of sacerdotium's theorists were quoted at length, let us not forget that they were not theorizing in a void for their own sakes, they were theorizing to protect the sacerdotium from encroachments by the imperium in the person of the Byzantine Emperor. In spite of some impressive theories, little actual gains were made, hence Gregory's actions. In this first great conflict of sacerdotium and imperium, imperium dominated. Hence it is natural when we examine prophecy that imperium dominates there, too. The end of the seventh century witnessed the birth of the first of our two prophetic figures, the Last World Emperor.

Our first author very obviously presents his prophetic figure within the Byzantine political schema. He is the author of the Pseudo-Methodius, a work which was attributed to the fourth century martyr bishop Methodius of Patara. The work itself was actually written in Syriac by an unknown author sometime between 644 and 678. The time and location provide us with some probable reasons why it was written. In the seventh century Christianity ran headlong into the new, aggressive religion of Islam and was sent reeling.
In 622 Mohammed made his Hegira, and by 633 the cities of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria were lost to the Christian faith. Christianity had swiftly been deprived of the lands of its birth; this was, in the words of Bernard McGinn, "the most important historical event since the conversion of the empire." Syria was an important site because it had provided a refuge for many adherents of the Monophysite heresy, and they welcomed the Islamic invaders as liberators from orthodox Byzantine rule. Pseudo-Methodius wrote against all of this; his work was a politico-religious manifesto, rejecting any kind of defeatism or collaboration with the Moslems, warning against reliance on the weak and distant ruler of Ethiopia as a will-o’-the-wisp, calling for war to the finish against the conquerors, and preaching that salvation from the Moslem yoke could only come from one source, the most powerful Christian monarch of the time, the basileus at Byzantium.

In short, for Pseudo-Methodius the Islamic invasions assumed eschatological proportions, and into this eschatological scheme he inserted a new figure, the Last World Emperor. This was a necessary insertion, for the Byzantine Empire was the most powerful Christian kingdom in the world, and many saw it as a sacred entity and as a bulwark restraining the coming of the Antichrist. Pseudo-Methodius' writings provided a workable explanation of how the Empire could fall and thus pave the way for the advent of the Antichrist, unifying imperial ideas with eschatological ones. This prophecy proved to be a very popular one; there are at last count 190 manuscripts of the Latin version, of which 21 predate the twelfth century. Furthermore, his creation the Last World Emperor became archetypal, and as we will see had a considerable effect on later prophetic writers.

The Last World Emperor figure in Pseudo-Methodius emerges as a conqueror, attacking the Moslems who have usurped the Holy Land:

The king of the Greeks, i.e., the Romans, will come out against them in great anger, roused as from a drunken stupor like one whom men had thought dead and worthless (Ps. 77:65). He will go forth against them from the Ethiopian sea and will send the sword and desolation into Ethribus their homeland, capturing their women and children living in the Land of Promise. The sons of the king will come down with the sword and cut them off from the earth.

After conquering Palestine, the Last World Emperor would put these people into slavery with their former slaves as their new masters. Everyone would then return to the lands of
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their fathers, and the wrath of the Emperor would fall on Egypt, Arabia, and Ausania, the lands of the Moslems, which would be devastated:

The whole indignation and fury of the king of the Romans will blaze forth against those who deny the Lord Jesus Christ. Then the earth will sit in peace and there will be great peace and tranquility upon the earth such as has never been nor ever will be any more, since it is the final peace at the End of time.64

Pseudo-Methodius here makes use of the Millennium, the time of peace before the advent of the Antichrist, but he transfers it from its pattern in the Book of Revelation to the reign of the Last World Emperor. But after this brief period of peace (considerably shorter than Revelation’s thousand years) the "Gates of the North," which Alexander had shut in a number of Alexander-legends, would be opened and a new horde of barbarians would descend upon the world. But they would be readily defeated by the Last World Emperor’s forces:

After a week of years, when they have already captured the city of Joppa, the Lord will send one of the princes of his host and strike them down in a moment. After this the King of the Romans will go down and live in Jerusalem for seven and half-seven times, i.e., years. When the ten and a half years are completed the Son of Perdition will appear.65

Finally, the Antichrist would arise and bring about the penultimate downfall of the Last World Emperor:

When the Son of Perdition has arisen, the king of the Romans will ascend Golgotha upon which the wood of the Holy Cross is fixed, in the place where the Lord underwent death for us. The king will take the crown from his head and place it on the cross and stretching out his hands to heaven will hand over the kingdom of the Christians to God the Father. The cross and the crown of the king will be taken up together to heaven. This is because the Cross on which our Lord Jesus Christ hung for the common salvation of all will begin to appear before him at his coming to convict the lack of faith of the unbelievers. The prophecy of David which says, "In the last days Ethiopia will stretch out her hands to God"(Ps. 67:32) will be fulfilled in that these last men who stretch out their hands to God are from the seeds of the son of Chuseth, the daughter of Phol, king of Ethiopia. When the Cross has been lifted up on high to heaven, the king of the Romans will directly give up his spirit. Then every principality and power will be destroyed that the Son of Perdition may be manifest.68

Pseudo-Methodius goes on to detail some of the actions of the Antichrist and describe the final coming and triumph of Christ. The Last World Emperor thus is clearly presented as a type of Christ-figure, associated with both the place and the very Cross of the Crucifixion.
The religious character that the Byzantine Emperor had assumed is clearly manifest; it had become so significant that Pseudo-Methodius had to alter the events of the book of Revelation to include him. Note also that the Empire is not destroyed nor the Emperor defeated by the Antichrist; rather, the Last World Emperor surrenders himself and allows the final events to transpire. The Byzantine Empire and Emperor thus become entities so strong that they can only be destroyed if they let themselves be. This first portrait of the Last World Emperor clearly demonstrated the ideological domination by imperium.

Our second author presents the Last World Emperor in almost exactly the same way as Pseudo-Methodius, but in a bit more detail. "She" was purported to be one of the famous and very respected female seersesses of the Classical world, the Sibyls. In addition to other borrowings from its Classical birthplace, Christianity absorbed the Sibylline tradition as well. The most popular of all of these Sibylline works was that of the Tiburtine Sibyl (Sibylla Tiburtina); it is preserved in over 130 medieval Latin manuscripts, thirty which date from before the thirteenth century and seven which date from before the eleventh. The exact date of composition is unclear; P.J. Alexander, who has done some remarkable work with the text, estimates that an urtext was composed in Greek sometime between 378 and 390 and then subjected to a complicated series of retranslations and interpolations over the years. It is fairly clear that there must have been an early Latin translation, which has now been lost. The later Latin version of the Tiburtine Sibyl includes an account of the Last World Emperor which was not in the Greek original; we cannot be sure with any precision when it was inserted. Several scholars feel that it was present from the earliest Latin version, which would have been produced before the seventh century, although there is disagreement on this point. Lacking the Latin original, it is impossible to come to any definite conclusions. Pseudo-Methodius' account of the Last World Emperor almost certainly came before that of the Tiburtine Sibyl; it is possible that the text which has been translated below was influenced by Pseudo-Methodius, although due to its convoluted development the political reasons for its creation are not as evident. The Sibyl gives a more personalized portrait of the Last World Emperor:
There will arise a king of the Greeks whose name is Constans. He will be king of the Romans and the Greeks. He will be tall of stature, of handsome appearance with shining face, and well put together in all parts of his body. His reign will be ended after one hundred and twelve years. In those days there will be great riches and the earth will give fruit abundantly so that a measure of wheat will be sold for a denarius, a measure of wine for a denarius, and a measure of oil for a denarius. The king will have a text before his eyes that says: "The king of the Romans will claim the whole Christian empire for himself." He will devastate all the islands and the cities of the pagans and will destroy all idolatrous temples; he will call all pagans to baptism and in every temple the Cross of Christ will be erected. "Then Egypt and Ethiopia will be eager to stretch their hands to God" (Ps. 67:32). Whoever does not adore the Cross of Jesus Christ will be punished by the sword. When the one hundred and twelve years have been completed, the Jews will be converted to the Lord, and "his sepulchre will be glorified by all" (Isa. 11:10). In those days Judah will be saved and Israel will dwell with confidence.78

After this conversion of the Jews, the Sibyl goes on to predict the coming of the Antichrist, who would arise from the tribe of Dan, deceive many, and muster the forces of Gog and Magog.79 The Sibyl continues:

When the king of the Romans hears of this he will call his army together and vanquish and utterly destroy them. After this he will come to Jerusalem, and having put off the diadem from his head and laid aside the whole imperial garb, he will hand over the empire of the Christians to God the Father and God the Son.80

The Sibyl concludes with the triumph of Antichrist, the resurrection of Enoch and Elijah, the persecution of Christians, and the final victory over the Antichrist by the Archangel Michael in a battle on the Mount of Olives. The Sibyl follows Pseudo-Methodius very closely. The Sibylline program—the description of the Last World Emperor, the abundance of the earth in his day, the victories over unbelievers and conversion of the Jews, the defeat of the forces of Antichrist, and the Emperor's final surrender of his temporalities before Christ in the Holy Land—becomes almost the template by which other Last World Emperor visions are constructed. And it is clear that the Sibyl's account, although in Latin, presents a leader who reflects the imperial Byzantine political ideology. Although the description of the Emperor's regalia (diadema capitis, habitus regalis), matches that of earlier imperial Rome rather than the later Byzantine Empire,81 nonetheless he is initially identified as "king of the Greeks" and has the same centrality in the events of the end of the world the Byzantine Emperor had concerning the affairs of the sacerdotium.
In order to understand what happened to the figure of the Last World Emperor in later writers, we must first turn to two important developments in Europe in the eighth and ninth centuries. We have seen how the actions of Pope Gregory I resulted in a shift of focus by the papacy from the Byzantine Empire to the new kingdoms of Europe, an attempt by the sacerdotium to gain autonomy from the imperium. This action was backed up in the eighth century by the production of the very famous forgery, the Donation of Constantine, which purported to be a decree by the Emperor Constantine honoring the position of the Papacy as an act of gratitude for Constantine's miraculous delivery from leprosy. The document was accepted as genuine for centuries, and provides us with an interesting example of a counterattack by sacerdotium against imperium. The Donation provides for absolute papal authority in the affairs of the sacerdotium:

Because our Imperial power is earthly, we have decided to honor reverently his [i.e., Pope Silvester's] most holy Roman Church, and to exalt the most holy See of Blessed Peter in glory above our own Empire and earthly throne, ascribing to it power and glorious majesty and strength and Imperial Honor. And we command and decree that he should have primacy over the four principal Sees of Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, as well as over all the Churches of God throughout the whole world; and the Pontiff who occupies at any given moment the See of that same most holy Roman Church shall rank as the highest and chief among all the priests of the whole world and by his decision all things are to be arranged concerning the worship of God or the security of the faith of Christians.78

It is interesting to note that the Donation spells out in detail that the Pontiff controls by Imperial fiat certain areas which were traditionally Eastern in orientation. But besides absolute control of the sacerdotium, the Donation goes on to guarantee the papacy something more:

To correspond to our own Empire and so that the supreme Pontifical authority may not be dishonored, but may rather be adorned with glorious power greater than the dignity of any earthly empire, behold, we give to the often-mentioned most holy Pontiff, our father Silvester, the Universal Pope, not only the above-mentioned palace [the Lateran], but also the city of Rome and all the provinces, districts and cities of Italy and the Western regions, relinquishing them to the authority of himself and his successors as Pontiffs by a definite Imperial grant. ... Our Empire and the power of the kingdom should be transferred and translated to the Eastern regions and that in the province of Byzantium in the most suitable place a city should be built in our name and our Empire established there; because it is not just that an earthly Emperor should exercise authority where the government of priests and the Head of the Christian religion have been installed by the heavenly Emperor.77
Thus the Donation gave the papacy not only the control of the Church, but the western portion of the Empire as well. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the Donation actually gives Silvester the credit for the Emperor's move to Byzantium by noting how Constantine did not want to rule from the same city as 'his betters.' The whole Donation of Constantine was a pointed thrust against the authority of the Byzantine Emperors, and would be used frequently and to great effect by later popes in their struggles with the forces of imperium. The papacy put its ideas into practice on Christmas Day, 800, when Pope Leo III (795-816) crowned Charlemagne emperor:

Afterwards, on the following day of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ in the aforementioned basilica of blessed Peter the apostle, everyone assembled. And then the venerable and kind prelate crowned him with a most precious crown with his own hands. Then all the faithful of Rome, seeing such great protection and love as he had for the holy Roman Church, unanimously in a loud ringing voice cried out at the command of God and blessed Peter the apostle, keybearer of the kingdom of heaven: "Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus crowned by God, the great and peacemaking emperor." Before the sacred confession of blessed Peter the apostle and invoking many saints, this was said three times; and he was appointed Roman emperor by all.78

Previously, Charlemagne had accepted being made patrician of the Romans; now for service to the Church and (so Leo thought) to protect the Church he had been made Emperor, entirely against his will. The coronation was occasioned by a vacancy on the Byzantine throne; it is very probable that Leo hoped to marry Charlemagne to the Byzantine empress Irene, and thus unite Western and Eastern empires and churches.79 Charlemagne, of course, refused to cooperate, and Leo's plans were frustrated, but his actions were significant nonetheless. By virtue of the Donation of Constantine, Leo assumed the authority to remove the Roman Empire from the Byzantines and transfer it to the Franks, an audacious act. Although Charlemagne did not cooperate, his successors proved less intransigent. All were crowned by the pope, and they came in time to adopt all that went with the idea of being "Emperor of the Romans." Four generations after Charlemagne, Louis II (855-875) wrote to the Byzantine Emperor Basil I (867-886) in 871 that Basil could not be a legitimate emperor because the pope had not designated him as such, and furthermore did not adhere to the orthodoxy of the West, but the cacodoxy of the East.80
With these events in mind, let us examine the writings of Adso, abbot of Montier-en-Der (c. 910-992), specifically his Letter on the Origin and Life of the Antichrist (De Ortu et Tempore Antichristi), for as the idea of the Empire was brought west so, too, was the idea of the Last World Emperor. Adso was a hagiographer with ties to Frankish royal court; his letter was dedicated to Gerberga, who was married to one of the last of the Carolingians, Louis IV (936-954), as well as being sister of Otto the Saxon. Adso's letter is self-consciously compiled from earlier sources, but it is original in that it presents the life of the Antichrist in the form of a saint's life, and makes a number of creative departures from its sources. The Last World Emperor figure is present in the letter, but it is unclear exactly from what source. Several scholars have concluded that Adso was unfamiliar with the Tiburtine Sibyl and with Pseudo-Methodius and conclude that the figure of the Last World Emperor had already been brought to Carolingian Europe, although no texts survive. Others feel that Adso was familiar with Pseudo-Methodius, but took as many liberties with him as he did with his other sources. In any case, it is interesting to examine Adso's views on the nature of the Roman Empire and the Last World Emperor:

Though we see the Roman empire destroyed in great part, nevertheless as long as the kings of the Franks who hold the empire by right shall last, the dignity of the Roman empire will not totally perish, because it will endure in its kings. Some of our learned men say that one of the kings of the Franks who will come in the last time will possess anew the Roman empire. He will come at the last time and will be the last and greatest of all rulers. After he has successfully governed his empire, at last he will come to Jerusalem and will put off his scepter and crown on the Mount of Olives. This will be the end and the consummation of the Roman and Christian empire.

After this the Antichrist would come and follow his program of persecution, before finally being slain, either by Jesus Himself or by the actions of the Archangel Michael, an interesting reference to the events in the Tiburtine Sibyl. In any case, we can see the continuation of the familiar themes of the glorious last years of Rome and the Last World Emperor's final surrender of his temporalities in the Holy Land. The Last World Emperor, who began as a Byzantine figure, became a Frankish one, and the Empire has been transferred firmly from Byzantium to Europe. Thus the Last World Emperor came to enter
the consciousness of Europe as a European figure in the work of later writers. Adso reflects in his prophecy what Leo III began in his pontificate.
CHAPTER III

THE INVESTITURE CONTROVERSY

The next major phase in the conflict between sacerdotium and imperium, the Investiture Controversy, produced little development in the figure of the Last World Emperor, but was absolutely crucial in the area of political development. Furthermore, the increasingly aggressive political stance that the papacy adopted during this long Controversy would pave the way for a greater legalism that in turn would help the later development of the figure of the Angelic Pope. Paradoxically, the sacerdotium found itself again dominated by the imperium as it had been during the caesaropapist times, only this time it was the German imperium which the sacerdotium itself had helped to create. The sacerdotium again tried to break free of the imperium's domination through a vigorous expression of superiority and domination of its own. In turn, the imperium attempted to retain rights which it regarded as customary, and in so doing began systematically to consider and define its political position; in effect, to use political theory. This period was a very complex and confusing one, as much for its contemporaries as it is for us today. We still cannot say with any surety whether there was any "winner"; modern scholarship is so fiercely divided that emphasis will be placed primarily upon a direct examination of the relevant historical documents, through which we can observe some interesting developments in the struggle of imperium and sacerdotium.

The Controversy essentially had its beginnings many years before its principal players, the German Emperor Henry IV and pope St. Gregory VII entered the field. In the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, the sacerdotium had fallen into a state of corruption such that the Salian Emperors embarked on a program of ecclesiastical reform which extended to the papacy itself. The Saliens set several reform-minded individuals on the Throne of St. Peter, but it was just a matter of time before the impetus of reform shifted
from an external program by the Empire to an internal program by the Papacy. During the pontificate of Leo IX (1049-1054), a number of reform-minded ecclesiastics gathered at his court, including St. Peter Damian (1007-1072), Humbert of Silva Candida (1000-1061), and Hildebrand, later Pope Gregory VII. Leo operated in a spirit of great cooperation with the Emperor Henry III (1039-1056), but this cooperation ended with their deaths, and the Empire was left weakened since Henry's son and successor Henry IV was only an infant. Peter Damian and Humbert began a consideration on the effects of the lay investiture of bishops which spilled over into a consideration of the proper relationship of sacerdotium and imperium. Of the two views, Peter Damian's were more balanced and reasonable as we can see from a letter he wrote to Henry IV in 1065:

> Just as both powers, the royal and the priestly, are joined to one another in the first place in Christ by the special truth of a sacrament, so too they are mutually bound to one another in the Christian people by a kind of covenant. Each in turn needs the services of the other. The priesthood is defended by the royal protection while the kingship is sustained by the holiness of the priestly office. The king is girded with a sword so that he may go armed against the enemies of the Church. The priest devotes himself to vigils of prayer so that he may win God's favor for king and people. The former ought to direct earthly affairs under the lance of justice; the latter should give drink to the thirsty from the spring of divine eloquence. The former is established to coerce evil doers and criminals with the punishment of legal sanctions; the latter is ordained for this, to bind some with the zeal of canonical rigor through the keys of the Church that he has received and to absolve others through the clemency of the Church's compassion.

Peter Damian concludes with St. Paul's words from Romans 13:4 and goes on to admonish Henry for not putting down the antipope Honorius II, since he felt suppression of criminals was the royal duty of a Christian king. Damian's ideas were essentially conservative ones and represent a balanced interpretation of the kind of ideas we have seen in Gelasius. Humbert's theories, on the other hand, were more rigid and uncompromising, like the man himself, as we can see in his Libri III Adversus Simoniacos (1054-1058):

> Anyone then who seeks to compare the priestly and royal dignities in a useful and blameless fashion may say that, in the existing Church, the priesthood is analogous to the soul and the kingship to the body, for they cleave to one another and need one another and each in turn demands services and renders them one to another. It follows from this that, just as the soul excels the body and commands it, so too the priestly dignity exceeds the royal or, we may say, the heavenly dignity the earthly. Thus, that all things may be in due order and not in disarray the priesthood, like a soul, may advise what is to be done. The kingship in turn, like a head, excels all the members of the body and leads them where they should go; for just as
kings should follow churchmen so also layfolk should follow their kings for the good of Church and country. And so the people should be taught by one power and ruled by the other.⁴

Humbert thus represents a more narrow interpretation of the Gelasian formula. Although there is still balance here, nonetheless the way is quite clear for the sacerdotium to exert not only superiority, but also some measure of control over the imperium. This, and not investiture, proved in many ways to be the guiding issue in the Investiture Controversy.

As mentioned above, the sacerdotium increasingly assumed the impetus for reform. Simony and clerical marriage were two of the moral problems that the papacy sought to root out. But alongside the process of moral reform, the papacy also sought a greater control over the internal affairs of the Church. Two excerpts from a papal decree of April 1059 demonstrate this; in addition to prohibitions of simony and nicolaitism, the following reforms were also noted:

1. Firstly it was enacted in the sight of God that the election of the Roman pontiff should be in the power of the cardinal bishops, so that anyone who is enthroned without their previous agreement and canonical election and without the subsequent consent of the other orders of clergy and of the people shall not be held for a pope and an apostle, but rather for an apostate....

6. That no cleric or priest shall receive a church from a layman in any fashion, whether freely or for a price.⁵

These promulgations of pope Nicholas II (1058-1061) were quite extraordinary. In the first place, the sacerdotium now asserted control over itself; the pope would be chosen by the cardinals and not the Emperor, as had been the custom, although the Emperor retained the right of approval. In the second place, it very definitely set the Papacy's position on lay investiture. These two decrees would pave the way for further dispute, which was first seen during the election of Pope Alexander II (1061-1073), who had been elected pope before being confirmed by Henry IV. An antipope, Honorius II (1061-1064), was selected, although the German Imperial court came to accept Alexander II as the legitimate pontiff. 1073 proved to be a crucial year, for Pope St. Gregory VII (1073-1085) came to the papal throne at the same time Henry IV was embroiled in a fierce insurrection in Saxony. Gregory's election was irregular; it was said that at the death of Alexander II the Roman people spontaneously demanded that he be made pope and dragged him off to be ordained. The
cardinals approved, but had not decided first; furthermore, the Emperor was not given
notification in accord with the papal election decrees of 1059, but as Henry had troops far
away in both Saxony and Poland, he could not risk a conflict and so accepted the situation.
Moreover, he actually apologized for selecting some inferior men for ecclesiastical positions,
as a letter of 1073 notes:

Since, in order to continue rightly administered in Christ, the kingship and
priesthood are always in need of the strength which He delegates, it is surely
fitting for them, my lord and most loving father, not to disagree with one
another, but rather to cleave to each other, inseparably joined with the bond
of Christ. With God's consent we have held the office of kingship for some
time now, but we have not shown to the priesthood the proper justice and
honor in all things. To be sure, we have not borne in vain the avenging
sword of the power given us by God; yet we have not always unsheathed it
justly in judicial punishment against wrongdoers. Now, however, through
divine mercy, we have been stung by some remorse...we have sinned against
heaven and before you, and now we are not worthy to be called your son...not
only have we usurped ecclesiastical properties, but we have also sold the
churches themselves to unworthy men—men embittered with the gall of
simony—who have entered not by the door but by some other way; nor have
we defended the churches as we should have. And now, since alone, without
your authority, we cannot reform the churches, we earnestly seek your
counsel together with your help in these matters as well as in all our affairs.  

This was the one of the first pictures the new pope Gregory VII received of Henry IV; the
emperor voluntarily subordinating himself to the sacerdotium. It is doubtless a picture that
he remembered.

Gregory set about busily attempting reform and more importantly, consolidating his
position. He was determined to press the papacy's rights as a feudal suzerain, as the
following October 1074 to King Stephen of Hungary demonstrates:

Your letter to us arrived late owing to a delay on the part of your messenger.
It would have been more graciously received had not your ill-considered
condition been so grievously offensive to St. Peter. For, as you may learn
from the chief men of your country, the kingdom of Hungary was long since
offered and devoutly surrendered to St. Peter by King Stephen as the full
property of the Holy Roman Church under its complete jurisdiction and
control...you yourself know how much favor from St. Peter or good will from
ourself you can expect. You cannot receive these or hope to reign long
without apostolic reproof unless you correct your fault and acknowledge that
the scepter of the kingdom which you hold is a fief of the apostolic and not of
the royal majesty. For neither fear nor favor nor any respect of persons shall,
so far as in us lies, prevent us from claiming with God's help every possible
honor due to him whose servant we are.
Clearly, we are far from the days of the first conflict of *sacerdotium* and *imperium*, and are in a feudal, not an imperial culture. Gregory saw the papacy as not just a spiritual entity but a temporal one as well, with a full array of feudal rights. Thus he could chastise Stephen not only as a pope, but also as a feudal overlord. In addition to his feudal rights, Gregory zealously pursued his rights as head of the *sacerdotium*, as the following December 1074 letter to Otto, bishop of Constance demonstrates:

A report has come to us with regard to Your Fraternity, which I have heard with grief and regret—a report which, if it had been made to us by the lowest member of the Christian community, would undoubtedly have called for a severe disciplinary sentence. ... [W]e were striving to wipe out the heresy of Simony and to enforce the chastity of the clergy, inspired by apostolic authority and the authentic opinions of the holy fathers. ... To you also, who preside over the numerous clergy and the widespread population of the church of Constance, it has...seemed good to us to send a special letter under our own seal. With this as your authority you can more safely and boldly carry out your orders and expel from the Lord's holy place the heresy of Simony and the foul plague of carnal contagion.

Gregory here clearly not merely reforming the clergy, he is at the same time exerting control over them; the letter continues to reprimand Otto severely for his laxity and to demand his presence at a Lenten Synod to answer for "this disobedience and contempt of the Apostolic See." Gregory also clearly feels that his letter and seal, in effect, his authority alone, would be sufficient to guarantee the desired reforms. These rights, feudal control of his liegemen (even if they were kings) and doctrinal control of his bishops, did not cause undue controversy, but in the next year he produced something that did, the *Dictatus Papae*, of March 1075. The *Dictatus Papae* is not an in-depth work but rather a framework of headings to be elaborated upon. Despite its brevity, its 27 points contain some volatile propositions, for example:

3. That [the Roman pontiff] alone can depose or reinstate bishops.
8. That he alone can use imperial insignia.
9. That only the pope's feet are to be kissed by all princes.
12. That it is licit for him to depose emperors.
19. That he ought to be judged by no one.
27. That he can absolve subjects of wicked men from fealty.

These are the culminations of certain political themes of the *sacerdotium* which had been developing: the idea that the pope alone should control the affairs of the *sacerdotium*, that the pope could transfer empire, that the pope is above human law, and that the pope has...
the powers of excommunication, but when these conclusions were presented together in this
case, they seemed radical. Gregory compounded the situation by a critical letter to Henry
IV in December 1075:

It would have been becoming to you, since you confess yourself to be a son of
the Church, to give more respectful attention to the master of the Church,
that is, to Peter, prince of the Apostles. To him, if you are of the Lord's flock,
you have been committed for your pasture, since Christ said to him: "Peter,
feed my sheep" (John 21:17), and again: 'To thee are given the keys of
heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven
and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven' (Matt.
16:19). Now, while we, unworthy sinner that we are, stand in his place of
power, still whatever you send to us, whether in writing or by word of
mouth, he himself receives, and while we read what is written or hear the
voice of those who speak, he discerns with subtle insight from what spirit the
message comes. Wherefore Your Highness should beware lest any defect of
will toward the Apostolic See be found in your words or in your messages
and should pay due reverence, not to us but to Almighty God, in all matters
touching the welfare of the Christian faith and the status of the Church. And
this we say although Our Lord deigned to declare: "He who heareth you
heareth me; and he who despiseth you despiseth me" (Luke 10:16)." 

This is an elaboration of the ideas of Leo I, who first systematically considered the pope's
position as a successor of St. Peter. But to Henry IV in the eleventh century, these ideas
presented in this fashion were nothing less than inflammatory.

Naturally, Henry could not allow these claims to go unanswered. His response to
Gregory in 1076 contains, amidst numerous attacks on Gregory's character, a restatement
of the way the German imperium had traditionally regarded its legitimacy:

Henry, King not by usurpation, but by the pious ordination of God, to
Hildebrand, not now Pope, but false monk:...[Y]ou construed our humility as
fear, and so were emboldened to rise up even against the royal power itself,
granted to us by God. You dared to threaten to take the kingship away from
us—as though we had received the kingship from you, as though kingship and
empire were in your hand and not in the hand of God...You have also
touched me, one who, though unworthy, has been anointed to kingship among
the anointed. This wrong you have done to me, although as the tradition of
the holy Fathers has taught, I am to be judged by God alone and am not to
be deposed for any crime unless—may it never happen—I should deviate from
the Faith. For the prudence of the holy bishops entrusted the judgment and
the deposition even of Julian the Apostate not to themselves, but to God
alone. The true pope Saint Peter also exclaims, "Fear God, honor the king" (1
Peter 2:17). You, however, since you do not fear God, dishonor me, ordained
of him."

Henry's ideas are very like those of the Byzantine emperors as he here stresses that his
right to rule comes directly from God, and proclaims his immunity from judgment by any
other authority than God. However, this traditional argument proved somewhat less than satisfactory in the eleventh century, so in a letter to the German bishops of later the same year Henry modified an older idea into a new one:

[Without God's knowledge [Gregory] has usurped for himself the kingship and the priesthood. In this deed he held in contempt the pious ordinance of God, which especially commanded these two—namely the kingship and the priesthood—should remain, not as one entity, but as two. In his Passion, the Savior Himself meant the figurative sufficiency of the two swords to be understood in this way: When it was said to him, "Lord, behold there are two swords here," He answered, "It is enough" (Luke 22:38), signifying by this sufficient duality, that the spiritual carnal swords are to be used in the Church and by them every hurtful thing is to be cut off. That is to say, he was teaching that every man is constrained by the priestly sword to obey the king as the representative of God but by the kingly sword both to repel enemies of Christ outside and to obey the priesthood within. So in charity the province of one extends into the other, as long as neither the kingship is deprived of honor by the priesthood nor the priesthood is deprived of honor by the kingship."

Henry provides an interesting reinterpretation of the Gelasian formula as he here makes the first extensive use of the very famous two-swords allegory of the relation of sacerdotium and imperium, based on what we now recognize as uniquely medieval interpretation of Christ's words in Luke 22:38 (which we today recognize as more a curt dismissal of armed resistance rather than an exposition of political allegory). As noted before, the idea of the prince bearing a sword was not new (see Henry's 1073 letter), but it was here that the two-swords allegory was first expressed systematically. It was a crucial one that would be used later many times by many authors. In some ways, too, it resembles the Gelasian formula, without the inclusion of the notion of the superiority of the sacerdotium. But theorizing about the cooperation of sacerdotium and imperium had availed Henry little, for in the same year he was excommunicated by Gregory.

With an appeal to St. Peter and protesting his own lack of ambition, Gregory declared in February 1076:

I deprive King Henry, son of the emperor Henry, who has rebelled against thy Church with unheard-of audacity, of the government over the whole kingdom of Germany and Italy, and I release all Christian men from the allegiance which they have sworn or may swear to him, and I forbid anyone to serve him as king.
For a variety of reasons, Gregory's excommunication was successful. Henry's victory over the Saxons had made him unpopular with much of the German nobility, which had reason to fear a strong, centralized government. Furthermore, Gregory's appeal to the authority of St. Peter struck a chord among ecclesiastics; his own churchmen backed him up, and Henry's soon came over to the papal side. Part of the reason for Gregory's success was his own authority as pope; people did not lend as much credence to argument from scripture which came from the Emperor as they did to one which came from the pope (furthermore, arguments using such religious language could easily be turned back against the imperium, as Bernard of Clairvaux did to the two-swords allegory; see below). Henry was forced to back down and to agree to attend a diet at Augsburg in February 1077 where Gregory would consider whether he was fit to remain emperor. But in January of that year he made his way secretly to Canossa where Gregory was staying and begged him for absolution. The choice between responding as a pastor or as a politician must have been difficult for Gregory, but after three days of Henry's humiliation Gregory gave him absolution and released him from excommunication. This proved to be a disastrous political mistake; Henry regained many of his old supporters and the German princes formerly on Gregory's side deserted him and elected an Emperor on their own, Rudolph of Swabia. Civil war raged and Gregory remained neutral; he announced that he would choose which of the two candidates would be suitable to be emperor. But he took three years to make that choice. In 1080 he again excommunicated Henry IV, but he lacked the support he had earlier, as many blamed him for the civil war. Henry in turn summoned the Synod of Brixen, which declared Gregory deposed and set up the anti-pope Clement III (1080-1100). The decree of the Synod used language which echoed Henry's earlier two-sword allegory:

[T]he ever-unconquered king had allowed this madness to rage untouched for so long, when Paul, the vessel of election, witnesses that the prince does not carry a sword without cause and Peter, the first of the Apostles, cries out that the king not only is supreme but that the governors are to be sent by him specifically for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of the good. In fulfillment of these sayings it seemed just to this most glorious King and to his princes that the judgment of the bishops with the sentence of divine censure ought to issue against this Hildebrand before the material sword went forth against him, with the consequence that the royal power might resolve to prosecute him with greater force after the prelates had first deposed him from his proud prelacy.
Later that year Rudolph, the rival claimant, was killed in battle, and in 1081 Henry invaded Italy. In March of that same year Gregory wrote a long letter to Bishop Hermann of Metz, which explained his position:

Who does not remember the words of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ: "Thou art Peter and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. 16:19). Are kings exempted here? Or are they not of the sheep which the Son of God committed to St. Peter?30

Gregory continues the argument of the innate superiority of the sacerdotium voiced by Humbert before him. He goes on to quote various historical figures to support his position: Pope St. Gelasius I, Pope St. Julius I, Pope St. Gregory I, St. Ambrose, and Pope St. Symmachus I. He points out emperors and kings who had been excommunicated, and notes how base and vile the imperium is compared to the sacerdotium, also detailing the power the sacerdotium has as reflected by its ability to cast out demons and to administer the sacraments. But there was something of a flaw in this argument, which did not go unnoticed in Gregory's day; even though the sacerdotium may have had a higher position in the eyes of God than the imperium, and even though in the past popes and bishops had excommunicated emperors, nonetheless excommunication and deposition are two different things, and just because the papacy had done the former, it did not follow that it could do the latter. As Brian Tierney notes:

Whatever Gelasius meant by his famous pronouncement, he certainly did not maintain that he as pope could depose the emperor Anastasius; nor did it ever occur to St. Ambrose that he could depose Theodosius; nor, we may well suppose, did any such idea occur to St. Peter himself in connection with the emperor Nero. Ambrose and Gelasius both took for granted the existence of two separate orders of government, each with its own defined sphere of action. But the pattern familiar to Gregory was that of a unitary church-state. When Gregory read in his old texts of a superiority inherent in the spiritual power, he conceived of it as a superiority within a single, unified system of government, implying the hierarchical subordination of one power to the other. In this matter he seems to have been completely a captive of the conventional presuppositions of his own age.31

Gregory's second excommunication and rephrased theories failed to capture the support that his first efforts had and eventually he abandoned the deposition issue. Henry IV took Rome
in 1084 and Gregory's Norman allies arrived too late to save his position; instead they sacked Rome and took Gregory VII to Salerno, where he died in 1085.

The Investiture Controversy outlived Gregory, and continued in the political events of Europe and also in the writings of a number of individuals on both sides of the issue. As the rather shrill, vituperative words used above by Gregory and Henry to describe each other demonstrate, the Investiture Controversy spawned a new kind of writing, propaganda. In addition, the forces of imperium were, for the first time in history, really challenged to define themselves theoretically, and the forces of sacerdotium to respond. In short, the Investiture Controversy also witnessed the birth of another new kind of writing, the political pamphlet. It is the work of several of these writers, selected as representative, which we shall consider next. The most extreme views one way or the other came from the Norman Anonymous, sometimes referred to as the "Anonymous of York," writing circa 1100. He proceeds from the authority of Gelasius, but early in his work he makes a rather wise observation, which apparently had not occurred to previous authors:

The priestly authority and the royal power hold the principate of sacred government. Some seek to divide the principate in this fashion, saying that the priesthood has the principate of ruling souls, the king that of ruling bodies, as if souls could be ruled without bodies and bodies without souls, which cannot be done by any means. For if bodies are well ruled it is necessary that souls are well ruled too and vice versa, since both are ruled for this purpose, that at the resurrection they may both be saved together. With this unity of man in mind, the Norman Anonymous goes on to consider what authority is best suited to rule well, and opts for imperium. His is the closest to earlier caesaropapist ideas; he bases his ideas on the fact that Christ as Second Person of the Trinity was first a king, but only assumed the role of priest since the Incarnation, thus since authority flows from Christ, imperium is superior to sacerdotium. A king thus has lordship over the things of the world, and is fully entitled to invest a bishop, but by investiture really only distributes temporalities. Kings are superior to all members of the sacerdotium:

No one should take precedence by right over [the king], who is blessed with so many and such great blessings, who is made like unto God with so many and such great sacraments, for no one is consecrated and made like God with more and greater sacraments than he is, nor indeed with equivalent ones, and so no one is co-equal with him. ... It is not to be said that he is inferior to the bishop because the bishop consecrates him, for it often happens that lesser men consecrate a greater, inferiors their superior, as when
cardinals consecrate a pope or suffragen bishops a metropolitan. This can be done because they are not the authors of the consecration but the ministers. God makes the sacrament efficacious; they administer it.24

An opposite view of imperium comes from Manegold of Lautenbach (c.1030-c.1103), a supporter of Gregory VII who, writing circa 1080/1085, repeats many of Gregory’s ideas:

Since then it is evident from the aforementioned opinions of the holy fathers and from others, so numerous that it is irksome to include them, that the Roman Church is distinguished with such great authority and indeed excels all the principalities and powers of this world in its singular and incomparable dignity, and since, according to the harmonious witness of the holy fathers, no one is permitted to judge its judgments or reverse its sentences and no one may have the will or power to disobey its decrees, anyone who has not remained in communion with it is a stranger and a sinner and an enemy of God, and whatever is done against its discipline can in no wise be held lawful.25

Much of this text could have come straight from the Dictatus Papae. Manegold thus wholeheartedly supports the actions of Gregory took against Henry IV; later in the text he makes a veiled reference in an allegory to Henry, noting that if a person kept a swineherd who abused the swine, then that person was fully justified in withholding the swineherd’s wages and dismissing him.25 Manegold later makes an important challenge to the traditional interpretation of the nature of the imperium:

Since then no one can make himself an emperor or king, the people raise some man above themselves for these reasons, to rule and govern them by virtue of his just authority, to apportion to each his own, to protect the good, to repress the wicked and to deal out justice to all. If, however, he breaks the compact by which he was elected and ruins and confounds what he was established to order correctly, reason justly considers that he has absolved the people from their duty of submission to him since he first broke the bond of mutual fidelity by which he was bound to them and they to him.27

This idea denies the divine aspects of the imperium, and charges instead that it is merely inspired by men. Here we have a primitive form of the social contract theory, which would be more fully developed by later writers.

Our third writer comes from the side of imperium and is the author of the anonymous tract De Unitate Ecclesiae Conservanda, composed between 1090 and 1093. This tract’s arguments were well-constructed but it was very little known; one manuscript was discovered and formally published in 1519 by Ulrich von Hutten, and then lost.28
Nevertheless, it is worth examining, as it is an interesting attempt to turn the arguments of the sacerdotium back against the sacerdotium, viz:

If [Gregory's] words had been tempered with the charity that edifies, the breach with the rulers of the world that now exists would not have arisen since, as the holy Pope Leo writes, "There can be no general security unless the things that pertain to the profession of religion are defended by royal and priestly authority." So too Pope Gelasius declared, "Christ, mindful of human frailty, regulated with an excellent disposition what pertained to the salvation of his people. Thus he distinguished between the offices of both powers according to their own proper activities and separate dignities..." Since God Himself has thus arranged things and instituted these two, the royal power and the sacred authority of priests, by which this world is chiefly ruled, who can attempt to go against this except one who resists the ordinance of God?29

The unique thing about the De Unitate Ecclesiae Conservanda is that the author takes all of the examples cited by Gregory VII in his 1081 letter to Bishop Hermann of Metz and gives them a point-by-point refutation, turning them back against Gregory, as the above example demonstrates. The author thus resembles the Norman Anonymous, but seeks more of a balance between the two powers.

It is inevitable that within this genre of propagandistic literature, some individuals would propose solutions to the individual problem of lay investiture, even if they could not solve the larger problem of the conflict of sacerdotium and imperium. Ivo of Chartres (c.1040-1115) was one of them. Writing to the Archbishop of London in 1097, he noted:

[I]t does not seem that kings are prohibited by apostolic authority from installing [bishops] in bishoprics after canonical election has been held, for we read that supreme pontiffs of holy memory have sometimes interceded with kings on behalf of men elected to churches in order that the bishoprics to which they were elected might be granted to them by those same kings, and we read that others have delayed consecrations because royal installation did not follow the election. ... Why should it matter whether this installation is accompanied by hand or gesture, by word or by staff, when the kings do not intend to bestow anything spiritual but only to add their assent to the petition of the people, or to confer on the persons elected the ecclesiastical estates and other worldly goods which the churches receive through the munificence of kings.30

Ivo's suggestions are quite reasonable, and demonstrate a clear understanding of the differing nature and responsibilities of sacerdotium and imperium. Indeed, he seems to be a voice of reason in the whole Investiture Conflict, addressing the Holy See exasperatedly:

I do wish, together with many other devout persons, that the ministers of the Roman church, like experienced doctors, would concern themselves with curing the most grievous sickesses and not have to hear their mockers saying, "You strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. You pay tithes on mint
and anise and cummin but leave undone the weightier matters of the law" (cf Matt. 23:23-24).

Ivo’s ideas are followed very closely those of Hugh of Fleury (d.c.1118), who writes circa 1102/1104 in his Tractatus de Regia Potestate:

I think that a king, inspired by the Holy Spirit, can appoint a pious cleric to the honor of prelacy. The archbishop indeed ought to commit to him the care of souls. The most Christian kings and princes promoted holy men in the church according to this prudent custom down to our own times. ... After the election the elected bishop ought to receive from the king’s hand, not the ring and staff but the investiture of secular things, and he ought to receive from the archbishop, among his orders, the care of souls through the ring or staff, so that this kind of business may be carried through without dispute and the privilege of his authority may be maintained by both earthly and spiritual powers. If this is regularly observed, what our Savior commanded in the Gospel will be fulfilled—"Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and to God the things that are God’s" (Luke 20:16).

In fact, the solutions settled on in the Investiture Controversy were very similar to those proposed by Ivo and Hugh. But the most unusual solution to the problem came from an entirely different source, Pope Paschal II.

In 1111 the German Emperor Henry V (1106-1125) occupied Rome with his army, hoping for a formal coronation from Pope Paschal II (1099-1118) and a solution to the problem of the Investiture Controversy. Paschal did not disappoint him, and advocated a solution that was both bold and radical:

And so, most beloved son, King Henry--now through our office, by the grace of God, emperor of the Romans--we decree that those royal appurtenances are to be given back to thee and to thy kingdom which manifestly belonged to that kingdom in the time of Charles, Louis, and of thy other predecessors. We forbid, and under sentence of anathema prohibit, that any bishop or abbot, present or future, invade these same royal appurtenances. ... Nor shall they, henceforth, unless by favor of the king, concern themselves with those royal appurtenances. But neither shall it be allowed our successors, who shall follow us in the apostolic chair, to disturb thee or thy kingdom in this matter.

Paschal was thus acting as an extreme reformer; under his plan all temporal goods that had originally belonged to the imperium were to revert back to it. Bishops and abbots were thus to become solely ecclesiastical figures, rather than serving both sacerdotium and imperium:

Furthermore, we decree that the churches, with the offerings and hereditary possessions which manifestly did not belong to the kingdom, shall remain free; as, on the day of thy coronation, in the sight of the whole church, thou didst promise that they should be. For it is fitting that the bishops, freed from secular cares, should take care of their people, and not any longer be absent from their churches.
Bishops were thus to live solely on tithes and ecclesiastical revenues alone. Paschal's solution was a bold but logical plan for the *sacerdotium* to escape from domination by *imperium*. Both Paschal and Henry thought that the solution was reasonable, but when it was read out at the coronation proceedings, the bishops strenuously disapproved. Those in the Imperial party refused to be bound by it, and the cardinals criticized it most strenuously. Henry then took Paschal into custody, and secured from him a document confirming the accustomed right of Imperial investiture of bishops. However, this document was later rejected by members of the *sacerdotium* and by Paschal himself as having been produced under duress, and in 1112 Henry V was excommunicated by the Synod of Vienne. It fell to one of Paschal's later successors, Calixtus II (1119-1124), to negotiate the solution that was ultimately accepted. This solution was the famous Concordat of Worms, drafted in 1122. In form, it was similar to the solutions which had been voiced by Ivo of Chartres and Hugh of Fleury, involving a recognition of the temporal and spiritual nature of the bishop's office. Both Henry and Calixtus had to make compromises; Calixtus' were as follows:

I, Bishop Calixtus, servant of the servants of God, concede to you, beloved son Henry--by the grace of God August Emperor of the Romans—that the election of those bishops and abbots in the German kingdom who belong to the kingdom shall take place in your presence without simony and without any violence; so that if any discord occurs between the parties concerned, you may—with the counsel or judgment of the metropolitan and the co-provincials—give your assent and assistance to the party which appears to have the better case. The candidate elected may receive the "regalia" from you through the scepter and he shall perform his lawful duties to you for them. But he who is elected in other parts of the Empire shall, within six months, receive the "regalia" from you through the scepter and shall perform his lawful duties for them, saving all things which are known as pertaining to the Church. If you complaint to me in any of these matters and ask for help, I will furnish you the aid, if such is the duty of my office. I grant true peace to you and to all of those who are or have been of your party during this discord.

Henry stated his compromises thusly:

I, Henry, by the grace of God August Emperor of the Romans, for the love of God and of the Holy Roman Church and of the lord Pope Calixtus and for the healing of my soul, do surrender to God, to the Holy Apostles of God, Peter and Paul, and to the Holy Roman Church all investiture through ring and staff; and do agree that in all churches throughout my kingdom and empire there shall be canonical elections and free consecration. I restore to the same Roman Church all the possessions and temporalities ["regalia"]
which have been abstracted until the present day either in the lifetime of my father or in my own and which I hold; and I will faithfully aid in the restoration of those which I do not hold. ... And I grant a true peace to the lord Pope Calixtus and to the Holy Roman Church and to all who are or have been on its side. In matters where the Holy Roman Church would seek assistance I will faithfully grant it; and in those where she shall complain to me, I will duly grant justice to her.37

The choice and election of bishops thus fell to Calixtus and his successors, and after the the candidate was chosen, then Henry and his successors could invest him with lands and properties. However, the Emperor was permitted to attend the election of any bishop, and could refuse to accept homage from him, thus possessing a de facto veto power over the whole proceedings. Indeed, as Brian Tierney notes, "in practice, secular rulers continued to have a very large say in the appointment of their bishops all through the Middle Ages."38

The Investiture Controversy thus did not end in an absolute victory for imperium over sacerdotium or vice versa. As noted before, it is extremely difficult to say that there was even a clear victory for either sacerdotium or imperium. The sacerdotium secured the right to select its own leader, thanks to Nicholas I, and in so doing secured a greater control over itself and more freedom from the imperium. But at the same time the imperium still retained some level of control over the investiture of bishops, even if it was only a negative veto power. The imperium thus retained a slight dominance over the affairs of the sacerdotium, although the popes had re-established themselves as forces to be reckoned with. Furthermore, some old political arguments were given new life and some new ones created, all of which would provide ammunition for the conflict of future generations of sacerdotium and imperium. And conflict there would be, for the issues underlying the Investiture Controversy were left essentially unresolved. The final words of Calixtus and Henry in each of their statements above seem to promise a new golden age of love and cooperation between sacerdotium and imperium, seemingly along Gelasian lines. But it was the cooperation of an exhausted draw, and a cooperation that would not last.

Having examined the political theories that were formulated and argued during the second great conflict of sacerdotium and imperium, it is time to turn to the area of prophecy during the Investiture Controversy. There was, surprisingly, almost no use made of
prophetic figures during the Controversy, perhaps because the partisans on each side were making use of the new political pamphleteering and propaganda rather than the traditional standby of prophecy. The imperium retained a marginal control over the sacerdotium, and thus in the field of prophecy we still see imperium dominating through the figure of the Last World Emperor. However, the actions of the Gregorian reformers demonstrated that the papacy was becoming a power to reckon with, and insured that it would not be absent from eschatology for long. As Bernard McGinn notes:

Similarly, if the Pope was the universal leader of Christendom as the Gregorians claimed, surely he would not sit idle at the most crucial moment in sacred history. ... In giving the papacy a position of true leadership in the religious consciousness of Latin Christianity, the Gregorians proved the necessary, if not quite sufficient, cause for the apocalyptic role of the successors of Peter.38

Although there was a considerable amount of insulting and lionizing made by the political and polemical authors of the parties of both imperium and sacerdotium, none seemed willing to go to the extreme of calling their opponent the Antichrist or a World Savior. None, that is, except Benzo, bishop of Alba (d. 1090). Benzo was an extreme supporter of both the Emperor and the antipope who found himself dislocated by the Investiture Controversy. In 1076, he was driven from his see by papal supporters. His Panepvrikus, completed in 1086, is our first example of applied prophecy, for in chapter 1, section 15, he identifies the Last World Emperor prophecies to Henry IV:

Title: She spoke of Christ and also wrote down the lists of rulers, The ancient prophetess of Cumae, with inner rejoicing.

For a long road still remains to him [Henry IV] as the prophecy of the Sibyl testified. When Apulia and Calabria have been brought back to the former state, Bizas will see him crowned in his own land. Then he will lead and expedition to Jerusalem and having rescued the Sepulcher and the other sanctuaries of the Lord he will be crowned to the praise and glory of the One who lives forever and ever. Babylon in amazement will come to Sion desiring to lick the dust of his feet. Then will be fulfilled what is written: "And his sepulcher will be glorious" (Isa. 11:10). Caesar, why do you wonder about this? He who created you has decided without you what he will do in your case. You should say: "O Lord, my God, you have done many wonders; in your deep thoughts there is none like you" (Ps. 39:6). The Lord lives and "...He is my illumination" (Ps. 26:1). These things will take place as the song of the Sibyl foretells. You, fellow priests of the emperor's ear, do not think the Sibyl's words the voice of a screeching crow! Where you hear that the sea is to be crossed, you should thing upon deep things. If you are doubtful in any way "...ask in Abel..." (2 Sam. 20:18), and when the veil has been rent those things that were hidden will be clear.40
Benzo here makes clear use of the Tiburtine Sibyl, and follows the Last World Emperor pattern fairly closely. The reference to Bizas, the legendary founder of Byzantium, indicates that Benzo expected Henry to be crowned as the Byzantine as well as German emperor. Benzo is stressing the positive, and thus does not mention the Last World Emperor's surrender before the advent of Antichrist. It is also intriguing to see that Henry, addressed as "Caesar," is seen by Benzo as an unbelieving figure who needs to be convinced. In any case, it is obvious that Henry was not swayed.

Nor, for that matter, was Europe. For slightly more than a decade after Benzo wrote his words, Christian armies occupied Jerusalem during the First Crusade (1095-1099), thus actually achieving part of the goals of the program of the Last World Emperor. No great explosion of prophecies preceded or followed. It has been traditionally supposed that apocalyptic sentiments contributed largely to the motivations of the crusaders, but as the work of Carl Erdmann demonstrates, such notions have been greatly exaggerated. Even when there were apocalyptic motivations, these were often dismissed with scorn by leveller heads. Witness, for example, the account in the crusader chronicle of Ekkehard of Aura (d.1130), Hierosolymita. Under a chapter tellingly labelled "Pseudo-prophets and seducers in sheeps' clothing" he recounts how unto the crusader armies the Devil "aroused the false prophets and mixed together false brothers and disreputable women under the guise of religion." He goes on to recount quite a strange tale, noting that "From there arose that fabulous story about Charlemagne, as if he had been raised from the dead in his own body." Ekkehard's scorn makes it quite clear that he regards these individuals not as the prime movers of the Crusade, but as the lunatic fringe, about whom he feels that "because of their great apostasy, it is necessary that they be compelled to do penance." Essentially, as Bernard McGinn notes, "the crusade was not so much a result of apocalypticism as it was a notable stimulus to the revival of apocalyptic themes." We shall see this revival as prophecies mushroom during the next phase of conflict between the imperium and sacerdotium, the conflict between the papacy and the Hohenstaufen.
CHAPTER IV

THE CONFLICT WITH THE HOHENSTAUFEN

The relative peace following the Concordat of Worms proved to be short-lived. The German electors ultimately replaced the Salian dynasty with the Hohenstaufen in the person of Conrad III in 1138. Unlike his grandfather Henry IV, Conrad was never crowned emperor, nor was he a particularly strong ruler; his reign was turbulent and chaotic. But his nephew, Frederick, was a different story. Crowned emperor in 1152, Frederick I "Barbarossa" (1152-1190) sought to revive the imperial dream and lift the German imperium out of the sorry state into which it had fallen. And the conflict of imperium and sacerdotium, never really settled during the Investiture Controversy, began anew. This conflict between the papacy and the Hohenstaufen would be more savage than before, with greater import for the development of political theory and the eschatological figures of the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope. But before we turn to the events of Barbarossa's reign, let us examine some extremely important political works by writers on the side of sacerdotium which antedate his accession.

Our first writer is Hugh of St. Victor (c.1098-1142), a member of the Augustinian abbey of St. Victor, where he taught for most of his life. He was an unquestioned master of the works of St. Augustine, and he has been called "the most influential theologian of the twelfth century." His most important work is De sacramentis christianae fidei, written circa 1134, which advanced ideas that would prove extremely popular with later authors. It is a complex and wide-ranging work, using a meditation on the sacraments as a rubric under which Hugh presents an exposition of salvation history and a consideration of the nature of the world. In his lengthy considerations, Hugh presents an interpretation of human society that is most interesting; following St. Paul, he develops an organic theory for the nature of society. "Christ is the head, the Christian the member" he notes, spelling out
the source of organization. But for there to be organization, society, like a body, must have different parts that do different things:

Now just as in the human body all members individually have their own proper and separate offices and yet each one does not do what it alone does, so in the body of Holy Church the gifts of grace have been distributed, and yet each one does not have for himself alone even that which he alone has.

Hugh goes on to explain this by noting how all parts of the body function for the body as a whole, not each for themselves (e.g., eyes see for the whole body, not just for themselves). He defines Holy Church as "the aggregate of Christians," and continues his organic metaphor by maintaining that this aggregate "embraces two orders, the laics and clerics, as it were, two sides of one body." Each of these orders has a head; the laics have a king and the clerics have the pope, the former ruling temporal things, the latter ruling spiritual ones. This is all familiar material, but Hugh comes down squarely on the side of the sacerdotium when he asserts which order is superior:

Now the more worthy the spiritual life is than the earthly and the spirit more than the body, so much does the spiritual power precede the earthly or the secular in honor and in dignity.

Not only is the sacerdotium superior to the imperium, it was also involved in creating it, as Hugh continues:

For spiritual power has also to establish earthly power in order to exist, and it has to judge it, if it has not been good. Indeed, it itself was established first by God and when it goes astray it can be judged by God alone, just as it is written: "The spiritual man judgeth all things; and he himself is judged of no man" (1 Cor. 2). Now it is manifestly declared among that ancient people of the Old Testament where the priesthood was first established by God that spiritual power, in so far as it looks to divine institution, is both prior in time and greater in dignity; afterwards indeed royal power was arranged through the priesthood at God's order. Wherefore, in the Church sacerdotal dignity still consecrates regal power, both sanctifying it through benediction and forming it through institution. If then, as the Apostle says, "He who blesses is greater, and he who is blessed less," (Cf. Hebr. 7), it is established without any doubt that the earthly power which receives benediction from the spiritual is thought inferior by law.

Thus not only is the sacerdotium superior, it also has the power to judge the imperium and is immune from judgment in return—and all of this based on the authority of scripture and history. And to make it perfectly clear where the head of the sacerdotium got his authority, he notes in another work, "the pope holds the succession and place of Christ."
Our next author was certainly one of the most influential and outspoken writers of the twelfth century, St. Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153). As abbot of the Cistercian house at Clairvaux, he provided advice, welcome or not, to most of the major figures of his century. Master of "triumphant propaganda," he was, in the words of Walter Ullman, "the most consequent exponent of Christian cosmology." In other words, he was strictly on the side of the sacerdotium, completely and vocally. Most of Bernard's political ideas may be drawn from De consideratione, five small books of advice sent to the Cistercian pope Eugenius III (1145-1153) which were written from 1149 to 1153. However, it was not a systematic exposition of political theory; D.E. Luscome and G.R. Evans note that De consideratione was written in order to induce Eugenius to balance the monastic vocation with that of the papacy, to be authoritative and yet remain humble at the same time, considerations that are also very evident in the writings of St. Gregory the Great, another monk turned pope. They note that "Bernard was more concerned with the Pope's relationships with God and with the world in his charge." Bernard covers and expounds upon many of the common themes we have seen. Like Hugh of St. Victor, Bernard views the Church as an organic body, and he is careful to remind Eugenius that it must be governed properly and its members put in the proper places to assure harmony and correct function:

"You create a monster if you remove a finger from a hand and make it hang from a head, above the hand and on a level with the arm. So it is in the body of Christ if you put members in places other than where he arranged them." Bernard also describes the office of pope using several by now familiar terms. He notes how the pope is "called to the fullness of power." He interprets Peter's walk on the waters as a demonstration of the fact that Peter was "the unique vicar of Christ." And, presenting the story of Peter's leap into the water to greet the risen Lord while the other apostles waited for a boat, notes by this action how Peter "received not just a single ship to govern...but the whole world," presenting the image of pope as "gubernator" or steersman. Finally, Bernard makes use of Henry IV's two-swords allegory:

"You instruct me to feed dragons and scorpions, not sheep," you reply. Therefore, I say, attack them all the more, but with the word, not the sword. Why should you try to usurp the sword anew which you were once commanded to sheathe? Nevertheless, the person who denies that the sword
is yours seems to me not to listen to the Lord when He says, "Sheathe your sword" (Jn. 18:11). Therefore, this sword is also yours and is to be drawn from its sheath at your command, although not by your hand. Otherwise if that sword in no way belonged to you, the Lord would not have answered "That is enough," but, "That is too much," when the apostles said, "Behold, here are two swords" (Lk 22:18).

This passage seems to yoke together two varying ideas. Bernard is noting that the pope possesses the spiritual and temporal swords, but ought not use the temporal one. It is quite possible that here Bernard was upbraiding Eugenius III, who had led troops into battle. Bernard was very concerned that Eugenius concern himself with the proper things; elsewhere, concerning papal settlement of lawsuits, he noted distastefully:

These base worldly concerns have their own judges, the kings and princes of the world. Why do you invade someone else's territory? Why do you put your sickle to someone else's harvest? Not because you are unworthy, but because it is unworthy for you to be involved in such affairs since you are occupied by more important matters. On the other hand, where necessity demands it, listen not to me but to the Apostle: "If this world will be judged by you, are you unworthy to judge the smallest matters?" (1 Cor. 6:2).

Here again, Bernard yokes opposites; Eugenius ought not concern himself with temporal things (and base ones at that), but can if need be. It is in this spirit that he continues his exposition of the two swords allegory:

Both swords, that is, the spiritual and the material, belong to the Church; however, the latter is to be drawn for the Church and the former by the Church. The spiritual sword should be drawn by the hand of the priest; the material sword by the hand of the knight, but clearly at the bidding of the priest and at the command of the emperor. But more of this elsewhere. Now, take the sword which has been entrusted to you to strike with, and for their salvation wound, if not everyone, if not even many, at least whomever you can.

Bernard here turns Henry IV's allegory around, subordinating imperium to sacerdotium. Although he notes "More on this elsewhere," he did not develop the argument further in De consideratione, but he did restate it in a letter to Eugenius III concerning the failure of the Second Crusade:

Now, in the passion of the Lord both swords must be drawn, since Christ is suffering anew where he suffered on another occasion. By whom if not you? Both are Peter's; the one must be drawn at his nod, the other by his hand, as often as is necessary. And, about the one which seemed less his, Peter was told concerning that one, "Put your sword in its sheath." Therefore, even that one was his, but it was certainly not to be drawn by his hand.
In this fashion Henry's allegory was taken over by the sacerdotium. It would attain wide use, appearing in the works of later authors, culminating in Boniface VIII's Unam Sanctam. And it was put into practical effect by Bernard himself, for it was he who placed the banner of St. Peter into the hand of Conrad III at the cathedral of Speyer in 1146, commissioning him to go on the Second Crusade.23

Our third author was, in his area, as significant as our previous two. He was John of Salisbury (c. 1115/1120-1180), and he served in both the English and papal courts. Unique among our twelfth-century writers, John was a very self-conscious classicist. For example, in the work we shall consider, the Policraticus, he cites classical authors more than a thousand times, more frequently than he cites the Bible or the Fathers.24 Indeed, the fourteenth-century writer Vitalis de Furno assumed that the Policraticus was actually the product of a classical author.25 All of this was possible because John, despite his extensive practical political experience, makes little mention of contemporary affairs; it is entirely possible that he uses classical examples so much in order to make veiled attacks on individuals and situations he knew, whether out of a desire not to offend or for "reasons of prudence."25 At any rate, his work was extremely popular and was "extensively pillaged"26 by later authors. The Policraticus (an imaginary name invented by John to give his work a classical "feel"; most modern editions translate it as The Statesman's Book) itself is a rambling work covering a wide variety of topics. This format is due to the fact that it is actually a collection of essays written at different times and collected together as a gift for Thomas a Becket.27 In it John also develops an organic view of society, as did Hugh of St. Victor. John's metaphor of the body politic is more elaborate and charming than Hugh's: the head is the king, the soul the sacerdotium, the heart the senate, the senses the judges and governors, the hands the officials and soldiers, the sides the courtiers, the stomach and intestines the financial ministers, and the farmers and workmen the feet.28 Like Bernard, John makes use of the two swords metaphor, noting:

The sacred Gospel narrative bears witness that two swords are enough for the Christian imperium; all others belong to those who with swords and cudgels draw nigh to take Christ captive and seek to destroy his name.29
John here uses the word *imperium* in the sense of "commonwealth" or "society" and not "secular power" as it has been being used throughout this thesis. Following St. Paul, he notes elsewhere that "Not without reason (the prince) bears a sword, wherewith he sheds blood blamelessly." But John very closely follows Bernard’s ideas in delineating where the prince gets this sword:

This sword, then, the prince bears from the hand of the Church, although she has no sword of blood at all. Nevertheless she has this sword, but she uses it by the hand of the prince, upon whom she confers the power of bodily coercion, retaining to herself authority over spiritual things in the person of the pontiffs. The prince is, then, as it were, a minister of the priestly power, and one who exercises that side of the sacred offices which seems unworthy of the priesthood. For every office existing under, and concerned with the execution of, the sacred laws is really a religious office, but that is inferior which consists in punishing crimes, and which therefore seems to be typified in the person of the hangman.

Describing the secular authority in terms of a "hangman" reinforces its inferiority, and John reinforces this by relating the spurious story we have seen earlier recorded by Gregory I concerning Constantine’s refusal at the Council of Nicea to judge the bishops, calling them "gods." He mentions the figure of Melchisedech and also notes St. Ambrose’s excommunication of the emperor Theodosius to buttress his argument further. Finally, echoing Hugh of St. Victor, he notes:

Again, according to the testimony of the teacher of the gentiles, greater is he who blesses man than he who is blessed (Heb. 8:7); and so he in whose hands is the authority to confer a dignity excels in honor and the privileges of honor him upon whom the dignity is conferred. Further, by the reasoning of the law it is his right to refuse who has the power to grant, and he who can lawfully bestow can lawfully take away.

Even coming from a classical and thus different approach, John of Salisbury ends with the same conclusions about the nature of *sacerdotium* and *imperium* and their inter-relations that Hugh and Bernard derived before him. We can see in the example of these three writers that intellectually, the *sacerdotium* thus gained ground and some very powerful and persistent arguments in the wake of the Investiture Controversy and at the beginning of the Hohenstaufen Conflict.

Conflict between the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium* became inevitable with the accession of the German emperor Frederick I in 1152. Frederick wished to consolidate his
territories and ultimately control all of the traditional imperial territories, especially Germany and Italy, and in Italy, Rome. The papacy just as adamantly wanted to remain independent, fearing that the status of the Church might decline to a mere imperial bishopric if Frederick ruled Rome directly. The sacerdotium would not tolerate dominance by the imperium, and pursued a policy by which any lands held by the emperor in Rome "were held from the pope as from an overlord." But this policy created a dangerously unstable situation, one which exploded at the Diet of Besançon in 1157. The events which occurred there provide a good opportunity to examine how the sacerdotium and imperium came to regard themselves in the mid-twelfth-century.

Frederick had called a Diet of imperial vassals at Besançon in Burgundy, an imperial province. Two papal legates, one of them Rolandus Bandinelli, chancellor of the Roman church, came to the Diet to press the case for one Scandinavian archbishop Lund, who was held prisoner in Germany and whom Frederick had failed to liberate. They read out the letter they had brought from Pope Hadrian IV (1154-1159), which contained the following passage:

For you should recall, O most glorious son, before the eyes of your mind, how willingly and how gladly your mother, the Holy Roman Church, received you in another year, with what affection of heart she treated you, what great dignity and honor she bestowed upon you, and with how much pleasure she conferred the emblem of the imperial crown. ... Nor do we regret that we fulfilled in all respects the ardent desires of your heart; but if Your Excellency had received still greater benefits [beneficia] at our hand (had that been possible), in consideration of the great increase and advantage that might through you accrue to the Church of God and to us, we would have rejoiced, not without reason.

The trouble was occasioned by the word beneficia which meant "gift" or "benefit" as well as "fief"; the imperial chancellor Rainald, who was translating the letter into German for the benefit of the attending nobles, apparently chose to translate the word in the last sense. At this, Otto of Freising (c.1111-1158), from whose account this is drawn, calls to mind a mosaic in the Lateran of Lothair III kneeling before Innocent II and receiving from him certain Italian territories as fiefs. The mosaic had been made shortly after the actual event in 1133, and had an inscription reading

Coming before our gates, the king vows to safeguard the City,
Then, leigeman to the Pope, by him he is granted the crown.
The mosaic had offended Frederick I so much when he first saw it in 1155 that Hadrian promised to have it removed, but its memory obviously lurked large in imperial minds. They assumed that Hadrian had similar plans in mind for Frederick, and arose in an uproar when Hadrian's letter was read. Their anger was not placated when one of the legates (possibly Rolandus, although we are not sure) queried in response, "From whom does he have the empire, if not from our lord the pope?" In response, Frederick circulated a letter to the German bishops in October of 1158, which detailed the incident at Besançon, opening with the following address:

Considering that the Divine power, from which all other power in Heaven and on earth is derived, has committed to us, whom it had anointed, the kingdom and the Empire to rule over and has ordered the peace of the Churches to be preserved by Imperial arms, it is not without a great pain of our heart that we feel compelled to complain to your Grace that from the head of the Holy Church, to which Christ affixed the character of His peace and affection, causes of dissension, seeds of evil and the poison of a pestiferous disease seem to emanate; so that if God does not avert it, the whole body of the Church—as we fear—will be infected by them, its unity disrupted and a schism will occur between the kingdom and the priesthood.

Frederick's sharp words are in tone remarkably like those of Henry IV before him. And, like Henry, he claims that his right to the empire comes from God alone. He even goes on to articulate Henry's traditional two swords metaphor:

And as the kingdom and Empire belong to us, being granted to us through the election of the princes by God alone, Who has subjected the world in the passion of His Son Christ to the rule of the two necessary swords, and since the Apostle Peter has enlightened the world with this teaching, "Fear God, honor the king" (1Ptr. 2:17), whoever may say that we have obtained the Imperial crown as a benefice from the lord Pope, contradicts the Divine instruction and the teaching of Peter and shall be guilty of a lie.

In an earlier letter (February, 1158), he voices similar ideas, and comments on the Lothair mosaic:

In the chief city of the world God has, through the power of the empire, exalted the Church; in the chief city of the world the Church, not through the power of God, we believe, is now destroying the empire. It began with a picture, the picture became an inscription, the inscription seeks to become an authoritative utterance. We shall not endure it, we shall not submit to it; we shall lay down the crown before we consent to have the imperial crown and ourself thus degraded. Let the pictures be destroyed, let the inscriptions be withdrawn, that they may not remain as eternal memorials of enmity between the empire and the papacy.
Hadrian's first response to Frederick's accusations was an attempt to gain support among his bishops. He circulated a letter to them, which read in part:

[B]rethren...strive to lead back our aforesaid son to the right way as soon as possible. ... Let not our same son give heed to the counsels of the ungodly, let him consider what it behind and before (Ps. 139:5), and walk in that way in which Justinian and other Catholic emperors are known to have walked. For by imitating the example of those men he will be able to lay up for himself both honor on earth and blessedness in heaven.40

It is curious to note here how the caesaropapist emperor Justinian has come to be the epitome of the faithful Catholic emperor in Hadrian's mind; selective memory or wishful thinking, perhaps, on the part of the sacerdotium. Nonetheless, Hadrian's attempt was unsuccessful. The German bishops considered the matter, and Otto of Freising notes the conclusions to which they came:

The free crown of empire we ascribe solely to the divine beneficence (beneficium). We recognize first in the election the vote of the archbishop of Mainz, then those of the other princes, according to their rank; the anointing as king we recognize as the prerogative of the archbishop of Cologne; the final anointing, as emperor, indeed pertains to the supreme pontiff.41

In other words, the German bishops would support the traditional order of things and not the Papacy's ideas. His support crumbling, Hadrian's only way of salvaging the situation lay in a gesture of self-effacement. He wrote to the emperor in 1158 to provide the final "official" explanation of what had happened at Besançon, by defining what he had meant by beneficium:

[Among us beneficium means not a fief but a good deed. ... And indeed your Highness clearly recognizes that we placed the emblem of imperial dignity upon your head in so good and honorable a fashion that it merits recognition by all as a good deed. Hence when certain people have tried to twist that word and the following formula, namely, "we have conferred upon you the imperial crown," from its own proper meaning to another, they have this not on the merits of the case, but of their own desire and at the instigation of those who by no means love the concord of Church and state. For by "we have conferred" [contulimus] we meant nothing else than when we said before "we have placed" [imposuimus].42

Thus, with a little verbal dancing, Hadrian was able to salvage the situation. Sacerdotium caved in before imperium in this instance, not able to press claims which had been growing since Leo III's pontificate. But this did not guarantee concord between the two powers.
Hadrian died in 1159, but under his successor things were no better for Frederick. In the papal election, most of the cardinals chose as pope cardinal Rolandus Bandinelli, one of the two legates to the Diet of Besançon and certainly the least desirable candidate to Frederick. Three pro-imperial cardinals chose another pro-imperial candidate as an antipope, Victor III (1159-1164); it was this man that Frederick supported against Rolandus, who took the name Alexander III (1159-1181). There were no exact rules for majority and dissent in the papal election procedure, so despite the fact that the majority had supported Alexander III, Frederick nevertheless decided to call a council at Pavia in 1160 to decide who was to be pope. Although it must be noted that in the past emperors such as Constantine, Theodosius, Justinian, and Charlemagne had called councils, in this instance the sacerdotium had legitimate grounds for fearing that Frederick meant to begin dominating Church affairs. Alexander did not deign to attend the council, and naturally enough, Frederick chose Victor III as pope. But John of Salisbury did attend the council, and left for posterity a description of Frederick that gives us a good idea of how the sacerdotium viewed his actions and intentions:

It seems to me to make very little difference whom the presumption of the little Pavian convention supports, unless that the election of Alexander, if anyone doubted of it, is confirmed by the very testimony of the opposing party. ... I know what this German (i.e., Frederick) is attempting. For I was at Rome, under the rule of the blessed Eugenius, when, in the first embassy sent at the beginning of his reign, his intolerable pride and incautious tongue displayed such daring impudence. For he promised that he would reform the rule of the whole world, and subject the world to Rome, and, sure of success, would conquer all things—if only the favor of the Roman pontiff would aid him in this. And this he did in order that against whomever he, the emperor, declaring war, should draw the material sword—against the same the Roman pontiff should draw the spiritual sword. He did not find any one hitherto who would consent to such iniquity, and, Moses himself opposing—i.e. the law of God contradicting—he raised up for himself a Balaamitic pontiff, through whom he might curse the people of God.4

Victor was accepted as pope in all imperial areas, Alexander in the rest of Europe. Alexander was quickly driven out of Italy to take refuge in France. But as Brian Tierney notes, Alexander had an advantage in that "the Lombard cities were just as opposed to the imperial claims in Italy as the pope was."44 They formed the Lombard League and received Alexander’s support, successively revolting against Frederick until they won a decisive
victory at the Battle of Legnano in 1176. In 1177 Frederick signed the Peace of Venice, recognizing Alexander's claim and granting some autonomy for the Lombard cities. To prevent such confusion from happening again, Alexander promulgated a decree on papal elections, which decided "he shall be regarded as Roman Pontiff who shall be elected and received by two-thirds (majority)." In this contest, then, the sacerdotium soundly triumphed. Curiously enough, Alexander did not press his claims further. His only other major promulgation as pope was a prohibition on appeals from secular to ecclesiastical courts. It is quite possible that he realized he had obtained his victory over Frederick with the aid of secular rulers, and did not wish to issue claims which might antagonize them, as he had antagonized Frederick. Or perhaps it may have been because the question of papal claims was still being argued by a group of individuals known as Decretists.

As the previous note indicates, Alexander himself was a Decretist, one of that body of commentators on Gratian's Decretum, or Concord of Discordant Canons (completed c. 1140). Gratian, a Camaldolese monk about whom little is known, compiled his work as an attempt to present contradictory statements on canonical problems and then, through the dialectical method, reconcile them and demonstrate that there was in fact no actual contradiction. As might be expected, he was not completely successful in reconciling many direct opposites, and the way was paved for hundreds of later commentators and interpreters on his work, some famous, some anonymous, but most centered around the schools at Bologna, Paris, and Oxford. Many arguments on the proper relationship of sacerdotium to imperium were formulated by these Decretists, and they were not arguing in a vacuum, for as Brian Tierney notes, many of them "became bishops or royal administrators; they were consulted on legal and constitutional problems, they had among their pupils future cardinals and popes." Thus for the Decretists, theory influenced practice and vice versa. It would be impossible to summarize all of Decretist thought in a short or even long space; much of their work even today remains unprinted. But as a sample, let us consider the following two distinctiones.
In Distinctio 22, Causae 1, Gratian notes that the Church was founded by Jesus, who "conferred simultaneously on the blessed key-bearer of eternal life the rights over a heavenly and an earthly kingdom." Two of the commentators on this passage provide excellent examples of the opinions of the sacerdotium and the imperium on the subject. Commenting circa 1157-1159 in favor of the former is Rufinus (fl. 1150-1191), a teacher of canon law at Bologna who eventually became archbishop of Sorrento circa 1180:

Hence the supreme pontiff holds rights over the earthly kingdom as regards authority in this fashion. He first by his authority confirms the emperor in his earthly kingdom by consecrating him and then, by his sole authority, imposes penance on him as on other laymen if they abuse their temporalities and, after they have done penance, absolves them. Truly the prince has the authority of ruling secular things after the pope, and the duty of administering them apart from him, for the apostle ought not to manage secular affairs nor the prince ecclesiastical ones.

This represents a rather balanced interpretation of the Gelasian formula, and although the sacerdotium is presented as more important, the imperium retains some measure of independence and is not completely subordinated. A more forceful declaration in favor of the imperium was written circa 1181-1185 by an anonymous French Decretist commenting on the same Distinctione:

Nevertheless to us the contrary seems true for these reasons. There were emperors before there was any pope and they had power then, for all power is from the Lord God. Again, before he is consecrated as emperor, the emperor can use the sword by virtue of his election by the people who "transfer to him and on him all right and power" (Digest, 1.4.1). Again, how can the pope bestow on him the power of the sword if or its exercise when he himself does not have it, and is not competent to have it or exercise it. ... What then does the emperor receive from the pope when he is anointed? Confirmation of the power already received, or permission to exercise it in the capacity of an emperor.

Here we see someone on the side of the imperium re-stating the ideas we have heard before; the pre-existent nature of imperial rule and the idea that imperial power comes directly from God. The positions of Rufinus and the French Anonymous became fairly standard, and can be observed in the expositions of later Decretists. For example, let us first consider the work circa 1202 of Alanus Anglicus (fl. 1190-1215), a canon law teacher at Bologna:

But in truth and according to the Catholic faith, [the emperor] is subject to the pope is spiritual matters and also receives his sword from him, for the right of both swords belongs to the pope. This is proved by the fact that the Lord had both swords on earth and used both as it is mentioned here, and he established Peter as his vicar on earth and all Peter's successors. Therefore
today Innocent has by right the material sword. If you deny this you are saying that Christ established a secular prince as His vicar in this regard. Again Peter said to the Lord, "Behold, here are two swords" (Lk. 22:38), so the material sword too was with Peter. Again if the emperor was not subject to the pope in temporalities he could not sin against the church in temporalities. Again the church is a body and so it shall have only one head or it will be a monster. This opinion is not invalidated by the fact that there were emperors before there were popes, because they were only de facto emperors and none except those who believed in the true God had a right to the sword; nor do infidel rulers have it nowadays.81

Alanus restates familiar ideas and adds Bernard's quaint metaphor about the two-headed beast. However, he does not just restate old ideas; note at the end how he answers the argument of the Norman Anonymous from above. Now let us go on to consider the work circa 1189-1191 of Hugaccio (fl. 1180-1210), a teacher of canon law at Bologna and later Bishop of Ferrara, who notes how the offices of emperor and pope were unified before the coming of Christ, but were separated by Him:

I believe, however, that the emperor has the power of the sword and the imperial dignity from election by the princes and people, as at Dist. 93 c.24, for there was an emperor before there was a pope, an empire before a papacy. Again the words, "Behold, here are two swords" (Lk. 22:38), were spoken to symbolize the fact that the two powers, namely the apostolic and imperial, are distinct and separate. If, therefore, it is anywhere stated or implied that the emperor has the power of the sword from the pope, I understand it as meaning the unction and confirmation which he has from the pope when he swears fidelity to him; for before this, although he is not called emperor, he is an emperor as regards dignity though not as regards unction, and before that he has the power of the sword and exercises it.82

Huggucio's ideas are also traditional for the imperium, and are nearly identical with those of the Norman Anonymous. In summation, then, the Decretists provided a forum for the restatement and development of ideas concerning the sacerdotium and the imperium. Much of their work would be used by later writers.

Developments continued within the political sphere. The agreement reached by the Peace of Venice held for a while, and there were a few years of peace between the sacerdotium and the German imperium, or at least little overt conflict. Frederick I died on crusade in 1190 and Henry VI (1190-1197) succeeded him. He did little to trouble the sacerdotium, but Frederick had arranged his marriage to the daughter of Roger II of Sicily, making him an heir both to the Empire and kingdom of Sicily and keeping papal fears of expansion by the imperium alive. In the year after his death, 1198, two powerful figures
came into play, the emperor Otto IV (1198-1218) and pope Innocent III (1198-1217). And
the conflict between sacerdotium and imperium broke out anew. The German electors had
been unable to decide on one candidate, and Innocent had assisted the accession of Otto over
the other candidate, Philip of Hohenstaufen (1198-1208), brother of Henry VI. Both
Innocent and a substantial number of the German electors feared the establishment of an
hereditary dynasty. In return for Innocent's support, Otto signed the Convention of Neuss
in 1202 whereby he renounced all claims to German lands south of the Alps. Philip fought
his exclusion and nearly defeated his rival, but was suddenly murdered in 1208. In 1209
Otto underwent formal coronation and then summarily broke the Convention of Neuss by
attacking southern Italy and Sicily, lands belonging to Frederick, Henry VI's son and a
papal ward. Innocent excommunicated Otto in November of 1210, and helped to get young
Frederick elected emperor at Nuremberg in September of 1211. Otto gradually lost support
until he was deposed as king in 1215 and died in 1218. Innocent supported Frederick in
the 1212 and 1216 elections in return for a promise from him to keep the imperial lands
and the kingdom of Sicily separate. Frederick agreed, promising to let his young son Henry
rule Sicily. In 1220 Frederick was crowned in Rome.

During his pontificate, Innocent proved to be a figure of controversy, as much so to his
contemporaries as to scholars today. In his letters, he referred to himself in extremely
elevated terms. One of his sermons, for example, in its consideration on the office of the
papacy invokes the by now familiar "plenitude of power" and refers to the pope as "vicar of
Jesus Christ...set between God and man, lower then God but higher than man, who judges
all and is judged by no one."²³ Innocent was sure that his power came directly from God, as
the following decretal excerpt concerning disciplinary action against a bishop indicates:

God, not man separates a bishop from his church because the Roman pontiff
dissolves the bond between them by divine rather than human authority,
carefully considering the need for and usefulness of each translation. The
pope has this authority because he does not exercise the office of man, but
that of the true God on earth.²⁴

Innocent's correspondence also displays such elevated language. An 1198 letter to the
archbishop of Ravenna notes, "Ecclesiastical liberty is nowhere better cared for than where
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the Roman church has full power in both temporal and spiritual affairs." And another letter, to the patriarch of Constantinople in 1199, says that Peter was given "not only the universal church but the whole world to govern." And a letter to the emperor Alexius II (1195-1203) of Constantinople in 1201 quotes Christ's words in Matt. 16:19 "Whatsoever you bind on earth, etc." and points out that Christ was "excepting nothing when He said 'Whatsoever.'" Innocent's ideas on the relationship of sacerdotium and imperium can be handily summed up by an allegory of his that was to become nearly as popular as the two-swords allegory:

Just as the founder of the universe established two great lights in the firmament of heaven, a greater one to preside over the day and a lesser to preside over the night, so too in the firmament of the universal church, which is signified by the word heaven, he instituted two great dignities, a greater one to preside over souls as if over day and a lesser one to preside over bodies as if over night. These are the pontifical authority and the royal power. Now just as the moon derives its light from the sun and is indeed lower than it in quantity and quality, so too the royal power derives the splendor of its dignity from the pontifical authority.

This sun-moon allegory clearly puts the imperium in a subordinate and inferior position to the sacerdotium, providing by allegory the idea which we have seen that the imperium derives its power from the sacerdotium. It is thus easy to conclude from these writings and from Innocent's actions as pope, such as his expansion of the territories of the Papal States and of his control over the city of Rome, that he was a hierocrat of the strictest sort, devoted to the absolutist papal control of all government.

Such a conclusion becomes difficult to maintain if we consider the tone of some of Innocent's other works. In his younger days, Innocent was a student of Hugaccio of Pisa, a moderate if not actively pro-imperium writer. Innocent published the first official collection of decretals, the Comnpletionis tertia, in 1209, and wrote many decretals of his own. Much of his thought on the relationship of sacerdotium and imperium can be derived from these decretals, many of which contain some interesting reservations. The decretal Per venerabilem (1202) was occasioned by a request of Innocent by Count William of Montpellier to legitimize two of his children, just as Innocent had done for King Philip II (1180-1223). Innocent declined to do for William what he had done for the king, noting:

Inspired by these considerations, we conceded the favor to the king as we had been requested, holding it both from the Old and the New Testament that it is not only in the States of the Church--where we have full power in
temporal matters—but also in other countries that we can occasionally exercise the temporal jurisdiction in certain cases, after having previously examined. This does not mean that we want to prejudice the rights of anybody else or usurp any power which does not belong to us because we do not ignore that Christ replied in the Scripture: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's"; consequently, when He was asked to divide an inheritance between two claimants, He said: "Who hath appointed me judge or divider over you?" 

Far from being an absolutist, Innocent here claims the right to intervene directly only in the affairs of the Papal States, and by noting the phrase "in certain cases" placed great limitations on the papacy to intervene in secular matters. Furthermore, he had nothing to gain in this decision; it alienated William, who was a noted opponent of the Albigensians of southern France. In time, this decretal would be used against the sacerdotium, for later lawyers interpreted portions of it to mean that Innocent's actions on behalf of Philip II meant that the French kingdom was consequently entirely independent of the German Empire. Thus in a curious way, Innocent helped lay the foundations for the formation of the national state, and the particular state he would help create would later plague his successors, as we shall see below. Another decretal, Novit ille (1204) resulted from hostilities over feudal grievances between Philip II and John Lackland of England (1199-1216), both of whom Innocent wished to see stop quarreling and go on the Fourth Crusade. The decretal gave a rationale by which the papacy could intervene in a purely feudal dispute:

No one, therefore, may suppose that we intend to disturb or diminish the jurisdiction or power of the illustrious king of the French just as he does not want to and should not impede our jurisdiction and power. ... For we so not intend to render justice in feudal matters, in which the jurisdiction belongs to him, unless something may be detracted from the common law by some special privilege or contrary custom, but we want to decide in the matter of sins, of which the censure undoubtedly pertains to us, and we can and must exercise it against anyone. ... In this, indeed, we do not lean on human considerations, but much more on Divine law, because our power is not from man but from God: anyone who has a sound mind knows that it belongs to our office to draw away any Christian from mortal sin and, if he despises the correction, to coerce him with ecclesiastical penalties. ... We are thus entitled to wield the power to proceed in this manner in any criminal sin, in order to recall the sinner back from vice to virtue and from error to truth, and particularly so if sins are committed against peace which is the bond of charity.
This papal ability to intervene in an affair *pro ratione peccati* can be seen two ways: either it is a severe limitation by the *sacerdotium* on its own practical power, or it is an attempt by the *sacerdotium* to expand its power, since so very many of the disputes of the Middle Ages involved sin in one form or another. In short, *Novit ille* proved to be rather elastic, depending upon who was interpreting it. A third and very important decretal, *Venerabilem fratrem* (1202), was composed as a result of the imperial civil war between Philip of Hohenstaufen and Otto IV. The decretal, originally a letter, was directed to the Duke of Zaebringen, leader of the Hohenstaufen party, and contains Innocent's position toward the German *imperium*:

> Just as we—who owe justice to particular persons according to the service connected with the Apostolic office—do not want our justice to be usurped by others, so we do not wish to vindicate to ourselves the rights of the princes. Wherefore we recognize, as we should, the right and power of those princes to whom it is known to pertain by right and ancient custom to elect a king who is subsequently to be promoted to the dignity of Emperor; and particularly so as this right and power has come to them from the Apostolic See, which had transferred the Roman Empire from the Greeks to the Germans in the person of Charlemagne. But on the other hand, the princes should recognize, and they actually do recognize, that the right and authority to examine the person elected as king—who is to be promoted to the office of Emperor—belong to us, who anoint, consecrate, and crown him.62

This decretal clearly recognizes the rights of the electors, but by invoking the old transfer of empire idea gives the *sacerdotium* the important power to veto an imperial candidate, much as the *imperium* retained the veto power over the candidate for a bishopric after the Investiture Controversy. The transfer of empire notion also subordinates the power of the electors to the *sacerdotium*, for it notes that their ability to elect a king was delegated to them from the *sacerdotium* in the first place. Moreover, further on in the decretal Innocent notes that he retains the right to choose an emperor if the electors are deadlocked, and also admonishes them to cease their recalcitrance and adopt his chosen candidate Otto.

Innocent thus presents a somewhat contradictory figure. On the one hand he is a papal autocrat, on the other a pope willing to place great limitations on his power. We have the individual who accepted all of England from King John as a papal fief,63 but we also have the individual who acted with the following reservation noted by J. Watt:
If, as Cheney has suggested, Innocent III intended to claim direct power in political as well as ecclesiastical matters over his new vassal state, the pretension was never actualized either by him or his successors. In actual practice, Innocent did not interfere in the affairs of any country save the Papal States and, to a lesser degree, England, both of which were his legitimate feudal possessions. Furthermore, this master statesman always remained deeply concerned about religious affairs as well as political ones, as his patronage of St. Francis of Assisi (1182-1226) and his convocation of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) demonstrate. We can thus conclude, along with other scholars, that Innocent did not proceed from absolutist motives but rather that he maintained some fairly traditional ideas and remained conscious of a need for balance and restraint. His works, however, did lay a foundation for much work by later papal expansionists.

Innocent's protection and support of Frederick II (1220-1250) was doubtless an attempt to protect the sacerdotium, but in assisting Frederick to the imperium, he helped create the deadliest enemy the sacerdotium ever knew. The reign of Frederick II witnessed the fiercest and most intense struggle between sacerdotium and imperium yet. During this conflict, Frederick was bitterly opposed by two very skilled and unyielding popes, Gregory IX (1227-1241) and Innocent IV (1243-1254), who were every bit as efficient administrators and every bit as unwilling to compromise as he was. Though their conflict took on religious and even apocalyptic aspects (see below), Brian Tierney notes that "all this could not hide the fact that their quarrel with the emperor was a political one." Frederick proved to be a man of exceedingly rare ability whom the sacerdotium would have found uncomfortable but perhaps endurable as ruler of Sicily, but certainly not as the ruler of all Italy. The trouble began with Frederick's coronation as emperor by Innocent's successor, the mild-mannered Honorius III (1216-1227). Frederick had not surrendered his Sicilian possessions to his son as he had promised, but Honorius did not press the issue, and Frederick spent the years from 1220 to 1226 reorganizing his lands and building an efficient centralized government under his rule. In 1225 he married Isabella of Jerusalem and obtained a claim on that kingdom. He did not make preparations for a crusade to make good that claim until 1227,
and when preparations had been made, he neglected to go, citing ill health. Piqued, Pope Gregory IX censured his conduct and excommunicated him in September of 1227, renewing the excommunication in March of 1228. Frederick finally left on crusade in June of 1228 after Gregory had freed his Sicilian subjects from their feudal oaths. With Frederick away, Gregory declared a crusade against him and ousted the imperial administrator from the Papal States. Frederick regained a portion of the Holy Land in a surprising new way, by treaty rather than conquest, and returned in June of 1230 to have his excommunication reinforced for having presumed to go on crusade while excommunicated. He responded by conquering a portion of the Papal States. In July of that year after a series of negotiations, a treaty was worked out, the Peace of San Germanio. Frederick agreed to return Gregory's lands and Gregory agreed to allow Frederick's subjects to return to feudal obedience. However, this peace proved to be only a short-lived compromise.

In 1231 Frederick, like Justinian before him, issued a series of law codes, the Constitutions of Melfi, also called the Liber Augustalis. Like the Digest, they provide us with an example of the codifier's attitude toward the nature of the imperium. In the introduction to the Liber Augustalis, Frederick notes why the institution of imperium exists. Mankind, originally created good, through original sin found himself embroiled in conflicts:

Thus man, whom God created virtuous and simple, did not hesitate to involve himself in disputes. Therefore by this compelling necessity of things and not less by the inspiration of Divine Providence, princes of nations were created through whom the license of crimes might be corrected. And these judges of life and death for mankind might decide, as executors in some way of Divine Providence, how each man should have fortune, estate, and status. Frederick thus maintained the traditional idea that the existence of the imperium was predicated by the innate evil of men, and that it existed as a brake on that evil. Princes also had a special role to fulfill regarding the sacerdotium:

The king of kings and prince of princes demands above all from their hands that they have the strength to render account perfectly of the stewardship committed to them so that they do not permit the Holy Church, the mother of the Christian religion, to be defiled by the secret perfidies of slanderers of the faith. They should protect her from attacks of public enemies by power of the secular sword.
The *Liber Augustalis* is concerned in several points with the problem of heresy, as was Frederick himself; it was he, after all, who instituted the practice of burning heretics alive.8 8 Frederick here clearly makes use of the two-swords allegory, but by no means accepts the idea that the papacy held both swords, as is evident from the continuation of the passage:

Thus we, whom He [Christ] elevated beyond hope of man to the pinnacle of the Roman Empire and to the sole distinction of the other kingdoms at the right hand of the divine power, desire to render to God a twofold payment for the talent given to us (cf. Matt. 25:14-30) out of reverence for Jesus Christ, from whom we have received all we have.7 9

The notion that the power of the emperor received his power from God alone was a traditional one in the ideological armory of the imperium, and though we have seen it before, the way it is presented here is in the rather lofty tones that the sacerdotium usually reserved for itself. Gregory was not pleased by Frederick's ideas and actions, and was concerned about ecclesiastical liberties in the Empire. Frederick did nothing to mollify him.

In 1234 the Romans revolted, and in 1235 Frederick suppressed a rebellion by his son, Henry. The provinces and areas in the Lombard League, which had fought imperial encroachment during the Investiture Controversy, now fought Frederick II. In the midst of this struggle we find Gregory reprimanding Frederick in a letter of October, 1236. Gregory first makes use of the Donation of Constantine:

It is publicly obvious to the whole world that the aforesaid Constantine, who had received the exclusive monarchy over all parts of the world, decided as just--with the unanimity of all and with the full consent of the whole Senate and people, established not only in the City of Rome but in the whole Roman Empire--that as the vicar of the Prince of Apostles governed the empire of priesthood and of souls in the whole world so he should also reign over things and bodies throughout the whole world; and considering that he should rule over earthly matters by the reigns of justice to whom--as it is known--God had committed on earth the charge over spiritual things, the Emperor Constantine humbled himself by his own vow and handed over the Empire to the perpetual care of the Roman Pontiff with the Imperial insignia and scepters and the City and Duchy of Rome, which you endeavour now to disturb by distributing money in it following in this the example of him who "will drink up a river and not wonder; he trusteth that the Jordan will run into his mouth" (Job 40:18).7 1

This version of the Donation places particular stress on the idea of papal rule of "the whole world"; after it, Gregory goes on to refer to the translation of empire and some ritual details of imperial coronations:
Whence later in the person of the aforesaid Charlemagne who thought that the difficult yoke imposed by the Roman Church should be carried with pious devotion, the Apostolic See transferred the judgment-seat of the Empire to the Germans, placed it upon your predecessors and your own person, as you will admit that it happened by means of consecration and anointment—although reducing in nothing the substance of its own jurisdiction—and conceded to them the power of the sword in the subsequent coronation; you should therefore realize that you will clearly stand convicted of infringing the rights of the Apostolic See and your own faith and honor as long as you do not recognize your own creator.72

Gregory's position here clearly lacks the informed self-restraint characteristic of Innocent; in his view, the imperium is very clearly a creation of the sacerdotium. The Donation of Constantine had not been used in political theory for a while, and it was a somewhat weak argument for Gregory to advance, for not only was its authenticity being called into question by this time, but also there was a hole in it—if an emperor could give such a gift, there was no reason why an emperor could not retract it. Gregory lost a great deal of support in 1237 when Frederick defeated the Lombard League at the Battle of Cortenuova. Peace negotiations between Frederick and Gregory began in August 1238, but were broken off by Gregory when Frederick invaded Sardinia, a papal possession. In March of 1239, Gregory again excommunicated Frederick and absolved his subjects of their oaths of fidelity.73 There followed a war of words and flurry of name-calling that was worse than in any previous conflict of sacerdotium and imperium. Gregory was the first to take the situation to apocalyptic levels. In a June, 1239 letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury he painted Frederick in the colors of the Beast from Revelation 12:1-2:

The beast filled with the names of blasphemy has risen up from the sea. With the feet of a bear, a mouth like a lion, and the rest of his limbs like a leopard, in his rage he has opened his mouth to blaspheme the divine name (Rev. 13:1-2). He even hurls like darts against God's tabernacle and against all the saints who dwell in heaven. He desires to break all things to pieces with this iron hooves and teeth and to tread everything underfoot. At one time he prepared secret battering rams against the faith; now he constructs the war machines of the Ishmaelites in the open, he arranges stratagems to carry off souls, he rises up in his true form against Christ, the Redeemer of the human race, the tables of whose Law he has already tried to abolish with the pen of wicked heresy.74

Following this, the charge of heresy became a common complaint from the sacerdotium against Frederick. Not to be outdone by these words, Frederick demonstrated in his
response of July 1239 that he, too, could make use of apocalyptic elements. He first he
made use of the now-familiar sun-moon allegory:

In the very beginning of the world, the wise and ineffable providence of God, whose counsels are secret, set up two lights in the firmament of heaven, a
greater and a lesser: the greater to rule the day and the lesser to rule the
night. The two are set up in such a manner in their own places in the zodiac
that even if they are often placed side-by-side, the one does not interfere with
the other; rather, the higher shares his brightness with the lower. By means
of a similar eternal provision God wished there to be two powers in the
firmament of the earth, the priesthood and the empire, the one for security,
the other for protection, so that man, who was for too long separated into the
two components of body and soul, should be restrained by double bonds, and
the world have peace when all excesses have been curbed.7 8

The use of this allegory displays an intriguing stratagem on Frederick's part; in presenting a
traditional view of medieval world order, he was able to represent himself as the principle
upholding it, and could go on to demonstrate that by disturbing this order, Gregory was the
one who was truly the Antichrist:

The Roman pontiff of our time, a Pharisee sitting in the seat of false doctrine
and anointed with the oil of evil beyond all his fellows, has stopped following
the heavenly order and strives to abolish all this. Perhaps he thinks he can
exhort those higher bodies that are governed by nature and not by human
will. He intends to bring the radiance of our majesty into eclipse while
turning truth to falsehood in papal letters full of lies sent out to various
parts of the world attacking the purity of our faith from sophistry and not
from true reason. He, who is pope in name alone has said that we are the
beast rising from the sea full of the names of blasphemy and spotted like a
leopard. We maintain that he is the monster of whom we read: "Another
horse rose from the sea, a red one, and he who sat thereon took away peace
from the earth so that the living slaughtered one another" (Rev. 6:4)...he is
that great dragon who leads the world astray (Rev. 12), Antichrist, whose
forerunner he says we are.76

Frederick backed these words up with an invasion of the Papal States, which prompted a
fierce denunciation from Gregory:

What other Antichrist should we await, when as is evident in his works, he
is already come in the person of Frederick? He is the author of every crime,
stained by every cruelty, and he has invaded the patrimony of Christ seeking
to destroy it with Saracen aid.77

In response to this threat, Gregory decided to call a Church council. Frederick prevented it
from happening by waging a naval battle and defeating the papal fleet, seizing the French
bishops and cardinals who were on their way to the council. This outraged Gregory, but he
had little time to take any action, as he died in August.
Frederick was determined to have a more pliant pope on the papal throne. Gregory's successor Celestine IV (1241) lasted only seventeen days, and it was a good two years until Innocent IV (1243-1254) was elected. In Innocent, Frederick appeared to have obtained his wish; Innocent's pontificate began on a conciliatory note. Sacerdotium and imperium began a series of negotiations which culminated in a tentative agreement in March of 1244. This agreement, however, did not last and Frederick came to realize that Innocent was just as intractable as Gregory had been. Innocent fled Italy for the city of Lyons, which although nominally under imperial control, was actually independent. There Innocent could count on the protection of the highly pious French king St. Louis IX (1226-1270). Innocent called the Council of Lyons in 1245. Frederick tried to counter by calling an Imperial Diet in the same year, but to no avail. The Council had many points of business on its agenda, but chief among them was the struggle with Frederick II. With the Council behind him Innocent issued a proclamation in July of 1245 which accused the emperor of several serious charges:

He [Frederick] has committed four very grave offenses, which cannot be covered up by any subterfuge (we say nothing for the moment about his other crimes); he has abjured God on many occasions; he has wantonly broken the peace which had been re-established between the Church and the Empire; he has also committed sacrilege by causing to be imprisoned the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church and the prelates and clerics, regular and secular, of other churches, coming to the Council which our predecessor had summoned; he is also accused of heresy not by doubtful and flimsy but by formidable and clear proofs.7 8

The bull then goes on to detail at considerable length each one of these four charges, paying special attention to the state of poverty inflicted by Frederick on the Church in the papal feif of Sicily, and concludes with an expression of the traditional papal authority:

We therefore, who are the vicar, though unworthy, of Jesus Christ on earth and to whom it was said in the person of blessed Peter the Apostle: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth," etc., show and declare on account of the above-mentioned shameful crimes and of many others, having held careful consideration with our brethren and the holy Council, that the aforesaid prince—who has rendered himself so unworthy of all the honor and dignity of the Empire and the kingdom and who, because of his wickedness, has been rejected by God from acting as king or Emperor—is bound by his sins and cast out and deprived of all honor and dignity by God, to which we add our sentence of deprivation also. We absolve for ever all who owe him allegiance in virtue of an oath of fealty from any oath of this kind; and we strictly forbid by Apostolic authority that any one should look upon him henceforth as king or Emperor.79
The bull goes on to exhort the electors to choose a new emperor; Innocent would take charge of providing a new king for Sicily. Innocent’s words imply that God is speaking first, and he is merely following suit; no finer example of the papacy’s elevated conception of itself is possible. Frederick’s response to this was, in the words of J. Watt, "propaganda...[which] tended to concentrate more on papal character deficiencies than on principles of papal government." Nevertheless, this propaganda was shocking, for in it not only did Frederick not deny he had impoverished the clergy in his lands, he gloriied in the deed:

Do not suppose on account of what we ask of you that the magnanimity of our majesty has been in any way bowed down by the sentence of deposition launched against us, for we have a clean conscience and so God is with us. We call him to witness that it was always our intention to persuade the clergy of every degree that they should continue to the end as they were in the early days of the church living an apostolic life and imitating the Lord’s humility, and that it was our intention especially to reduce those of highest rank to this condition. Those clergy [of former days] used to see angels and were resplendent with miracles; they used to heal the sick, raise the dead and subject kings and princes to themselves by holiness, not by arms. But these, drunk with the pleasures of the world and devoted to them, set aside God, and all true religion is choked by their surfeit of riches and power. Hence, to deprive such men of the baneful wealth that burdens them to their own damnation is a work of charity.

We can see in this desire to return the Church to apostolic poverty a form of the sentiment that produced the contemporary Franciscans, but lifted from its context and allowed to run amok. Concerns about ecclesiastical poverty had been part of the impetus St. Francis had for establishing his order, and Frederick thus represents feelings that were shared by others besides himself, but feelings that were taken by him ad absurdum. For Francis poverty was a goal for his order and not a program for the whole Church, certainly not one to be applied by force. At any rate, we may see in Frederick’s reply one of the earliest steps toward the modern laical state; others would later take these steps farther, as we shall see.

In the same year, 1246, Innocent wrote an encyclical letter in defense of the deposition of Frederick called Eger Cui Levia. It was also a defense of the Donation of Constantine, that old saw which Gregory had imprudently brought up, as well as a restatement of the two-swords allegory into a document that "fairly clinked with the symbolism of keys and
swords. The work also depended heavily on the writings of Alanus Anglicus and Innocent III. In it, Innocent IV sought to redefine the Donation in a new way:

Therefore they do not discern shrewdly or know how to investigate the origins of things who think that the apostolic see first received rule over the empire from the prince Constantine, for this rule is known to have been inherent in the apostolic see naturally and potentially beforehand. For our Lord Jesus Christ, the son of God, was a true king and a true priest after the order of Melchisedek just as he was true man and true God, which he made manifest by now using the honor of royal majesty before men, now exercising on their behalf the dignity of the pontificate before the Father, and he established not only a pontifical but a royal monarch in the apostolic see, committing to Peter and his successors control over both an earthly and a heavenly empire, which was adequately signified in the plurality of the keys, so that the vicar of Christ might be known to have received the power of judging over the heavens in spiritual things through the one key that we have received, over the earth in temporal things through the other.

In short, the authority of the pope had always existed in the Church by virtue of Jesus' authority transferred to Peter; the conversion of Constantine was merely a recognition of the innate superiority of the Church. The encyclical goes on to deal with the two-swords allegory, and, true to form, applies both of the swords to the sacerdotium:

For indeed the power of this material sword is implicit in the church but it is made explicit through the emperor who receives it from the church, and this power which is merely potential when enclosed in the bosom of the church becomes actual when it is transferred to the prince. This is evidently shown by the ceremony in which the supreme pontiff presents to the emperor whom he crowns a sword enclosed in a sheath. Having taken it the emperor draws the sword and by brandishing it indicates that he has received the exercise of it. It was from this sheath, namely from the plenitude of the apostolic power, that the aforesaid Frederick received the sword of his exalted principate, and in order that he might defend the peace of the church, not disturb it.

Better arguments by Innocent come from his commentaries on Gregory IX's Decretales, the further collections of canon law which had been produced in 1234. He displays just as much shrewdness as his predecessor Innocent III in these commentaries; furthermore, he is far from papal absolutism, and is conscious of limitations on papal power. For example, he felt that the pope could only directly control the empire during certain circumstances, viz:

This is because of a vacancy in the empire, for the pope succeeds only to the rights of the empire and so if another ruler subject to some other superior than the emperor is negligent in rendering justice or if there is no other ruler in such a territory, then jurisdiction does not devolve to the pope, for there is a special bond of union between pope and emperor because the pope consecrates and examines the emperor, and the emperor is the protector of the pope and takes an oath to him and holds the empire from him.
In another place, he notes restrictions on the papacy regarding property rights:

I maintain, therefore, that lordship, possession and jurisdiction can belong to infidels licitly and without sin, for these things were made not only for the faithful but for every rational creature as has been said. For he makes his sun to rise on the just and the wicked and he feeds the birds of the air, Matthew c.5, c.6. Accordingly we say that it is not licit for the pope or the faithful to take away from infidels their belongings or their lordships or jurisdictions because they possess them without sin.

This sort of sophistication meant little to Frederick, however.

In 1246 the German electors chose Henry Raspe to replace Frederick. Unfortunately, Henry died the next year, in February of 1247. In May, Frederick announced that he would capture Innocent, but he became bogged down in military matters. In April of 1248 Frederick's excommunication was renewed, and in December of 1250 he died. Innocent had triumphed in the end, not so much by military or philosophical superiority, but simply by outlasting Frederick. Frederick's successor Conrad IV (1250-1254) proved largely unsuccessful as an emperor. Frederick's illegitimate son Manfred showed some signs of his father's genius, but was killed at the battle of Benevento in 1266, defeated by Charles of Anjou (1268-1282), whom the papacy had chosen to control Sicily. The Hohenstaufen line died out with the execution of Frederick's grandson Conradin after the battle of Tagliacozzo in 1268. The sacerdotium had finally, firmly triumphed over the imperium. We can observe this victory in two areas, the intellectual and the material. In the intellectual field, the writings of the decretalist Hostiensis (d. 1271), canon lawyer and cardinal-bishop of Cestina, demonstrate a return to the hard kind of papal absolutism we saw with Alanus earlier in the century. Observe what he does to Innocent III's sun-moon allegory in a 1250-1253 work:

The difference between the priestly dignity and the royal is as great as that between the sun and the moon. Although these words have been expounded in different ways by the doctors you may say that, just as the moon receives its light from the sun and not the sun from the moon, so too the royal power receives authority from the priestly and not vicar versa. Again, just as the sun illuminates the world by means of the moon when it cannot do so by itself, that is at night, so too the priestly dignity enlightens the world by means of the royal when it cannot do so by itself, that is when it is a question of inflicting a blood penalty. ... This means also that the sacerdotal dignity is seven thousand, six hundred and forty-four and a half times greater than the royal, for we read in the fifth Book of the Almagest of Ptolemy, Proposition 18, "It is clear that the magnitude of the sun contains the magnitude of the moon seven thousand six hundred and forty-four and a half times."
Furthermore, even when he advocates a dualism, it is one in which the imperium is clearly subjugated to the sacerdotium, and is base and inferior as well:

Royal power, that is, an executive power to inflict punishment. He [Innocent] used the word "power" as if to say that the pontiff's power inheres in the righteousness with which he should be imbued, but the king's in the actual force with which he should be supported, and so it seems that each needs the other and that if they are in harmony with one another all is well in the government of the holy church of God. Nevertheless the pontifical power ought to have precedence as being greater and more honorable like one that enlightens in the manner of a shining lamp, while the royal power ought to follow, as being lesser and cruder like a club for striking and beating down infidels and rebels. ... Nowadays in many places the secular sword has become a priestly one, judging clerics and spiritual cases like laymen and temporal ones, which is against the laws...and the spiritual sword has become a military one, stirring up and prolonging wars for trivial reasons and doing this not only through others but through itself, which is against the laws. ... This pestilential situation will not end until each power stays content within its own limits. ... It would be salutary to enact a special statute on this matter.8

In the material field, we may see the sacerdotium's triumph in the new ruling house of Germany. After the extermination of the house of Hohenstaufen, there was an interregnum until 1274, when Pope Gregory X (1271-1276) recognized the election of Rudolf of Habsburg (1273-1291) as king. To obtain the imperial title, Rudolf was willing to make enormous concessions which included any control over the Papal States, Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia, all of which were placed firmly in papal hands. The Act of the Electors in 1279 surrendering all of these territories also notes to what degree the German imperium had fallen, in the way the electors accepted the sacerdotium's version of its two-swords allegory and other theories:

Embracing Germany from of old with genuine affection, the Roman Mother-Church has adorned her with the title of earthly dignity which exceeds all the other titles of temporal rulers on earth; and planting in her soil princes like select trees, she gave them such wonderful increase of their power that they can, with the support of the Church's authority and their election, bring forth--like a select fruit--him who will hold the reins of the Roman Empire. He is that lesser light in the firmament of the militant Church which is illuminated by the greater luminary of Christ's Vicar. It is he who draws and sheaths the material sword at the bidding of Christ's Vicar; so that under his protection the pastor of pastors may keep together the sheep entrusted to him helping to protect them with the spiritual sword, while with the temporal sword he may restrain and correct by punishments the evil doers and praise the good and faithful. Therefore, in order that all matter of dissension and possible scandal or even an occasion for strife between the Church and the Empire may be removed and that both these swords, established in the house of the lord, may be coupled in fitting alliance and exercise their influence for the sound reformation of the government in the whole world...we approve and
ratify all which had been...done and effected by our lord Rudolf...to our most
holy father and lord, the lord Pope Nicholas III.8

The dream of the imperium had died with Frederick II; no more would imperial presence
function in Italy. In its own home territory, the sacerdotium had triumphed decisively.

With the mention of Frederick II, it is time to turn our attention to prophecy during the
Hohenstaufen period, for as we have seen to a degree above and shall see in greater depth
below, Frederick became not only a political figure in the struggle between sacerdotium and
imperium, but an eschatological one as well. As we shall also see, this was an important
time for the development of prophecy and our figures of the Last World Emperor and
Angelic Pope; perhaps because the conflict between the imperium and the sacerdotium was
so fierce. Indeed, just as the papacy emerged as a very powerful and dominant entity
during this time, so, too, we at least see the birth of the Angelic Pope as a kind of counter-
figure for the Last World Emperor. We also see the continuation of the old Sibylline
tradition and the birth of a new tradition, the Joachite. Let us begin our examination by
turning to an author we have seen before in another context, Otto of Freising.

We have seen Otto's comments on the conflict between Frederick I and Hadrian IV.
However, near the beginning of his Gesta Frederici Imperatoris, written between 1156 and
1158, he also recounts a Last World Emperor prophecy. The prophecy appears to have been
directed toward Louis VII of France around 1146 when he was preparing to go on crusade,
and survives in several forms.90 Otto recounts the general pattern of events that occurred in
the prophecy:

It goes like this: "I say to you, L, shepherd of bodies, whom the spirit of the
pilgrim God has inspired, addressing you by the first letter of the sum total
that makes up your name." In the course of this writing, under a certain
husk of words concerning the storming of the royal city and also of ancient
Babylon, a triumph over the entire Orient, after the manner of Cyrus, King
of the Persians, or of Hercules, was promised to the aforesaid Louis, King of
France.91

After noting this summary, which is consistent with the familiar pattern of the Last World
Emperor, Otto goes on to recount an actual section of the prophecy:

When you have arrived at the side of the eternal seated square and come to
the side of the eternal standing squares and to the product of the blessed
number through the first actual cube, raise yourself to her whom the Angel
of your mother promised to visit and did not visit. You shall extend from her
even to the penultimate—when the promisor ascends her first, the promise fails on account of the best goods. Then plant your rose-colored standards even as far as the uttermost labors of Hercules, and the gates of the city of B will be open before you. For the bridegroom has set you up as a mainsail, he whose bark has almost foundered and on whose peak is a triangular sail, that he who proceeded you may follow you. Therefore your L will be turned into a C, who diverted the waters of the river, until those toil to procure sons have crossed the stream.\(^9\)

Much in this small passage is obscure: the "first actual cube" may refer to the city of Jerusalem as described in Rev. 21:9-27; the "bridegroom," "bark," "triangular sail," and "mainsail" undoubtedly stand for, respectively, Christ, the Church, the Trinity, and the Last World Emperor. The "L" refers to Louis as we have seen, and the "C" perhaps recalls the name Constans, the Sibylline name for the Last World Emperor, who would attain victory over "B," Babylon, which by the twelfth century meant the Moslem world. Otto credits a Sibylline source, but scornfully:

This document was then considered by the most excellent and pious personages of the Gauls to be of so great authority that it was declared by some to have been found in the Sibylline books, by others to have been divinely revealed to a certain Armenius. But whosoever that prophet or charlatan was who spread this around, let him determine whether its fulfillment may yet be expected in the future, or if (being scorned as already having failed of fulfillment) the fact that it gained some credence may be attributed to Gallic credulity.\(^9\)

Otto's words express a scornful derision like that of Ekkehard of Aurea, as well as something else—a consciousness of a difference between the Germans and the French, and a corresponding derision by a German for the French and their "Gallic credulity." The nationalist thread to the eschatological figures begins here, but remains largely undeveloped until later. The Empire was still tied firmly to the Germans in people's minds; it was not until that Empire was brought low that the idea of imperial apocalyptic could be transferred to other groups.

A similar scorn for things French may be seen in the Play of Antichrist, although its author shows no sign of rejecting prophecy. Rather, galvanized by Frederick I's revival of the imperium, he sees fit to apply the program of the Last World Emperor detailed by Adso and Pseudo-Methodius directly to the German empire. The play itself was written circa 1160 and survives in only a single manuscript, now at the Benedictine monastery of
Tegernsee in Bavaria. It is not clear whether the play was ever actually performed. Nevertheless, the Play of Antichrist is a very original updating of the Last World Emperor theme. In it, the German Emperor conquers the French King, subjugates the Kings of Greece and Jerusalem, and finally vanquishes the King of Babylon at Jerusalem. The Play details that event as follows:

In the meantime the Emperor and his men go out to battle, and when the responsory is finished they fight with the King of Babylon. When they have overcome him and he begins to flee, the Emperor and his men enter the Temple. After he has worshiped there, taking the crown from his head and holding it along with the scepter and imperial globe before the altar he sings:

Receive what I am offering! With a bounteous heart
I resign the Empire to You, King of Kings,
Through whom all rulers reign. You alone can
Be called Emperor and are ruler of all things.

Having placed them on the altar, he returns to the throne of his ancient realm, while Ecclesia, who went to Jerusalem with him, stays in the Temple.®

The Play changes the traditional pattern of the Last World Emperor a bit by having him surrender his regalia in the Temple rather than elsewhere, and also by having him remain as the German King after his abdication from the Empire. The inclusion of the character Ecclesia provides an outlet for some German anti-sacerdotium feelings as well; later in the play, after the appearance of the Antichrist, some Hypocrites greet him, singing:

Holy religion has already faltered.
Vanity has seized Mother Church.
Why this waste through these adorned ones?
God does not love worldly priests.
Climb to the height of kingly power!
Through you the remnants of old age will be changed!®

One of the themes of the play is the carnage that the Emperor's abdication causes; the author implies that this was an unsound action for an Emperor. In the Play, the Antichrist is summarily crowned in Jerusalem, and the deposed king of Jerusalem goes to the King of the Germans to complain:

I have been deceived by those who appeared to be good;
I have been robbed by the fraud of the dissemblers.
I thought that the condition of the Kingdom was favorable
If it was ordered by the laws of such men.
While you were the defender of the high dignity of Rome,
The state of the Church was honorable.
Now that the evil of your withdrawal is exposed,
The law of destructive superstition flourishes. Through this section the author implies that the sacerdotium is better guided by the imperium. Eventually the Antichrist, ruling as the new King of Jerusalem, manages to convince even the King of the Germans by his miracles, but at the end of the play Christ arrives and slays the Antichrist. We can thus see in the Play of Antichrist a very partisan pro-imperium work that is at the same time very anti-sacerdotium, written in the same time that Frederick I was contending with Alexander III.

Pro-imperium works also continued to come from the East. The Vaticinia Sibillae Erithraeae is a Sibylline work which in its present form dates from the mid-thirteenth century. However, it has been convincingly argued that portions of the work were composed much earlier. At the beginning, the Erythraean Sibyl notes that:

Doxopater, a father of extraordinary skill, translated it [i.e., the Erythraean Sibyl] from Syriac into Greek, then it was taken from the treasury of Manuel, emperor of the Greeks, and translated from Greek into Latin by Eugenius, admiral of the king of Sicily. We lack this Syriac original, but all of the above-mentioned individuals are real personages. Nicholas Doxopatres was a Byzantine scholar-monk who sought sanctuary at the Sicilian court in the 1140's after falling out of favor in Byzantium. Manuel Comnenus was Byzantine emperor from 1143-1180. And Eugenius of Palermo (1130-1203) was a Sicilian scholar under King William II (1154-1160), who later under Tancred (1189-1194) was appointed admiral. All of this information helps us place a portion of the work as originating in the twelfth century. The work itself is an account of world history in three parts, supposedly given to the Greeks after the fall of Troy. Of greatest importance to us is the conclusion of the first part, which details the coming of a horrible beast in the East, an allegory of Mohammed. But after him:

A most mighty lion of heavenly color, spotted with gold, with five heads and fifty feet will roar from the West. He will make an attack on the beast and crush his power. He will devour the tail of the beast, but will not harm his head or feet at all. After this the lion will die and the beast will be strengthened; he will live and reign until the Abomination comes. After the Abomination the Truth will be revealed and the Lamb will be known; the lions and kingdoms will bow their necks to him. All the inhabitants of the earth will come together so that there may be one flock (Jn. 10:16) and they may be ruled by one rod. And there will be a short space of time.
This is a threadbare account of the Last World Emperor, lacking the details of the abdication in Jerusalem and defeat of the enemies of Christianity, but otherwise concluding with the pattern familiar from Revelation. At any rate, these prophecies were doubtless welcome in Sicily, which was so influenced by Byzantine custom and statecraft, and later with the German imperium, for the Sibyl was twice reworked circa 1251 and 1254 by followers of Joachim of Fiore (see below), and the later-composed second section deals extensively with accounts of Frederick II and his sons. The Sibylline tradition also continued as variations on the Tiburtine Sibyl were produced. An Anglo-Norman verse translation appeared in 1140, and the original Latin version influenced portions of other works, including Honorius Augustodunensis' Gemma Animae, John of Salisbury's Policraticus, and Peter Comestor's Historia Scholastica. Godfrey of Viterbo's Pantheon, written circa 1186/1187, presents the whole program of the Last World Emperor: the name Constans, the course of conquest, his reign in Jerusalem (122 years instead of the Tiburtine Sibyl's 112), and eventual deposition of the imperial crown and regalia before the advent of the Antichrist, who would be slain by the Archangel Michael on the Mount of Olives. The Sibylline tradition was thus still quite popular, and the Erithraean Sibyl in particular demonstrated that prophetic influence still flowed from the East.

We now come to the figure whose name became almost synonymous with medieval prophecy, and after whom eschatology was never the same. In his works we finally come across the figure of the Angelic Pope, not named as such, but a shadowy emerging figure. This is the famed visionary, abbot, and writer Joachim of Fiore (1132-1202), and it would do well to examine his life in more detail. Born in Calabria, he became a Benedictine monk in 1171 after a short time as an official in the Sicilian court at Palermo. He quickly rose to the rank of abbot, and in 1183, while on a journey to the monastery at Casamari, south of Rome, to see about incorporating his monastery into the stricter Cistercian Order, he had a series of visions which were to inspire his writings and make him a celebrated writer in his day and beyond. While at Casamari he wrote two of his most influential works: the Liber Concordie Novi et Veteris Testamenti and the Expositio in Apocalypsim. In 1184 he was
called before Pope Lucius III (1181-1185) to interpret a Sibylline prophecy. This commission gave his work papal approval and pulled him into the sphere of papal affairs. He became something of an advisor to the group in the Roman Curia which sought peace with the Empire between Alexander III in 1181 and Innocent III in 1198. This was not because Joachim was pro-imperium, but rather because he felt that the Church ought to assume a passive, suffering role in the conflict with the imperium. In the last two decades of his life he would write over a dozen books, the best known being his famous collection of explanatory diagrams, the Liber Figurarum. He would also meet with and advise several popes and secular rulers, including Alexander III, Innocent III, Richard I, Emperor Henry IV, Empress Constance, and the young Frederick II. Dissatisfied with the Cistercian Order, he founded his own monastery in 1190 at Fiore, from which sprang the short-lived Florensian Order. The election of Innocent III in 1198 was the beginning of Joachim's fall from favor, for as we have seen earlier, Innocent by no means desired to take a passive stance toward the imperium. It is not surprising that the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), largely Innocent's work, condemned Joachim's views on the Trinity some thirteen years after the abbot's death.

It is impossible to summarize the whole of Joachim's thought in a short space. Rather, we can note that his writings chiefly centered on three areas: commentary on the Scriptures, commentary on the Trinity, and studies on the nature of history. Even today it is difficult to understand just what exactly he meant by his complicated, often contradictory arguments and convoluted drawings. He drew an elaborate correspondence between events of the Old and New Testaments, dividing each into a period of seven corresponding phases, and overlaid this with a scheme with a tri-fold division of history based on the Trinity. His unique notion was that the Old Testament had been the era or status of the Father, and that the status of the Son was ending around his own day, making way for a transforming status of the Spirit. Central to this transformation would be a holy pope, who would live during the time of the Antichrist. Marjorie Reeves notes that "Joachim was not
in the least tempted to follow the tradition of a Last World Emperor," i.e., he expected the
Church to last until the end of the world. He described the transformation thusly:

In this generation first of all the general tribulation will be completed and
the wheat carefully purged of all tares, then a new leader will descend from
Babylon (i.e. Rome), namely a new pontiff of the New Jerusalem, that is,
Holy Mother the Church. His type is found written in Revelation: "I saw an
angel descending from the rising sun having the sign of the living God." (Rev.
7:2). With him are the remnants of those who were driven out (i.e. by the
Antichrist). He will ascend not by speed of foot nor change of place, but
because full freedom to renew the Christian religion and to preach the word
will be given to him. The Lord of Hosts will already begin to reign over the
whole earth.

Assisting the work of this pope would be two new religious orders of viri spirituales, one of
preachers, the other of contemplatives, whom he describes in his Expositio in Apocalypsim:

An order will arise which seems new but is not. Clad in black garments and
girt with a belt from above, they will increase and their fame will be spread
abroad. In the spirit of Elijah they will preach the faith and defend it until
the consummation of the world. There will also be an order of hermits
imitating the angels’ life. Their life will be like a fire burning in love and
zeal for God. ... The former order will be milder and more pleasant in order
to gather in the crop of God’s elect in the spirit of Moses. (The other) order
will be more courageous and fiery to gather in the harvest of evil in the
spirit of Elijah.

These two forces of pope and viri spirituales would combine efforts to defeat the Antichrist,
who would take the form of a king from the West, after which there would be a great peace
lasting for a length of time known only to God. Finally the Antichrist would be released,
precipitating the final judgment. Bernard McGinn reinforces Marjorie Reeves’ idea; “there is
no place in Joachim’s system for a Last Emperor—he’s gaze is fixed solely on the Church.”

Rather, Joachim’s writings pay more attention to the nature of the Antichrist and the roles
of the viri spirituales than to the idea of the Angelic Pope. Joachim’s influence was
extraordinarily widespread and his ideas perpetuated themselves, not only in southern Italy,
but also as far away as England and Germany. And as we shall see, many questionable
and doubtful works were applied to him.

Admirers of Joachim began the production of spurious works under his name. Many
were composed, but the one which fits our interest for this time was a commentary on the
prophet Jeremiah, the Super Hieremiam Prophetam. We lack a critical edition of this work
and thus it is impossible to determine exactly who created it; although some disagree with
Marjorie Reeves believes the work issued from southern Italian Florentian/Cistercian circles. She dates the work to before 1248, probably before 1243. The work itself is backdated by being addressed supposedly by Joachim to Henry VI, although it is clearly in the thick of the conflict between sacerdotium and Frederick II. We have noted earlier that Joachim's genuine works favored the idea of an Angelic Pope than a Last World Emperor. The Super Hieremiam Prophetam, as the product of southern Italians, goes a step farther. One of their main motivations was clearly a dislike of the German imperium, as the work notes:

The German empire has always been hard, cruel, and alien to us: hard in its yoke, cruel in its rod, alien in its scepter. It is necessary that the Lord destroy it with the sword of the Spirit and of fury so that all the kings of the earth may tremble at the crash of its ruin.

The reason for this destruction was the persecution by the imperium, especially Frederick II. The Super Hieremiam castigates Frederick II by "predicting" him as a monstrous offshoot of Henry IV:

Hear, Lord Emperor, and attend to what is said: "From the root of the serpent will arise a basilisk, and his seed will swallow the bird" (Isa. 14:29). You are the serpent on the roadside, your successor is the horned basilisk in the road. Under him the empire will be stung, that is, will be divided, and any rider coming to it will fall. Like a winding snake you will be lead forth from the kingdom; your successor, whose glance will scatter all, will spring out of his cave. He is called a horned serpent because he will stand up to many kingdoms. We should fear lest he bite the hooves of the horse by wounding the Church, that is, in his last hours he will cause the rider, the pope, to fall, or render the prelates, the princes of his dishonor, inactive. He will do this because they reproached him with his evil, or perhaps because he encroaches on the worship of the Church, employing the power of unclean nations.

The reference to "unclean nations" doubtless refers to Frederick's habit of using Saracen mercenaries. By contrast, the Super Hieremiam like Joachim's works before it, represents the Church as suffering and places the papacy in an elevated position, although in it the figure of the Angelic Pope is slightly less clearly defined than in the Liber Concordie:

The rest, O Prince, can take place among your heirs. Another High Priest, like Zedekiah, will fight against the empire, because popes were scarce able to bear the yoke of your fathers and your little finger is heavier than the loins of your father (1 Kng. 12:10). This distress will last from the current year 1197 for sixty-four years that will be worse than the preceding ones...Therefore Peter will be crucified, the pope will be killed, and according to the doctors, the conventual sheep will be scattered at the death of the
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pastor. I do not know if it will be after three days or three years that the Good Shepherd and Leader of the House of Israel will arise.116

The first High Priest is Innocent IV or one of the other popes who opposed Frederick. This passage indicates another interesting feature of the Super Hieremiam: the willingness to apply concrete contemporary details to the normally deliberately obtuse genre of prophecy. Joachim had mentioned the existence of two orders of viri spirituales. When the Franciscans and Dominicans arose in the early thirteenth century, they seemed to be a confirmation of Joachim's prophecy, and his ideas gained increased credibility in the minds of some. To prove their master correct, the pseudo-Joachites made absolutely sure that people understood that the viri spirituales were indeed the Dominicans and Franciscans. In an explication of Noah's birds in the book of Genesis, they contrasted the dove, the new kind of preacher, with the crow, the old:

The dove is more fruitful in its offspring. it is diverse with wings of virtues, nimble in obedience, and is fed with the food of the elect, namely the Scriptures. In place of the song of preaching, it has sorrow for sins and the desire for the heavenly country. ... Here note that for this reason the crow is of one color, the dove of different color. In themselves we can understand that the orders signified by them are different in dress, but not in spirit. They strive toward one food and agree in a single vow and resolute desire. ... Spiritually, Peter signifies the order of preachers, James their lay brothers, and John the other order of minors, made a little lower than the angels themselves because it is the final order.117

The pseudo-Joachites were also willing to fix an exact date for the final conflict between sacerdotium and imperium, and for the transition to the third and final status:

The Temple is the Roman, or Universal Church, which is to be trodden down in general like the holy city for forty-two months from the time of Christ to the end of the second status. The forty-two months are forty-two generations in which the Christian people are to be afflicted. They will end in the year 1260.118

This again made the pseudo-Joachites appear to possess a secret understanding of contemporary events. Unfortunately, Frederick II died in 1250 with a full ten years to go before the fulfillment of the prediction, and when the year 1260 came and went with no appreciable change in the world, the pseudo-Joachites lost some of their attraction.

The itinerant Franciscan chronicler Salimbene (1121-1287) offers us an opportunity to begin to examine another group of inheritors of the Joachite message, the Franciscans, and
also to see what happened to that message, for Salimbene was a Joachite himself. His *Chronica* mentions that he received instruction in Joachite thought by an abbot of the Florensian Order in Pisa sometime between 1243 and 1247. Later he came to reject these ideas, as he writes circa 1264:

Another time when I lived at Ravenna, Brother Bartholomew Calarosus of Mantua, who was lector and minister at Milan and Rome, but at the time was living in Ravenna as a private person, said to me: "I tell you, Brother Salimbene, that John of Parma upset himself and his order because he was of such great knowledge, holiness, and excellence of life that he was able to correct the Roman curia and they would have believed him. But later on he followed the prophecies of insane men, and brought censure on himself, and injured his friends not a little..." I responded: "I agree, and it saddened me not a little because I loved him deeply..." When he heard all this, Brother Bartholomew said: "And you also were a Joachite." I said, "You speak the truth, but after the death of the Emperor Frederick and the passing of the year 1260, I completely left that teaching behind and propose to believe only what I see."  

John of Parma (c.1208-1289) was the Minister General of the Franciscan Order from 1247 to 1257; he and his friend Hugh of Digne (d.c.1257) were both extraordinarily interested in Joachite thought, and worked to incorporate it into the Order. John's tenure as Minister General was devoted to restoring the Order to its original poverty and purity; in this he was motivated by identification with Joachite ideals. For example, a Joint Encyclical issued in 1255 with Humbert, master General of the Dominicans, clearly identified the Dominicans and Franciscans with the *viri spirituales* and with Sibylline traditions, as he wrote:

> In the last days at the End of the world, as we believe without any doubt, [Jesus] raised up out two orders in the ministry of salvation. ... These are the two shining stars that according to the Sibylline prophecy have the appearance of the four animals and in the last days will cry out in the name of the Lord in the way of humility and voluntary poverty.  

The diffusion of Joachite thought into the Franciscan Order was not without incident. In 1254 a young friar named Gerardo of Borgo San Donnino published a work called the *Introduction to the Eternal Gospel*, in which he claimed that Joachite thought would supersede Christianity after 1260, and Joachim's writings would supersede the Bible. Naturally the papacy could not allow claims this extravagant to be made; after a papal commission at Anagni in 1255, Geraldo was condemned to life imprisonment, John of Parma was eventually replaced by St. Bonaventure as Minister General (in 1257), and the
Franciscans as a whole were ordered to clean house. They never did fully abandon Joachite thought, as we shall see below. Furthermore, the figure of the Angelic Pope remained alive in their writings. Roger Bacon (c.1220-1297), the *doctor mirabilis*, twice refers to the figure of the Angelic Pope. In his *Opus tertium*, sent in 1267 to Pope Clement IV and written sometime before, he notes:

> Forty years ago it was prophesied, and there have been many visions to the same effect, that there will be a pope in these times who will purify Canon law and the Church of God from the sophistries and deceits of the jurists so that justice will reign over all without the rumbling of lawsuits. Because of the goodness, truth, and justice of this pope the Greeks will return to the obedience of the Roman Church, the greater part of the Tartars will be converted to the faith, and the Saracens will be destroyed. There will be one flock and one shepherd, as the prophet heard (Jn. 10:16).

It is interesting to note that Roger applies some of the elements of the Last World Emperor figure--conversion of the Greeks, destruction of the Saracens, reunification of Christianity--into his view of the figure of the Angelic Pope. A later work, the *Compendium studii*, written circa 1272 for Pope Gregory X, has this to say:

> Many wise men have thought about this. Reflecting upon divine wisdom, the knowledge of the saints, the truths of history, as well as prophecies both sacred and solid (like those of the Sibyls, of Merlin, of Aquila, of Festo, and of many other wise men), they have thought that the days of the Antichrist would come in this period. Therefore it is necessary that evil be stamped out so that God's elect plainly appear. A very holy pope will first come who will remove all the corruptions in education and the Church and all the rest. Then all the world will be renewed and the fullness of peoples will enter in; even the remnants of Israel will be converted to the faith.

Here Roger credits some of his sources on apocalypticism. In his *Opus maius*, he lists a few more:

> I do not wish to be haughty here, but I do know that if the Church wished to study the sacred text and the holy prophecies, as well as the Sibylline prophecies, those of Merlin and Aquila, of Seston, of Joachim, and of many others, and furthermore, also histories and the books of the philosophers, along with the paths of astronomy, she would find a sufficient conception and greater certitude about the time of the Antichrist.

It is quite clear that Roger was very much influenced by these earlier works and had no reservations about borrowing from them, helping to shape the Angelic Pope into a more defined and powerful figure. Roger, however, was not always critical about the sources he used, and eventually was to spend some time in prison in the late 1270's under suspicion of
heresy, possibly for his Joachite ideas or for his uncritical acceptance of astrology and alchemy. Like Roger, Salimbene also detailed a prophecy about the Angelic Pope. His Chronica records a set of verses that he claims were shown to him by a Dominican priest before 1271, and were circulated widely among some cardinals and the Dominican Order:

In the third year of Clement IV
A holy pope will be given to the just people;
By Christ's gift a more holy man will succeed Clement,
A good and faithful servant from God's heaven...
God will adorn him and make him illustrious in a wondrous manner,
He will make him holy, great, and glorious,
He will give peace to the world and renew Jerusalem.
He will give fruits to the earth; God will give joy to the world...
He, the Holy Pope, about forty years of age,
Will appear. The man of angelic life
Will hold to the decrees of Christ.
You should fear, O you Giezites!
O holy Christ, you will then restore your beautiful Sepulcher to us
When the Saracens have been subjected and rejected.18

However, Salimbene noted this in 1276 at the death of Gregory X; another prophecy applied to a specific date that proved to be as false as his own Joachite expectations of the advent of the third status in 1260. Even St. Bonaventure himself was not fully free from Joachite-inspired apocalyptic, his view of history was rooted in a modified form of Joachitism,128 and his writings record that he hoped for a "an emperor who has zeal for the Church,"127 who, like Charlemagne, would exalt the Church as Charlemagne himself had done; in short, a kind of Last World Emperor figure. As we shall see below, elements of the Franciscan Order not only did not abandon apocalyptic thinking, they intensified it.

There is yet another prophetic tradition used during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which stands alongside those of the Sibyl and Joachim, the tradition of Merlin, the legendary British sorcerer and advisor to King Arthur. The figure of Merlin the prophet was set into the European consciousness with Geoffrey of Monmouth (c.1100-1155) and his classic History of the Kings of Britain, written circa 1136. Throughout the work, Merlin remains as a prophetic figure,129 as he is in a later work, the Life of Merlin, a long poem completed circa 1150. Merlin entered literature with the reputation of a sorcerer, but also with an entirely separate reputation as a prophet, specifically a prophet on political matters.129 A great deal of material came to be ascribed to him in later centuries.130 He
received great use in the conflict of the *sacerdotium* and Frederick II. For example, a brief
text known as the *Verba Merlini*, which seems to be the product of an early group of
Joachites, has this to say about the Hohenstaufens:

> The first F, a lamb in his shorn hair, a lion in his mane, will be a destroyer
> of cities. In the midst of a just resolve he will die between the crow and the
crow. He will survive in II who will die at the gates of Milazzo. The second
> F will be of unhoped-for and miraculous origin. The lamb will be torn to
> pieces among the goats, but not devoured by them. His marriage bed will
> swell and will prove fruitful in the neighbors of the Moors, and he will not be
> relieved in them. After that he will be enveloped by his own blood, but not
dipped in it for long; nonetheless, he will nest there.

The various initials are obviously: Frederick I, who died on crusade (the "crows" defy
explication; possibly they refer to cities near where he died); Henry VI, who became ill at
Milazzo in Sicily and died at Messina; and Frederick II. The meaning of the statements
applied to Frederick II are not clear to this day, and the *Sayings* goes on to detail a great
deal more about him. Another Merlinic work is of particular importance to us because of its
use of a Last World Emperor figure. This was *Les Prophecies de Merlin*, a vernacular work
written in a Franco-Venetian dialect and probably composed around 1275 in Venice by an
anti-imperial Franciscan. The work has Merlin speak of a Champion "crowned with a
crown of iron" who should arise "before the coming of the dragon Babylon." This Champion
would follow a modified version of the program of the Last World Emperor. Notably, he
would suppress heretics (doubtless an idea which wold appeal to a writer in Patarene-ridden
northern Italy):

> "I wish furthermore," Merlin was saying, "that you know that this Champion
> will make a truce with the pagans in order to destroy the heretics who shall
> take example from Lombardy. He will establish throughout his empire that
> anybody not found believing perfectly in the Holy Trinity and the Sacraments
> of Holy Church will be taken and burnt to ashes. This shall be done
> everywhere, because he will command at that time that there shall be no
> more wars and everyone shall be obedient to this Champion of all men."

The unusual feature about this figure is his national origin, but despite this odd element, he
would go to Jerusalem in the usual pattern of the Last World Emperor:

> "If you wish to know," said Merlin, "in what land he will be born, I tell you
> openly he will be from Wales. When he shall destroy all the heretics, the
> truce with the pagans will be over, and he will go by sea to the proximity of
> Jerusalem along with the Doge of the Good Sailors, a great part of the
> Lombards, and the French who will go with him to avenge the death of their
> lineage." ... Merlin said there would be an army overseas near Jerusalem by
whom the Holy Land should be taken away from the hands of the pagans, as well as the great pagan land that is called T. This shall be done by the Good Champion with the Doge of the Good Sailors, as you have heard here before. But the pagans will recover a great part of his towns. At that point Merlin said that almost all of great heathendom will be destroyed, and the pagans will never recover towns or castles. As he said, they will not recover what they have lost through the Champion of Wales, who will take almost the whole world for himself. He shall put under him Rome and all Italy; no part shall ever be recovered by the pagans.138

Although the place of origin is different, this is recognizably the Last World Emperor from his pattern of conquest. The author of this Merlinite work thus stepped back a little and had the Church renewed by the Last World Emperor instead of the Angelic Pope, but at the same time he indirectly slighted both Germany and France by having his Last World Emperor come from Wales and not any of the traditional lands comprising the imperium.

Finally, although in this era we see a preponderance of Angelic Pope-related prophecies, we can also see a few Last World Emperor prophecies directed precisely at Frederick II, for or against, by individuals who were willing to take a step beyond the apocalyptic language which Gregory IX and Frederick II had used against each other. The whole nature of this conflict of sacerdotium and imperium can be found in a set of verses, extremely popular at the time:

The Emperor to the Pope:
The fates warn, the stars teach, and so do the flight of birds
That I will soon be the hammer of the world.
Rome, a long time wavering, having committed various errors,
Will collapse and cease to be the capital of the world.

The Pope to the Emperor:
Your reputation relates, Scripture teaches, and your sins announce
That you will have a short life and eternal punishment.134

Whence these lines came is unclear. Holder-Egger felt that the first four lines were composed by a pro-imperium author after Frederick's victory at the battle of Cortenuovo in 1237; the pope's words were composed as a response by a pro-sacerdotium writer. H.M. Scholler, however, felt that the verses were composed after Frederick's victory in the naval battle off Monte Christo in 1241.137 In any event, these verses survive in at least eight different versions,138 a testimony to their popularity. Frederick's own popularity was clearly reflected in a sermon addressed to him in person in 1229 by Nicholas of Bari. Frederick
was reaching his zenith; he had been crowned King of Jerusalem and had put down a rebellion in Apulia when Nicholas wrote:

It is said that the scepter will not be taken from the hand of the Lord Frederick nor a leader from his thigh (that is, the empire from his heirs) until he who is to be sent comes (that is, Christ comes to the Last Judgment). This race will rule to the End of the world because the Origin is with it in the day of his power (Ps. 109:3), which means that Christ in all his vicars.

Concerning such matters it has been said through the prophet: "Justice and an abundance of peace will arise in the days of the Lord, until the moon is lifted up and rules from sea to sea and from the great river to the ends of the earth. The Ethiopians will go before him and his enemies will lick the dust." All the days from Christmas to Epiphany are especially called days of the Lord, since on or within these days, that is on the Feast of St. Stephen following the Nativity, justice was born, namely the justice of the Lord Emperor Frederick which is so great in this world and which renders to each his due—to God three things, fear, honor, and love; to kings, friendly alliance; to subjects, grace and mercy. This has been done by the Lord and is wonderful in our eyes (Ps. 117:23), that the emperor was born on St. Stephen's day. Stephen means "crowned," and on his day was born the Lord who was to be crowned with many a diadem so that the meaning of the name might allude to his dignity and earthly things might agree with divine.

Therefore, dearly beloved, let us salute him with the Angel Gabriel: Hail, Lord Emperor, full of the grace of God. The Lord is with you, that is, was, and will be.(Lk. 1:28).139

Although this does not present the traditional pattern of the Last World Emperor, it is certainly difficult to get more fawning than Nicholas is here; his last words go beyond even the memory of caesaropapism and into the realm of blasphemy. We can contrast Nicholas' words with those of a later poem from the Roman curia about the Last World Emperor. The prophecy was ascribed to John of Toledo, the cardinal of Porto, and probably dates from the 1260s:

A new king will come and will prostrate the whole world
To vanquish with horror of war the farthest region.
He hastens from the high and craggy mountains,
From an unhoped-for source, a mild man without guile.
Poor in resources, rich in goodness, richest in his
Bountiful understanding. Because of his merit God will be his seer.
He will conquer the Sicilians and the evil tribe of the
Savage Frederick. They will not be named any more.
He will rebuild all the things which the harsh Frederick,
His savage shoot, and its successor overthrew.
Under the guidance of the pope he will put the Romans in sore straits:
They will strengthen Rome and thus bear the burden.
After that, by battle they will drag the followers of Mohammed to Christ
So that there will be one flock and one shepherd.
You, my companions, have confidence that all these things
Were revealed to me by the science of the moving heavens.
One thousand two hundred and fifty-six years
Had gone by when the work was completed.\textsuperscript{140}

This Last World Emperor decisively defeats the seed of the "savage Frederick," and although Jerusalem is not mentioned, he does work for the conversion of the Moslems. Interestingly enough, here we have mention of the Last World Emperor cooperating with the pope; this theme will be expanded upon in the next century, as we shall see below. Bernard McGinn feels that this prophecy was applied to Charles of Anjou, who hunted down and defeated Frederick's descendants; he also made plans for a crusade which were never fulfilled.\textsuperscript{141}

With this prophecy we bring this section to a close, because it illustrates the turning point of both political theory and prophecy. The sacerdotium defeated the imperium and wound up an exhausted master of the field. But while the German imperium was brought low, nevertheless there remained a French regnum, uncombatted and still strong. The idea of national regnum would gain precedence over the idea of imperium. And it was to national kingdoms that both political theory and prophetic eschatology gravitated.
CHAPTER V

PHILIP IV AND BONIFACE VIII

The final conflict of sacerdotium and imperium we shall examine, the conflict between Boniface VIII and Philip IV, represents a new development, for the struggle was between a national king and the papacy, rather than the empire and the papacy. Although France had a claim on the notion of the imperium—France having been an heir of the Carolingian empire as was Germany—most of the arguments advanced by the French during this conflict made no mention of or claim on the traditional idea of imperium. Rather, the arguments tended to be based on the notion of a national state, making this conflict one of regnum and sacerdotium rather than imperium and sacerdotium, although still clearly one of secular versus sacred. Thus we will use the term regnum to denote Philip's side as an idea similar to but more precise than imperium. The sacerdotium's victory over the German imperium in the last conflict proved in many ways to be a Pyrrhic one, for though the papacy emerged as master of the field, it was nevertheless considerably weakened. Furthermore, it lost a great deal of status in the mind of Europe. As mentioned before, many individuals saw the conflict of Frederick II and the sacerdotium as no more than a disagreement between two powerful feudal lords. In this battle, the papacy used its spiritual weapons of excommunication and anathema alongside secular weapons of taxation and military force. The use of such powers in a less-than-elevated cause could not but cheapen the esteem of the papacy in the minds of many. And although the papacy had the best of the war of words and theory as well, nevertheless there was a new trend emerging. To understand part of Philip's success, we must follow a new intellectual trend as it began in the writings of the glossators and culminated in the writings of Thomas Aquinas.

Largely unnoticed by the intellectual combatants contesting for imperium or sacerdotium was a developing intellectual trend which claimed the independence of kingdoms from the
imperium. We have examined earlier Innocent III's decretal Per Venerabilem. With lines like, "Now the king [of France] acknowledges no superior in temporal affairs" it seems to ascribe a degree of independence from the imperium to the French monarchy. Innocent was not alone in these ideas. Ricardus Anglicus (d. 1242), the first English canonist to teach at Bologna, noted a similar idea in a gloss on the Compilatio, circa 1200:

But, on the other hand, it is evident that many kings are not subject to the emperor, for it seems that, just as they were subdued by force, so they can return by force to their proper liberty. Again, we read of kings invincible by command of God (Ecc. 18:1) which we do not read of the emperor. Again the people of a city can confer jurisdiction and ruling authority as in Novella 15 c.1; much more those of a kingdom. And the army elects an emperor, so by the same reason it can elect a king as at Dist. 93 c.24. Since then both emperor and king are anointed with the same authority, with the same consecration, with the same chrism as at C.16 q.1 post c.40, why should there be a difference in their powers?

Ricardus does not specify whether England should be the kingdom of which he speaks, but a later glossator, Vincentius Hisapnus, was very specific on the matter. Writing circa 1240 on the Decretales, he counters Johannes Teutonicus' statement that no kingdom should be outside the Empire with a burst of Hispanic chauvinism:

Make an exception, O Johannes Teutonicus, for the Spaniards who are exempted by the law itself and who barred the way to Charlemagne and his peers. I, Vincentius, say that the Germans have lost the empire by their folly. Every city contends with them for independence and every hut usurps lordship for itself. Only the Spaniards have acquired an empire by their valor, and they too have chosen bishops as at Dist. 63 c.25. [Is it not known] in France and England, in Germany and Constantinople, that the Spaniards rule blessed lady Spain, that they brought this lordship into existence and, as lords, are expanding it by their virtues of boldness and probity? The Spanish are then supported by their merits and worth; and like the Germans they do not lack a body of prescripts and customs. Who can number your praises, O Spain?--rich in horses, famous for food, shining with gold, slow to retreat, prudent, the envy of all, versed in the laws and standing high on sublime columns.

Marinus de Caramanico, in a gloss on Frederick II's Constitutiones Regni Sicilie, circa 1280, asserted the independence of Sicily:

This book of statutes is the principal law and it is observed as law in our kingdom of Sicily according to Digest 1.2.2.12 and Institutes 1.2.6. Let no one urge that the Roman laws cited apply only to the prince, that is to the emperor of the Romans, and that to him alone is it conceded to establish a law...we say the same of an independent king who is not subject to the power of any other, that he can establish a law...and such in the king of Sicily as we shall set out below. Therefore we make bold to say that the king can make law for the subjects in his realm and can even enact a statute contrary to the common Roman law.
Finally, Jean de Blanot, a French lawyer serving Louis IX, in his *Tractatus super Feudis et Homagiis* (1225-56) echoes Innocent III in asserting independence for France:

A baron who rebels against the king is seen to offend against the Julian Law on Majesty on this ground, that he has plotted the death of a magistrate of the Roman people (Digest 48.4.1.1.); or more truly because he is seen to have acted directly against the Prince, for the king of France is Prince in his own kingdom, for he recognizes no superior in temporal affairs.®

Clearly, we have evidence of the growth of national powers, with educated individuals in these powers who were willing to assert independence from an imperium that was no longer seen as universal. They were unsuccessful in their own times—the house of Hohenstaufen remained strong throughout most of the thirteenth century. Furthermore, their arguments also remained largely unconvincing. It would take more than Ricardus' biblical exegesis or Vincentius' chauvinism to provide an intellectual foundation for the existence of a separate national state. That basis would be provided in the latter portion of the thirteenth century by St. Thomas Aquinas.

The philosophy and theories of Aristotle were being revived in the thirteenth century by many individuals, but it was St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) who went the furthest in examining Aristotle and applying his work to medieval culture. Indeed, as Walter Ullman notes, "No one has studied Aristotle as thoroughly before or since."® The difficulty that the Middle Ages had with Aristotle was, of course, that he was not a Christian, and his philosophical inquiry proceeded from reason and natural law rather than faith and revealed truth. It was the genius of Aquinas which reconciled these two varying approaches into one unified logical structure. Aquinas demonstrated that there was no conflict between natural law and divine law; in one of his most famous statements he notes that "grace does not abolish nature but perfects it." This notion had repercussions in all fields of knowledge, but we will confine our inquiries to a brief examination of Aquinas and political theory. Aquinas created no political theory per se.® Instead, we may derive what he thought regarding political theory from passages in his other works: *De Regimine Principum*, a treatise on statecraft addressed to the King of Cyprus, and the *Summa Theologica*. What Aquinas has to say on these matters is strikingly different from what has been said before.
Aquinas' feelings about the nature of society are different due to the sources he used. Far from being an artificial arrangement created to check the sinfulness of fallen man, society instead was a natural creation:

When we consider all that is necessary to human life, however, it becomes clear that man is naturally a social and political animal, destined more than all other animals to live in community. Other animals have their food provided for them by nature, and a natural coat of hair. They are also given the means of defense, be it teeth, horns, claws, or at least speed in flight. Man, on the other hand, is not so provided, but having instead the power to reason must fashion such things for himself. Even so, one man alone would not be able to furnish himself with all that is necessary, for no one man's resources are adequate to the fullness of human life. For this reason the companionship of his fellows is naturally necessary to man.9

Not only is society itself thus natural to man, but human government as well:

Solomon had this in mind when he said (Eccl. 4:9): "it is better for two to live together than solitary, for they gain by mutual companionship." The fellowship of society being thus natural and necessary to man, it follows with equal necessity that there must be some principle of government within that society.10

Of all forms that this government could take, Aquinas recommends monarchy, since it best emulates nature:

Again, that is best which most nearly approaches a natural process, since nature always works in the best way. But in nature, government is always by one. Among members of the body there is one which moves all the rest, namely, the heart: in the soul there is one faculty which is pre-eminent, namely reason. The bees have one king, and in the whole universe there is one God, Creator and Lord of all.11

But government is not solely a natural process. Although Aquinas followed Aristotle, nonetheless he was a Christian, and so applied the highest end to human society as the quest for virtue and God:

But the object for which a community is gathered together is to live a virtuous life. For men consort together that they may thus attain a fullness of life which would not be possible to each living singly: and the full life is one which is lived according to virtue. Thus the object of human society is a virtuous life...the final aim of social life will be, not merely to live in virtue, but rather through virtuous life to attain to the enjoyment of God.12

Aquinas' method may be neatly summarized in his views on the nature of law, for nowhere is his idea "grace does not abolish nature but perfects it" more evident. Aquinas felt that there were four levels to law. The first he describes as follows: "the rational guidance of created things on the part of God, as the Prince of the universe, has the quality of law. ...
This we call the eternal law."13 Eternal law is the function of a universe created and maintained by divine intelligence. Creatures can participate naturally in eternal law, but man and other rational beings have reason and as such are a special case, so they participate in another kind of law: "[T]hey have a certain share in the divine reason itself, deriving therefrom a natural inclination to such actions and ends as are fitting. This participation in the eternal law by rational creatures is called the natural law."14 Humans who apply natural law to specific instances and customs create another level of law, "such particular dispositions, arrived at by an effort of reason, are called human laws."15 But as we have noted earlier, Aquinas felt that the end of humanity was not earthly but heavenly, the enjoyment of God, and so he noted a final level of law to help man attain this end:

But because man is destined to an end of eternal blessedness, and this exceeds what is proportionate to natural human faculties as we have already shown, it was necessary that he should be directed to this end not merely by natural and human law, but also by a divinely given law.16

For Aquinas, this divine law was of course to be found in the revealed truths of Christianity. Aquinas' notions about the nature of society and law are at their core revolutionary. The state has a natural existence, independent of Christianity. For example, based on his schema, Aquinas believed contrary to Alanus Anglicus that the government of non-Christians was legitimate in and of itself, and furthermore that Christians living under non-Christian government could not use their faith as a pretext to disobey that government. The state springs from natural law, and the divine law which separates Christians from, say, Muslims, does not abolish this fact.17 Passerin D'Entreves notes another interesting application of Aquinas' ideas on this subject, "There is no open mention, in the whole of St. Thomas' work, of the idea of a universal empire."18 Aquinas' theories were more properly applied to individual national monarchies rather than an all-encompassing imperium. D'Entreves continues:

The revival of the classical conception of the State thus helped destroy the medieval ideal of a universal community or Imperium Mundi. It prepared the way for the modern notion of the particular and sovereign State.19

Yet despite the revolutionary nature of Aquinas' notions about the regnum and the imperium, his notions about the sacerdotium will seem rather familiar. Although the state
has a natural origin, nonetheless divine law is superior to natural law, and thus the body that operates according to divine law is naturally superior to that which operates according to natural law:

The ministry of this kingdom is entrusted not to the rulers of this earth but to priests, so that temporal affairs may remain distinct from those spiritual: and in particular, it is delegated to the High Priest, the successor of Peter and Vicar of Christ, the Roman Pontiff; to whom all kings in Christendom should be subject, as to the Lord Jesus Christ Himself...under the New Law there is a higher priesthood through which men are led to a heavenly reward: and under Christ's law, kings must be subject to priests.20

In the Summa, Aquinas uses a familiar image to describe the relation of secular and ecclesiastical power, and the rights of the latter to intervene in the former:

The temporal power is subject to the spiritual as the body to the soul, as St. Gregory Nazianzenus says (Orat. XVII). Therefore there is no usurpation of power if a spiritual Prelate should interest himself in temporal affairs with respect to those things in which the temporal power is subject to him or in matters which have been left to him by the secular power.21

However, it must be noted that Aquinas felt the sacerdotium could in turn fully submit to the secular power if necessary; Aquinas notes, "Christ freely subjected Himself to human judgment, and Pope Leo also submitted himself to the judgment of the Emperor."22

However, the superiority unquestionably belongs to the sacerdotium, and this interference by the secular power into the affairs of the sacerdotium is on the sacerdotium's terms. With this fact in mind, one of Aquinas' most famous passages on political order becomes clearer to understand:

Both the spiritual and the temporal power derive from the divine power; consequently the temporal power is subject to the spiritual only to the extent that this is so ordered by God; namely in those matters which affect the salvation of the soul. And in these matters the spiritual power is to be obeyed before the temporal. In those matters, however, which concern the civil welfare, the temporal power should be obeyed rather than the spiritual, according to what we are told in St. Matthew (22:21) "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." Unless, of course, the spiritual and the temporal power are identified in one person as in the Pope, whose power is supreme in matters both temporal and spiritual, through the dispensation of Him Who is both priest and king; a Priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedek, the King of kings and Lord of lords, Whose power shall not fail and Whose dominion shall not pass away to all eternity. Amen.23

The sacerdotium and the secular power both have their spheres, and they seem to be co-equal, but Aquinas goes on to apply all power to the pope. It is possible that this passage...
might be meant to apply to the special situation of the Papal States, where the pope was actual temporal lord as well as spiritual. Nevertheless, it is very clear from what we have seen elsewhere that Aquinas viewed the sacerdotium as superior, in theory if not always in fact. These are rather traditional notions coming from the man whose application of Aristotle's idea of the natural origin of the state would change European politics forever.

The seed which was planted by the glossators and Thomas Aquinas sprang into full bloom in the latter part of the thirteenth century and through most of the fourteenth. The last phase of conflict we shall examine between sacerdotium and imperium, or regnum, occurred at this time. The roots of the conflict began in the person of an aged, nearly illiterate man, St. Peter of Murrone. In 1282 Pope Nicholas IV died, and the papacy remained vacant for nearly two years while pro and anti French factions contested. Nicholas II's decrees on papal elections had successfully kept members of the imperium from intervening in the election process by vesting all electoral power in the hands of the College of Cardinals, but his decrees could not prevent internal dissention from preventing the speedy choice of a pope. Peter of Murrone entered the picture in 1294. He had begun his ecclesiastical career as a Benedictine monk, but later left his monastery to become an itinerant preacher. A simple man and advocate of both clerical poverty and sanctity, he was much like a later-day Francis of Assisi. He founded an order of monks, later to be called the Celestines, who followed a modified version of the Benedictine Rule. After governing his order for a short time, he stepped down from the post of abbot and retired to live as a hermit on Mount Murrone. In 1294 he wrote a letter to one of the cardinals, chastising the lot for their failure to select a new pope, and threatened divine retribution if they did not do so quickly. In short order, the cardinals chose him as pope, more as a compromise candidate than anything else. In July 1294 Peter was elected, and finally consecrated as Pope Celestine V (1294) in August. From the beginning he captured many people's imaginations. He rode to his coronation on a mule, and was known for his simplicity. As apocalyptic notions about the Last World Emperor had surrounded Frederick II, so apocalyptic notions about the Angelic Pope surrounded the actual pope Celestine. The chief
promulgators of these sentiments were the Spiritual Franciscans, that wing of the Franciscan Order which had been in conflict with the Conventual Franciscans since about 1280 over the issue of the interpretation of the Rule and the possession of goods, the Spirituals favoring strict interpretation and absolute poverty and the Conventuals favoring a loose interpretation and provisions for the possession of some goods. Celestine and the Spirituals were great friends; one of his few acts as pope was to recognize them and allow them to exist under papal protection as the Poor Hermits of Celestine. One of their leaders, Angelo of Clareno (c.1247-1337) wrote of him that:

He commanded us to preserve the Rule and Testament according to the will and order of St. Francis faithfully and sincerely all the days of our lives, but to do without the name Friars Minor."

As we shall see below, it was this group which saw in Celestine the fulfillment of the ideas of Joachim and St. Francis, and who did a great deal to perpetuate and change the figure of the Angelic Pope. Besides supporting the Spirituals, Celestine's only other major act as pope was to renew the law of the Conclave, so that long vacancies in the papacy would be discouraged. But the feature which most drew people to Celestine, his simplicity, proved to be the cause of his undoing. He was completely out of place in the Curia, and had absolutely no idea on how to properly administer it. He was essentially a tool of King Charles II of Naples (1285-1309), and made a number of unsound appointments, several of them Charles' men, to high ecclesiastical posts. He was also completely oblivious to the orgy of self-serving and pocket-lining that summarily occurred before his simple, unsophisticated eyes. He gradually became aware that he was totally unsuited for the position into which he had been thrust, and after consulting Canon Law and issuing a bull declaring the right of a pope to abdicate, he laid down his miter, sandals, and ring in December 1294, the first and only pope in history to resign. However, his actions did not give him the peace he sought. One of the cardinals, Benedict Gaetani, was swiftly elected as pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303), and he realized the potential of Peter of Murrone as a focal point for dissidents. So for "safekeeping" he had Peter pursued, captured, and locked up in a cell in the castle of
Fumone, where the hapless hermit died in May 1296. However, questions about Boniface's legitimacy and actions toward Peter haunted him all the days of his reign.

It is difficult to accurately assess the character of Boniface VIII. He was a man of great piety, learning, and ambition, but also great inflexibility, tactlessness, and ill-temperedness, all coupled with a very blatant penchant for nepotism. Some historians have regarded him as a power-mad usurper, while others have pointed to the circumstances and conditions of his pontificate which drove him to many of his more extreme actions. In any case, it is clear that upon his accession he had the disorderly state of affairs left by Celestine's benign neglect to deal with. He also had to deal with a divided Europe. Echoes of the Hohenstaufen conflict were continuing in the persons of James II of Aragon (1285-1295) and Charles II of Anjou who were contesting for the throne of Sicily. Boniface's 1295 diplomatic solution to this conflict proved to be short-lived, so he taxed Europe heavily to finance a military one. This holy war ultimately failed, and in 1302 Boniface was finally forced to accept Frederick II (1296-1337), James II's brother, as king of a now-independent kingdom of Sicily. The taxation issued for this conflict was the impetus for the events of the next conflict. King Edward I of England (1227-1307) and King Philip IV of France (1285-1314) were engaged in a military conflict over feudal rights and commercial rivalries, and were taxing the clergy quite heavily to finance it, in spite of the fact that the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) forbade clerical taxation. These decrees in fact had been only loosely applied, and the clergy had been taxed in the past to support "just wars." Both Edward and Philip felt fully justified in taxing the clergy, as each claimed to be fighting a "just war" against the other. Possibly they were also influenced by Boniface's own taxation of the clergy, deciding that since he could do so to fund his "just war" over feudal possessions, so could they. For Boniface, their taxation and war were intolerable. He would have preferred that Edward and Philip cease their "just wars" against each other and turn instead to one against the infidel. It was quite clear that a new crusade was one of his goals, since the last Christian stronghold in the Holy Land had fallen in 1290. In February of 1297 he issued the bull Clerici Laicos, which began in the following fashion:
That laymen have been very hostile to the clergy antiquity relates; and it is clearly proved by the experiences of the present time. For not content with what is their own the laity strive for what is forbidden and loose the reigns for things unlawful. Nor do they prudently realize that power over clerks or ecclesiastical persons or goods is forbidden them: they impose heavy burdens on the prelates of the churches and ecclesiastical persons regular and secular, and tax them, and impose collections; they exact and demand from the same the half, tithe, or twentieth, or any other proportion of their revenues or goods; and in many ways they try to bring them into slavery, and subject them to their authority.

The bull goes on to pronounce a sentence of excommunication on any lay ruler who issues such a tax in future, and also on any churchman who cooperates with such taxation in any way. Boniface's sharp words toward the laity at the outset demonstrate some of his famous temper and tactlessness, and moreover display with what contempt this member of the sacerdotium regarded the lay power. Furthermore, the bull as a whole implied a strong limitation on the extent of the royal power.

The lay kingdoms naturally did not take Boniface's actions kindly. Edward outlawed complying clergy, although his anger was largely mollified by Robert of Winchelsea (c.1240-1313), the staunchly pro-sacerdotium Archbishop of Canterbury. Philip, however, rose to the challenge. It is almost impossible to determine Philip's motives or character. As Brian Tierney notes:

He worked behind a screen of extraordinarily efficient and ruthless royal servants, so that we know more about the motives and attitudes of his chief ministers...than about Philip's own personal convictions.

Some historians have viewed him as little more than an easy-going nonentity, manipulated by his ministers, while others have viewed him as a very strong administrator who chose to delegate great authority to his ministers and rule through them. Philip's counter to Boniface's Clericis Laicos was brilliant in its simplicity; in August 1296 he simply forbade the export of all precious metals, gems, and currency from France. Boniface's curia was entirely dependent upon ecclesiastical revenues from France, and the move crippled him. He also had two sets of enemies in Italy: the powerful Colonna family, old enemies of his own family, and the Spiritual Franciscans, who felt that at the very least he had instigated the resignation of their beloved Celestine, if not murdered him outright. Most of the Spirituals had fled to an island in the Gulf of Corinth at his accession, but some returned to Italy to
answer to charges raised against them by the Conventuals. In 1297 these two forces joined together to plague Boniface. A Colonna relative had plundered a convoy of papal treasure, and when Boniface attempted to induce the Colonna members of his curia to give up some of their castles in retribution, they refused and retired to their castles for a protracted siege. Joined by the Spirituals in the person of Jacopone da Todi (1230-1306), a noted Spiritual leader and poet, they issued a series of manifestos against Boniface. They condemned him for heresy, simony, and forcing Celestine to resign "contrary to the rules and statues of divine, human, and canon law, and a cause of scandal and error to the whole world." Ultimately he was charged with the murder of his predecessor. They went on to attack his legitimacy as pope, and called for a Church council to resolve the situation:

\[\text{[L]et care be taken that a universal council be swiftly assembled which, laying aside all error, will declare the truth concerning the iniquity, nullity, and injustice of the process he has presumed to institute against us. And meanwhile let no one obey or heed, especially in matters touching the safety of the soul, this man who does not possess the authority of a supreme pontiff although de facto he rashly holds the place of one.}\]

Philip's minister Pierre Flotte (c.1260-1302) travelled south to negotiate with Boniface, and in so doing met with representatives of the Colonnas. Boniface greatly feared that Philip might support them against him, especially in the matter of a call for a general council, and so he broke down and capitulated to Philip. In July 1297 he issued the bull *Etsi De Statu*, in which he noted that, regarding Philip IV, in the case of a national emergency, the bull *Clericis Laicos* "shall by no means extend to such a case of necessity." Also, Philip could levy taxes, "even when the Roman pontiff has not been consulted." Furthermore, Boniface left in the hands of the French monarchy the authority to determine just what constituted a national emergency. Philip's victory in this matter was thus swift and complete. He was also able in the same year to secure the canonization of his grandfather Louis IX, thus adding lustre and sanctity to the French royal house and, by extension, to himself. But the conflict was by no means over.

The year 1300 marked a change for Boniface, for that year he declared a Jubilee. Anyone coming to Rome and making a sincere confession would receive a plenary indulgence, the complete forgiveness of all sins. Heretofore, such indulgences had been
available only to crusaders, and the response to the Jubilee was overwhelming; tens of thousands came to Rome. Heartened by this display of fidelity, Boniface was emboldened to lock horns with Philip once again when the occasion came, as it did in 1301. Philip had ordered the arrest of Bernard Saisset, the bishop of Pamiers, on a charge of treason and had him imprisoned. Clerics were supposed to be immune to prosecution from secular courts, and for Boniface to let this action pass without comment would have been to acknowledge Philip's control over the Church in France. Boniface sent several papal bulls to Philip demanding the release of Saisset and revoking all the privileges which he had just granted to Philip. Along with them Boniface sent a personal letter in the form of a bull which he previously had presented to and approved by the College of Cardinals. This December 1301 bull, Ausculta Fili, opens with a strong statement of independence by the sacerdotium directed at Philip:

Listen, beloved son, to the precepts of a father and pay heed to the teaching of a master who holds the place on earth of Him who alone is lord and master; take into your heart the warning of holy mother Church and be sure to act on it with good effect so that with a contrite heart you may reverently return to God from whom, as it is known, you have turned away though negligence or evil counsel and conform yourself to His will and ours...The Roman pontiff is indeed the head of this bride who descended from heaven, made ready by God like a bride adorned for her husband; nor does she have several heads like a monster for she is without stain or wrinkle or anything unseemly.38

Boniface's imagery in the latter part of this excerpt echoes that of Bernard of Clairvaux. He also uses another familiar metaphor when he admonishes Philip, "You do not permit prelates and ecclesiastical persons to use the spiritual sword that is theirs against those who would injure and molest them."37 Perhaps most importantly, he sharply rebukes Philip in the following passage:

For, although our merits are insufficient, God has set us over kings and kingdoms, and has imposed on us the yoke of apostolic service to root up and to pull down, to waste and to destroy, to build and to plant in his name and according to his teaching (cf. Jer. 1:10)...wherefore, dearest son, let no one persuade you that you have no superior or that you are not subject to the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, for he is a fool who so thinks, and whoever affirms it pertinaciously is convicted as an unbeliever and is outside the fold of the good shepherd.38
This essentially traditional idea was by now inflammatory to Philip. His ministers responded for him; rather than circulating the original of this letter, they concocted a forgery in 1302 and circulated it instead. It was quite different from the original:

Boniface, bishop, servant of the servants of God to Philip, king of the French. Fear God and keep his commandments. We want you to know that you are subject to us in spiritualities and temporalities. The collation of benefices and prebends does not belong to you at all and if you have custody of any vacant churches you are to keep their revenues for those who succeed to them. If you have conferred any such benefices we declare the collations null and void and we revoke any that you have made de facto. Given at the Lateran on the fifth of December in the seventh year of our pontificate.30

Philip's ministers also circulated an equally strong and equally false response by Philip:

Philip, by the grace of God king of the French, to Boniface who acts as though he were pope, little or no greeting. Let your great fatuity know that in temporalities we are subject to no one; that the collation of vacant churches and prebends belongs to us by royal right and that their revenues are ours; that the collations we have made in the past or shall make in the future are valid and that we shall strongly defend their holders against anyone. All who think otherwise we hold for fools and madmen. Given at Paris.40

Boniface had tried in 1301 to compel the French bishops to attend a council in Rome in November 1302 to consider the state of the Church in France. Philip did not wish this council to take place, and to counter it he called his own assembly of nobles, clergy, and people in April 1302, which history has remembered as the first meeting of the Estates-General. His minister Pierre Flotte, referring to the forged letter from Boniface, decried the fact that Boniface was claiming to be the feudal overlord of France. The clergy responded by sending an envoy to Boniface; they were deeply embarrassed by these "claims" and sought to avoid attending the November council.

Boniface was startled by these developments, and issued a formal reply to the ambassadors of the Estates-General. It contained a sharp retort to the forgery of Flotte, but also a restatement of the pro ratione peccati logic of Innocent III:

[Pierre Flotte] attributed to us a command that the king should recognize that he held his kingdom from us. We have been an expert in the law for forty years and we know very well that there are two powers ordained by God. Who can of should believe then that we entertain or will entertain such a fatuous and foolish opinion? We declare that we do not wish to usurp the jurisdiction of the king in any way, and so our brother the cardinal of Porto has said. But the king cannot deny that, like all the faithful, he is subject to us by reason of sin. ... Our predecessors deposed three kings of France; they can read about it in their chronicles and we in ours, and one case is to be
found in the Decretum; and although we are not worthy to tread in the footsteps of our predecessors, if the king committed the same crimes as they committed or greater ones we would depose him like a servant with grief and great sorrow."

Speaking in purely feudal terms, Boniface noted that the kingdom of France was completely independent of him, for he was not its overlord. However, he did reserve the right of intervention pro ratione peccati, and under that right Philip, like all Christians, was subject. He also attempted to put Philip off-guard by invoking the old transfer of empire idea, noting how popes had deposed French kings in the past and would do so again if necessary. He was helped a little by contemporary events; that same summer Philip's troops suffered a resounding defeat at the Battle of Courtrai in Flanders, and Pierre Flotte was killed. Philip's attention was thus directed elsewhere, away from Boniface. Yet Philip still forbade the French bishops to attend the November council, and when November came, less than half of them--36 out of 78--attended. As a consequence, nothing was decided about the state of the Church in France. Instead, in November just after the council, Boniface issued the bull Unam Sanctam, the most famous document on Church and State in the Middle Ages. Prompted, to be sure, by the problem of ecclesiastical officials wavering in their obedience to the sacerdotium in favor of the regnum, the treatise concerns itself with the unity of the Church, but more so on the nature of papal power and its relation to secular authority. It contains many ideas that will be familiar to us. Indeed, Boniface echoes his own words of Ausculta Fili (and of Bernard) when he writes, "there is only one body and one head of this one and only Church, not two heads as though it were a monster." The two-swords metaphor reappears when he notes that, "We are taught by the words of the Gospel that in this Church and in her power there are two swords, a spiritual one and a temporal one." A reference to Matt. 26:52 indicates that both are in the hands of the pope, definitely the head of the Church and definitely the successor of St. Peter, but the temporal one is delegated to the secular power to be used ad nuntius. The spiritual power is definitely superior and is in charge:

But that the spiritual power excels any earthly one in dignity and nobility we ought the more openly to confess in proportion as spiritual things excel temporal ones. Moreover we clearly perceive this from the giving of tithes, from benediction and sanctification, from the acceptance of this power and
from the very government of things. For, the truth bearing witness, the spiritual power has to institute the earthly power and to judge it if it has not been good. So is verified the prophecy of Jeremias [1:10] concerning the Church and the power of the Church, "Lo I have set thee this day over the nations and over kingdoms" etc.4

This power to judge comes from St. Peter's power to bind and to loose (cf. Matt. 16:19). The bull concludes with, "we declare, state, define and pronounce that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."45 Note that we have seen the bases of all these arguments before, mostly in the words and documents of the popes of centuries past. Jean Riviere concurs; "not only the foundations but even the wording is borrowed from earlier authors."46 Yet the regnum rejected them as much as did the later German imperium under Frederick II; both bodies were far in time from the situations which had originally produced the arguments and wanted no limitations on their authority. Furthermore, Boniface's last words in Unam Sanctam were delivered with an absolutism that did nothing to placate those to whom the bull was directed.

Philip's counter-attack was harsh. At a royal council meeting in June 1303, a series of charges against Boniface were raised that were nothing short of character assassination. Boniface was accused of heresy, sodomy, black magic, murder, and a whole host of other spurious charges47 that go beyond even what Henry IV and Frederick II used against their papal adversaries. Boniface in return planned to excommunicate Philip, and moved from Rome to a secure place in Anagni to do so. Before he could issue the excommunication, Philip's minister Guillaume de Nogaret and Sciarrà Colonna, of the family of his old enemies, lead an army of mercenaries to seize the city of Anagni in September. They penetrated the papal palace and confronted Boniface. William of Hundleby has left us an eyewitness account of what transpired:

[The angered soldiery] forced their way to the Pope. Many of them heaped insult upon his head and threatened him violently, but to them all the Pope answered not so much as a word. And when they pressed him as to whether he would resign the Papacy, firmly did he refuse--indeed he preferred to lose his head--as he said in the vernacular: "E le col, e le cape!" which means: "Here is my neck and here my head." Therewith he proclaimed in the presence of them all that as long as life was in him, he would not give up the papacy.48
Nogaret and Colonna disagreed about what to do with Boniface, and on the third day of the occupation the citizens of Anagni rose up against them and they were forced to flee, leaving Boniface alive. However, he never recovered from the shock, and died a few weeks later. His successor, Clement V (1305-1314) proved to be a good deal more compliant towards Philip. A Frenchman, Clement was harassed by Philip and capitulated readily, and Philip won a series of victories. Early in his pontificate Clement began to undo the work of Boniface. In February 1306 he issued a meruit revoking the provisions of Unam Sanctam:

Hence it is that we do not wish or intend that anything prejudicial to that king or kingdom should arise from the declaration of our predecessor of happy memory Pope Boniface VIII, which began with the words "Unam Sanctam"; nor that the aforementioned king, kingdom and people should be any more subject to the Roman Church on account of it than they were before. But everything is understood to be in the same state as it was before the said definition, both as regards the Church and regards the aforementioned king, kingdom, and people.49

Furthermore, not only was he compelled to revoke the sentence of excommunication Nogaret had incurred, but he was forced to admit formally that Nogaret had been acting out of the highest motives and that his assault on Boniface was, rather, a praiseworthy action:

Finally, having inquired diligently into the matter we find that the said assertors, objectors and denouncers [of Boniface]...and the said king...were not impelled by any preconceived malice but were actuated by an estimable, just, and sincere zeal...and by apostolic authority we pronounce and with the council of our brothers we decree and by these presents declare that they were and are guiltless of malicious accusation and that they acted out of an estimable, just, and sincere zeal and from the fervor of their Catholic faith.50

Philip's ultimate triumph came in 1309, however, when Clement moved the papacy to Avignon, right where Philip could keep an eye on it. In this action, regnum had finally, decisively, triumphed over the sacerdotium.

This decisive triumph can also be seen in the arena of political thought. Indeed, it can be said that this conflict of sacerdotium and regnum witnessed the birth of modern political theory. It is intriguing to set the arguments of sacerdotium and regnum beside each other and examine them. Let us begin with a writer on the side of the sacerdotium, Giles of Rome (c.1243-1316). His De Ecclesia Potestate, written in 1301, represents the most ardent pro-sacerdotium views. His work is divided into three books. In the first, he considers the nature of the sacerdotium, and in so doing, he uses familiar arguments: Hugh of St. Victor,
Luke 22:38 and the two-swords metaphor, etc. And he reaches the natural conclusion from these that the sacerdotium is the superior of the two powers. But he goes on further to note that royal power derives its very legitimacy from the sacerdotium:

The royal power ought to recognize the priestly as a superior dignity by which, at God's command, it is instituted. And if it is said that not all royal power is instituted by the priesthood we say that there is no royal power not instituted by the priesthood which is not either unrighteous, in which case it is more a band of robbers than a power, or united with the priesthood, or subsequently confirmed by the priesthood. For in the law of nature, where there were many kingdoms of the gentiles, nearly all those kingdoms were founded by invasion and usurpation.

Giles certainly does not define natural law in the same way Aquinas did, adhering to the old notion of government being established as a check on the sinfulness of man. This question of superiority has repercussions in areas other than the political sphere, notably in that regarding private property, which is the subject of Giles' next book. Far from shrinking from the idea that the sacerdotium should own everything if it rules everything, Giles enthusiastically embraces it:

We intend to explain in this chapter that all temporal things are placed under the dominion and power of the Church. ... The power of the supreme pontiff governs souls. Souls ought rightly to govern bodies or they will be badly ordered as regards the part which does not obey the soul or mind or reason. But temporal things serve our bodies. It follows then that the priestly power which governs souls also rules over bodies and temporal things...It follows than that you should acknowledge that your heritage and all your lordship and every right of possession are yours more from the Church and through the Church and because you are a son of the Church than from your carnal father or through him or because you are his son.

Again, the metaphor is familiar, the application is not. This is a complete reversal of Innocent IV's ideas on property. Giles is magnanimous however; he notes "we do not deprive the faithful of their lordships and possessions," since the secular and sacred powers each have a different function. It is those different functions which he considers in his third book. Here he again makes use of the two-swords metaphor as well as the concept of plenitudo potestas as he explains how the sacerdotium acquired the material sword:

It is not on account of any defect of power in the spiritual sword that it may not judge concerning temporalities; rather it was on account of its excellence that a material sword was added to it. Because the spiritual sword is so exalted and such exalted things are committed to it, in order that it might attend to them more freely, the second sword was added, but this in no way diminished the jurisdiction and plenitude of power of the spiritual sword; rather it was done because it is fitting that what is appointed for great
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things should not concern itself with petty ones unless some cause arises.
And so the plenitude of power is in the spiritual sword and, when it is
expedient it may judge concerning temporalities. If then there is an appeal
from a civil judge to the pope, although it may not be in accordance with the
law on separation of courts it will be in accordance with the law on plenitude
of power.84

This again reinforces Giles' notion about the innate superiority of the Church; it is because
of this that material power was given to it. His concessions toward the temporal power do
not recognize any value in it, but allow it to perform the tasks that the sacerdotium does
not want to dirty its hands with. Furthermore, there is nothing wrong with an appeal from
a secular court to an ecclesiastical one, if the problem is serious enough to warrant the
sacerdotium's attention. The whole of De Ecclesiastica Potestate presents arguments that
are traditional and familiar, and draws them conclusions that favor the sacerdotium in the
highest way. The work itself was logical, well-organized, and well-argued. But as Brian
Tierney notes, "Equally striking, however, was its total failure to convince the contemporary
critics of the papacy against whom it was directed."85 Political theory had moved in another
direction since the introduction of Aristotle and natural law by Thomas Aquinas, and no
mere citation of religious authors and scriptural authorities, however cogently organized and
argued, would convince. Natural law was an understood concept now, and successful
arguments would have to rely on reason as well as revelation.

An example of this is the work of the French Dominican friar John of Paris (c.1240-
1306). His work Tractatus de Potestate Regia et Papali, written between 1302 and 1303,
while not single-mindedly as logical or as cogent as Giles' work, nevertheless was more
successful given its broader considerations. John notes that there are two kinds of error one
can fall into regarding property and the sacerdotium; the first being that of the
Waldensians, who deny the sacerdotium the rights to any property at all, the second being
"that of Herod":

who when he heard that Christ was born, believed him to be an earthly king.
From this seems to be derived the opinion of certain moderns who, in
rejecting the first error, go so far in the opposite direction as to assert that
the lord pope, since he stands in the place of Christ, has dominion over the
temporal goods of princes and barons and jurisdiction and cognizance
concerning them.86
This stands in contrast to the ideas of his contemporary Giles of Rome. In any case, John's ideas on the subject are a little more balanced:

Between such contrary opinions, the first of which everyone regards as erroneous, I think that the truth establishes a middle ground, namely that it is not improper for the prelates of the church to have lordship and jurisdiction over temporalities, and this is against the first error; but nevertheless that is not owed to them by reason of their status or in their capacity as vicars of Christ and successors of the apostles. Rather it can be fitting for them to have such things by concession or permission of princes if they have bestowed any such things out of devotion, or if the prelates have received them from another source.

However, John does note that in cases of theft or socially destructive selfish hoarding, "a prince is established by the people to preside as judge in such cases and to determine what is just and unjust." As we can see, John's notion is that the prince arises from the people. This is entirely consistent with his other views; for like Aquinas he, too, is an Aristotelian and cites Aristotle when he refers to the natural origin of the state:

Such a government is based on natural law and the law of nations. For, since man is naturally a civil or political creature as is said in Book I of the Politics—and the Philosopher proves this from food, clothing, and defense in which a solitary man is not self-sufficient as also from speech which is addressed to another, these things being necessary only for men—it is essential for a man to live in a multitude and in such a multitude as is self-sufficient for life.

In short, John feels that, far from being established by the sacerdotium, the regnum has an independent existence which comes from God:

The royal power both existed and was exercised before the papal, and there were kings in France before there were Christians. Therefore neither the royal power nor its exercise is from the pope but from God and from the people who elect a king by choosing either a person or a royal house...It would seem that the power of inferior pontiffs and ministers is derived from the pope more than the royal power, for ecclesiastical prelates are more immediately dependent on the pope than the secular princes. But the power of prelates is not from God through the pope but immediately from God and from the people who elect or consent.

John is quite traditional in his notions about the superiority of the sacerdotium. He alludes to Hugh of St. Victor and the sun-moon metaphor when he concludes, "Therefore the priestly power is of greater dignity than the secular and this is commonly conceded." However, he goes on to limit that superiority, noting that "if the priest is greater in himself than the prince and is greater in dignity, it does not follow that he is greater in all respects."
Actually, John strives for a balance between the two powers, based on their common divine origin, that is strikingly Gelasian in its tone:

And so the secular power is greater than the spiritual in some things, namely in temporal affairs, and in such affairs it is not subject to the spiritual power in any way because it does not have its origin from it but rather both have their origin immediately from the one supreme power, namely the divine.  

With this we have in many ways come full circle, and the thought expressed by the sacerdotium is much like that in caesaropapist times. Nevertheless, John makes one application of Aristotle and Aquinas that is rather startling. Both Aristotle and Aquinas felt that a form of mixed government, with an element of participation by the people, was the optimal kind. As we have seen above, John noted that the people choose a prince or a royal house. Later he goes on to elaborate this, demonstrating how the people can regulate the excesses of the prince. Or the pope:

If a prince was a heretic and incorrigible and contemptuous of ecclesiastical censures, the pope might so move the people that he would be deprived of his secular dignity and deposed by the people. ... So, too, if the pope on the other hand behaved criminally and brought scandal on the Church and was incorrigible, the prince might indirectly excommunicate him and "incidentally" bring about his deposition by warning him personally or through the cardinals. And if the pope were unwilling to yield the emperor might so move the people as to compel him to resign or be deposed by the people.

These particular ideas of John would eventually culminate in the idea of conciliarism, making the Church into a kind of representative body, with power resting in the hands of the Cardinals or bishops as representatives of the people, rather than the pope. This idea would be more fully developed in the future (by Marsilius of Padua among others, as we shall see below), and are largely beyond the scope of this thesis. But John demonstrates that even a writer who could restate the Gelasian synthesis could still voice ideas that were, at their heart, revolutionary vis-à-vis the sacerdotium.

Writers on the side of the imperium or regnum were increasingly less charitable to the older, traditional arguments of the sacerdotium. An intriguing example of this is the anonymous Disputatio inter Clericum et Militem written circa 1296/1298. The work itself is written in the form of a dialogue between a Clerk and a Knight. The Clerk sets up a number of the sacerdotium’s traditional arguments and the Knight refutes them, one by one,
mostly using common sense and some biblical knowledge. The Knight begins by denying the Church some of its accustomed rights:

For no one can make decrees about things over which he certainly has no lordship. Thus the king of the French cannot make decrees in regard to the Empire, nor the Empire in regard to the kingdom of France. And even as earthly princes cannot decree anything in regard to spirituals, over which they have received no power, so neither can you decree anything in regard to their temporals, over which you have no authority. Thus whatever you have decreed about temporals, over which you have not received power from God, is a waste of time.

In this we can see a culmination of the independence of the national state from the empire, and also a reflection of the contemporary events regarding Boniface VIII. The Knight disregards a host of theories, documents, and canon laws, instead appealing directly to the authority of the Bible, challenging the Clerk, "show me by various Scriptures that supreme pontiffs are lords over all temporals." The Clerk’s appeal to the arguments of the pope as successor of Peter and vicar of Christ receives the following reply:

Peter was constituted vicar of Christ for the state of humility, not for the state of glory and majesty. For he was not made vicar of Christ for those things that Christ now does in glory, but to imitate those things that Christ did when He was humble on earth, because those are necessary to us. Therefore He committed to His vicar that power which he exercised as mortal man, not that which He received when glorified. And I shall prove this to you by the testimony of those same Scriptures you quote. For Christ Himself said to Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world" (Jn. 18:36) and that He did not come to be ministered unto but to minister (Matt. 20:28).

Eventually the Clerk is badgered into retreating into a "leave us in our sphere" argument regarding the Church’s temporal goods. But the Knight responds that such goods were given to the *sacerdotium* for religious works, but notes:

But certainly you do nothing with them but apply to your own needs all that with which you ought to fill the bellies of the poor through benefactions and works of charity. Is it not necessary that through holy works of this sort the dead might be freed and the living saved? When you spend these endowments as if they were your own and consume them extravagantly in defiance of the givers' intention and also, in a sense, waste them by misuse, do you not wrong the living and the dead, and damnably steal from them? Should not the wage be taken away from the soldier who refuses to earn it?

The Disputatio represents a different world from so much of our other works. In it, the lay person is fully literate and conversant with Scripture. The *sacerdotium*’s long monopoly on arguments from Scripture is broken. Indeed, the Knight’s hostile aversion to clerical wealth...
and his appeals only to the authority of Scripture characterize the mind-set of many of the later Protestant reformers, making the Disputatio a curiously proto-Protestant work.

The attack on the sacerdotium by the author of the Disputatio pales before that of Pierre Dubois (c.1250-c.1321). His De Recuperatione Terrae Sanctae, completed between 1305 and 1307, presents a detailed plan for the recovery of the Holy Land. It is written in a spirit of rabid Gallic chauvinism. According to Dubois, preparatory to a recovery of the Holy Land would be a complete reorganization of Europe and the Church. In this program, the French king would confer secretly with the pope and the German king, and through bribery of them and the German electors, was to secure election to the German imperium. His brother was then to seize Constantinople, and the French king, now emperor, could appoint a prince to rule in Italy. The pope would be no problem in this area, for

in return for a perpetual annual pension [the pope] would turn over to the lord king the whole patrimony of the Church and temporal jurisdiction over its vassals, among whom are many kings.00

This action would free the French king to attain control over England, Aragon, and Majorca.

But the pope wouldn't remain in Italy. He would be moved:

When wars have been brought to an end by the means here suggested; when, in return for a guaranteed annual pension, the government, possession, and distractions of the pope's temporalities have been entrusted in perpetuity to the lord king of the French, to be governed by his brothers and sons as he shall see fit to provide, when the poisonous plots of the Romans and Lombards have ceased--then it is highly probable that the lord pope will be able to enjoy a long and healthful life in his native land, the kingdom of the French, with leisure to devote his sole attention to the governance of souls, and he may thereby avoid the inclement atmosphere of Rome, to which he has been unaccustomed from birth.70

Pierre is moved in this notion especially by a hatred of things Roman—he sees that it is the destiny of the French to control Europe, and with it to gain control of the Church:

The [Romans], eager in their pride to trample on the humility of the French, have presumed to attempt what has elsewhere never been heard of, namely, to lay claim to temporal dominion over the kingdom the French and its supreme prince, damnably inciting that kingdom of greatest peace and concord to perpetual sedition. The presumptuous beginning of this storm has been happily calmed, because the king of peace imparts the greatest harmony to his deputies.71

This whole program is one great fantasy on Pierre's part, more an intellectual exercise than anything else. Certainly his desire for peace is laudable enough. But his program is a
nightmare. Curiously, part of it did come to pass, for the French pope Clement V did
indeed move the papacy to France, under the aegis of the French monarchy.

A desire for peace was the prime motivator of another political thinker, Dante Alighieri
(1265-1321). Besides his famous poetic works Dante wrote a treatise on world government
sometime between 1310 and 1313 entitled De Monarchia. In many ways, it is the last gasp
of imperium-based theorizing. Dante was an ardent imperial supporter, and De Monarchia
reflects it. The work itself is divided into three parts. In the first part, Dante considers the
questions of world government and peace. He begins with a consideration of the mankind's
end:

I have now made it clear that the proper end of mankind taken as a whole is
to exercise continually its entire capacity for intellectual growth, first, in
theoretical matters, and, secondarily, as an extension of theory, in practice.
And since the part is a sample of the whole, and since individual men find
that they grow in prudence and wisdom when they can sit quietly, it is
evident that mankind, too, is most free and easy to carry on its work when it
enjoys the quiet and tranquility of peace. Man's work is almost divine ("Thou
hast made him a little lower than the angels"), and it is clear that of all the
things that have been ordained for our happiness, the greatest is universal
peace.

In Dante's eyes, mankind thus has the end of personal growth, spiritual as well as
intellectual (as we shall see below), and for this growth, mankind needs peace. For Dante,
this peace was disturbed by the frequent conflicts of sacerdotium and imperium throughout
Italy. Moreover, these conflicts had touched him personally, since they were the cause of
his exile from his home city of Florence. Using an Aristotelian notion, Dante designated the
imperium as the agent which would bring about the peace he sought:

Since it appears that the whole of mankind is ordained to one end, as we
have proved above, it should therefore have a single rule and one
government, and this power should be called the Monarch or Emperor. And
thus it is plain that for the well-being of the world there must be a single
world-rule or empire.

Peace would be guaranteed under a World-Empire because there would be no other
governments to combat it. Dante also felt, rather naively, that this empire would be able to
avoid corruption, simply because it possessed everything. The second book of De Monarchia
deals with reasons why the Roman empire is if fact God's chosen agent on earth. Most of
Dante's arguments on this point are appeals to the past achievements of the Roman empire,
appended with the fact that Christ became incarnate during the Augustine empire, when there was peace in the world. These arguments follow Eusebius and tend to be less than convincing. The final book of De Monarchia deals with the questions of where political authority originates, and it is in this book that Dante generated some controversy. He felt that all political authority was concentrated in the concentrated in the secular empire, and that the papacy had none whatsoever. He accords the papacy the greatest respect—even to the point of noting that the popes who did not share his ideas were, though wrong, still "moved wholly by zeal for mother Church,"74 and despite the fact that he calls the Decretalists "ignorant and unskilled in any theology and philosophy whatsoever,"75 nevertheless he feels that the Decretals themselves are "worthy of respect."76 In this last book he proceeds to systematically take on and deny the traditional arguments of the sacerdotium. All come under fire: the sun-moon allegory, the "vicar of Christ" idea, the "binding and loosing" notion, the two-swords allegory, and the Donation of Constantine. In each attack, he relies solely on logic, Aristotle, or the authority of Scripture, much like John of Paris. He concludes De Monarchia as he began it, with a consideration of the ends of man:

Twofold, therefore, are the ends which unerring Providence has ordained for man: the bliss of this life, which consists in the functioning of his own powers, and which is typified by the earthly Paradise; and the bliss of eternal life, which consists in the enjoyment of that divine vision to which he cannot attain by his own powers, except that they be aided by the divine light, and this state is made intelligible by the celestial Paradise.77

Like Aristotle and Aquinas before him, Dante feels that the political authority was good in and of itself, but he takes their ideas a step further—by regarding it as a function of the earthly Paradise, he implies that perfection on earth is a valid and attainable goal, to be realized through self-development, which of course is greatly facilitated by political order. This was De Monarchia's most controversial theme. An earthly goal, however, was not enough; man has a heavenly goal as well, and both of these goals could not be reached unless the two powers ordained for those ends cooperated:

However, the truth...must not be interpreted so strictly as to imply that the Roman government is in no way subject to the Roman pontificate, for in some ways our mortal happiness is ordered for our immortal happiness. Caesar therefore owed to Peter the piety which a first-born son owes to his father.
And so, in the light of paternal grace, this government will better enlighten our globe, over which it rules through Him alone who is the ruler of all things spiritual and temporal.\textsuperscript{39}

Thus De Monarchia ends on a note of Gelasian cooperation. But as John Morall notes, Dante has gone "further than anyone before him in breaking with the old idea of a unified Christian Commonwealth."\textsuperscript{70} Though his powers of "church" and "state" were to cooperate in harmony, nevertheless they were separate. In political ideas, Dante is thus rather like a less-sophisticated John of Paris. In his day, though, the imperium was already in decline; De Monarchia was most probably prompted by the German emperor Henry VII's (1308-1313) invasion into Italy. But the notions about the sacerdotium Dante entertained were reformulated to an extreme degree by another Italian writer, Marsilius of Padua.

Marsilius of Padua (c.1280-c.1343) brings a slightly different background to our collection of political theorists. He was trained in philosophy and also, surprisingly, medicine at the University of Paris. He became rector there in 1313, and was still there when he completed his Defensor Pacis in 1324. The work, released anonymously, was immediately controversial, and when it was discovered that Marsilius was the author, he fled Paris to take refuge with the German king Ludwig IV of Bavaria (1314-1347), so great was the hostility towards the Defensor Pacis. Clement VI (1342-1352), for example, claimed to have found 240 unorthodox statements in it.\textsuperscript{80} The work is somewhat like that of Dante and John of Paris, but it takes great strides beyond them. It is divided into two Discourses, and a brief Conclusion. In the first Discourse, Marsilius deals with the general problem of lack of tranquility in the state. Like Dante, he puts a high price on peace: "The fruits of peace or tranquility are the greatest goods, as we have said, while those of its opposite, strife, are unbearable evils."\textsuperscript{81} To attain this peace, Marsilius felt that it was necessary for all parts of society to function correctly. Here follows the ideas of John of Salisbury, but with the eye of a physician; medical metaphors abound in the Defensor Pacis:

\begin{quote}
Health, moreover, as the more experienced physicians describe it, is the good disposition of the animal whereby each of its parts can perfectly perform the operations belonging to its nature; according to which analogy tranquility will be the good disposition of the city or the state whereby each of its parts will be able perfectly to perform the operations belonging to it in accordance with reason and its establishment.\textsuperscript{82}
\end{quote}
He follows Aristotle and Aquinas in noting that society is a natural development and not a result of original sin:

For since diverse things are necessary to men who desire a sufficient life, things which cannot be supplied by men of one order or office, there had to be diverse orders or offices of men in this association, existing or supplying such diverse things which men need for sufficiency of life.\textsuperscript{83}

Marsilius follows an ascending theory of government; laws are to be decided by the "weightier part"\textsuperscript{84} of society, and regarding the type of government, he feels that "the absolutely better method is election,"\textsuperscript{85} i.e., some method of representative government. However, although there is a place for the Church in his theories, he feels that religious truths and laws are "incapable of being proved by human reason."\textsuperscript{86} With this in mind, we may move to his second Discourse, which deals with the cause of the lack of tranquility in the world. Here he places the blame squarely on the shoulders of the Church. He felt that the power of coercive judgment, which had caused so much havoc in society, was the main cause of the problem, and the Church should not possess this power:

neither the Roman bishop called pope, nor any other bishop or priest, or deacon, has or ought to have any rulership or coercive judgment or jurisdiction over any priest or non-priest, ruler, community, group, or individual of whatever condition.\textsuperscript{87}

He bases his decisions in this section largely on Scripture and particularly on Christ's words before Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world" (Jn. 18:36). Marsilius felt that an excommunication needed more than a decision of the pope or the bishops, it required "the consent of the whole body of the faithful"\textsuperscript{88}; without this consent, an excommunication was impossible. Indeed, Marsilius went so far as to deny that the pope had any authority at all:

By all of these demonstrations every person will be made almost sensibly aware that the Roman bishop or his church, or any other bishop or church, as such, has none of the afore-mentioned powers or authorities over the other bishops and churches by divine right or human right unless such power shall have been granted to him by the general council either outright or for a certain time. From this it will also be apparent that when the Roman or any other bishop ascribes to himself plenitude of power over any ruler, community, or individual person, such a claim is inappropriate and wrong, and goes outside, or rather against, the divine Scriptures and human demonstrations; and that such claims on the part of the Roman or any other bishop must be completely stopped, through admonition and even through coercive power if necessary, by the human legislators or by the men who rule by their authority.\textsuperscript{89}
Instead, Marsilius appealed to a conciliar authority. He felt that the people ought to have a share in the government of the Church as they do in the state:

And finally, we shall draw this necessary inference...namely, that the decisions with regard to the Scripture, the catholic faith, and church ritual, as well as the other decrees of the general council, can be altered, augmented, restricted, suspended, or totally revoked only by the authority of the general council, and not by any other particular group or individual.80

Thus Marsilius dealt with the perennial conflict of sacerdotium and imperium by eliminating the political power of the sacerdotium. For Marsilius, the state was all. Just as the sacerdotium would up humbled to the regnum in his work, so the sacerdotium had wound up humbled to the French monarchy in his day. Furthermore, his work brought into full flower the seed of the idea of conciliarism that John of Paris had planted. This idea would become a new source of conflict within both the sacerdotium and the regnum in the future.

Now it is time to examine the nature of prophecy during this our last struggle between sacerdotium and regnum. We shall look a little beyond Clement V's time where we ended our examination of political events and into the period of the Avignonese Papacy, for this event served as the catalyst for a great deal of apocalyptic thought and yearning. We shall chart the course of the growth of the Angelic Pope figure, for although paradoxically the secular power wound up triumphant, the sacerdotium remained dominant in many minds. This was particularly due to the fact that many prophecies were still being produced by the Franciscan Spirituals, who loved the papacy but not Boniface VIII, and who could hope for its eventual, final purification under a holy ruler. Finally we shall see the figures of the Angelic Pope and the Last World Emperor come together as part of a new program of renovatio mundi.

Our first prophetic work of this period is still caught up within the Joachite tradition. The work is the Oraculum angelicum Cyrilli, and it was probably completed in the 1290's. According to the legend, an angel appeared during Mass to a Carmelite named Cyril, bearing with him two silver tablets upon which a series of prophecies were written. Cyril had difficulty understanding them, and so supposedly sent them to Joachim of Fiore for interpretation. The present work consists of the prophecies plus "Joachim's" commentary.
The Angelic Pope figures in these prophecies in a conflict of figures identified as Rehoboam and Jereboam, the true and false pope. Chapter Six of the Oraculum speaks of a group of "moneychangers of the highest table" (i.e., the Church), various simoniacal servants of Jereboam, who would gather to play gambling games with their ill-gotten wealth. But not for long:

Drunken and asleep, they make little value of the damage of the poor and the blood of struggling slaves, until a wondrous bear, moved by the Spirit, comes forth from the rock and hastens to the Queen of Feathers and the New Seer. He will smash the gaming table and scatter those sitting there.

The Queen of Feathers and the New Seer remain obscure references, but the commentary by "Joachim" explains the figure of the bear thusly:

"Until a wondrous bear comes." This bear is a Roman pope. Just as a little bear is formed by the licking of its parents, the pope and any true prelate is appointed by the voice or tongue of the electors. It can also be said that before his election such a pope despaired precious garments like a bear which among the beasts is covered with mean and contemptible wool. So he is said to be "wondrous" and moved by the "Feathered Spirit."

The "Feathered Spirit" is, of course, the Holy Spirit, and it is quite possible that the symbol of the bear was meant to refer to the Orsini family, a prominent Roman noble family from whom had come several popes. In any case, this bear figure represents the Angelic Pope in one particular aspect; fulfilling the desire to have corrupt individuals rooted out of the Church as part of a program of purification.

Our next prophecy may in some ways refer to actual contemporary ecclesiastical events. The author was Robert of Uzès (d. 1296), a Dominican visionary. His two works, the Visiones and the Liber sermonum Dei were composed sometime between 1291 and 1296. In them we have an almost immediate reaction to the sad, strange events of 1294. The Liber sermonum Dei details a vision Robert had while walking along the Rhone river from Orange to Avignon. The Lord appeared to him at sunrise and told him to:

Say to the Angel of the Church: "In your simplicity you nourish wolves who rend my flock" (Jer. 23:1). I will pay you a visit (Exod. 3:16), because you have been deceived and have not known the rending of my flock. I will bring a great plague unless you correct this sin. I will demand the blood of my sheep at your hand. Remember your begging and resist proud thoughts (Rom. 12:16); as a humble man do not abandon the humble works you have begun. I will reward the humble. See what your subjects are doing and let not such things go unpunished. The day of your destruction upon which I shall take revenge is near."
Robert here refers to Celestine V; the promised "great plague" is doubtless his eventual abdication. Robert has harsher words for Boniface VIII:

You are to speak to the Idol of the Church, unless his heart be hardened. Say this so that your word may be a witness: "Who has placed this Idol upon my throne to command my people? He has ears and does not hear (Ps. 113:6) the cries of those lamenting and of those who are going down to hell. Their wailing exceeds the sound of the trumpet, the loud voice of thunder...He has a mouth and does not speak. He is always saying, "I have set men up over them to announce good things to them. It is enough that either through me or through others some good is done." Woe to the Idol! Woe to the one in possession! Who upon the earth is like this Idol? He has magnified his name upon the earth saying, "Who will put me down?"  

Here are contemporary events with an apocalyptic gloss. Robert apparently had no more love for Boniface than did the Spirituals. Robert goes a step beyond veiled criticism, and in the thirteenth of his Visiones records the following dream of an encounter with the Angelic Pope:

In the same place I saw in a dream that I was with my oldest brother and youngest sister. While we were walking we came to a door and heard the words: "The pope is inside, if you wish to see him." We entered and kissed his feet as he stood on the ground. I was amazed that he would sit upon the ground and looked upon his narrow short bed with its very poor covering. I said: "Why is it, Father, that you have such a poor bed? The poorest of the poor bishops of the world would not have a meaner one." The pope said to me, "We must be humbled." Suddenly we were on our way down a mountain and I saw him in the habit of the Friars Minor.  

It is unclear if this Angelic Pope is supposed to refer to an actual person. Nicholas IV (1288-1292) was the first Franciscan pope, but the mountain location of Robert's Angelic Pope is more reminiscent of Celestine V. Perhaps Robert refers to a future figure, yet to come in his day. In any case, Robert's emphasis on poverty and humility was a strong yet veiled criticism of Boniface VIII's worldliness and wealth.

With the beginning of the fourteenth century came prophecy in a new form, from a very familiar quarter, the Franciscan Spirituals. These lists of popes, or Vaticinia de summis pontificibus, proved very popular; they survive in more than fifty manuscript and twenty printed editions. We have mentioned earlier that a group of Franciscan Spirituals led by Angelo of Clareno took refuge on an island in the Gulf of Corinth at the accession of Boniface VIII, before returning to Italy to defend themselves against charges raised by the
Conventuals. While in the East, it is highly probable that they came into contact with a series of Byzantine prophecies called the "Oracles of Leo the Wise." This twelfth-century work was an illustrated list of present and future Byzantine emperors attributed to the learned ninth-century emperor Leo VI (886-912). Their form proved very versatile, and was easily adapted for re-use by the Spirituals. These Vaticinia as we have them are a pseudo-Joachite work depicting fifteen illustrations and brief prophecies of popes. They were undoubtedly compiled in the summer of 1304, perhaps as an attempt to influence the papal elections of that year. The illustrations quite clearly proceed from Nicholas III (1277-1280) to Benedict XI (1303-1304). Curiously, though, Benedict is only the tenth figure, and the Vaticinia finishes with not one Angelic Pope, but rather a set of five Angelic Popes. The first (Number 11), for example, depicts a semi-naked monk sitting on a rock, and is captioned as follows:

XI. Title. A Good Mark of Respect
There will be revealed an anointed one who has the first name of a monk. He will live on a rock.
"The lamentations of the others have come to me. Having left the world, I have a peasant's diet of herbs. I live in the world like a dead man, one groaning. I gather together good things and scatter every reward of evil-doing."
He will be totally justified when the Star appears black to you. You will then be naked and go into the depths of the earth.

In one of the manuscripts of this text, this figure is glossed with "This is the Angelic Pope according to Joachim." The final figure (Number 15) is most telling, for it depicts a figure placing a miter over a crowned and horned beast, with the caption:

XV. Title. Reverence and Devotion Will Increase.
You have found a good life far away from dishonor. You have received more from virtue than from fortune, but you have not gained virtuous grace. You have encountered judgments made harmful by envy. You will not be deprived by fate from above. Woe to the city of blood completely filled by the sundering of lies! Rapine will not depart from you, nor the sound of the whip, of the turning wheel, of the horse, of the howl!

The words for this figure are obscure in their meaning, but the picture itself is not. It refers to a triumph by the sacerdotium over the Antichrist, or over the imperium; most probably the latter. This adds a new and different facet to the figure of the Angelic Pope, and perhaps reflects on the hidden desires of the Spirituals, in as much as the fifteenth
A very similar and nearly contemporary work to the Vaticinia is a pseudo-Joachite treatise entitled the Liber de Flore. It, too, is a list of popes, but one devoid of illustrations and thus probably not stemming from a Byzantine source. Most probably it came from an earlier Joachite tradition. It was written circa 1304/1305, and since the first pope in the series is Gregory IX (1227-1241), the first pope to modify the Franciscan Rule, is also probably the product of Franciscan Spirituals. This particular series of popes culminates in four Angelic Popes. The first pope, "poor and naked" (with no nationality given but probably Italian\emph{103}), would be crowned by an angel. Then he would ally with a "generous king of the paternity of Pippin\emph{104} who would come to salute the "brightness of the glorious pope\emph{105} and who would confer on him the Eastern and Western Empire along with the title Bicephalus. Then together they would carry out the program of the Last World Emperor—the Greeks would be converted and the French king would conquer Jerusalem, eventually resigning the kingdom to become a Franciscan friar (a new wrinkle here). There would be a program for the Angelic Pope, too; Rome would be purged of all wealth and all clergy would live according to ecclesiastical poverty. After this first pope would come a second pope, French in nationality, who would travel to Germany and France. In the former country he would reform the Church, and in the latter he would bless the French people. There would then be a third Angelic Pope, an Italian Franciscan, and then a final one, a Gascon and great preacher who would make pilgrimages all over the earth. Eventually he would confront and convert the tribes of Gog and Magog in Palestine, there to rule the world until the coming of the Antichrist. Like the Vaticinia, the Liber de Flore seeks a unity of imperium and sacerdotium in one person, although the addition of the Antichrist provides a note of convention that the Vaticinia lack. The theme of cooperation of Last World Emperor and Angelic Pope would be picked up and expanded upon in a more nationalistic fashion by later authors, as we shall see below.
The Angelic Pope appears more dimly in the *Arbor Vitae Crucifixae Jesu* of the Tuscan Spiritual leader Ubertino of Casale (c.1259-c.1330). In his earlier days, Ubertino had met the famed John of Parma, and had been a teacher of theology and famous preacher in Florence. His criticisms of corruption in the Church grew so vehement that he was suspended in 1304. He retired to Mount Alverna, the same mountain where St. Francis had received the stigmata. There he completed his complex, varied *Arbor Vitae Crucifixae Jesu* in 1305. The work defies simple summation, so we shall instead look as a small portion of the fifth book, which is a long commentary on Revelation. Ubertino adhered to Joachite ideas; he criticized the laxness of the clergy of the fifth *status* (the present, for him), and expected its renewal in the coming sixth *status*. Notably, he casts Revelation in a Franciscan light, as the following passage notes:

So the blessed Jesus will do to His elect in the splendor of His light as He reveals the mysteries of the new *status*. Hence the eighteenth chapter of Revelation, after the battle against both the Mystical and the Open Antichrists, says: "After these things I saw another Angel descending from heaven, having great power, and the earth was illuminated by his glory" (Rev. 18:1). The order of doctors who preach the fall that has already taken place can be understood through this figure; they are different from those who preach the future fall. Perhaps that Angel will be the same Supreme Pontiff spoken of above or another successor of his perfection. He is said to descend from heaven. This can be understood thus—that from the very high state in which God immovably fixed them, as if they were in heaven, they descend without interruption through profound humility reaching the lowest levels, especially in thinking of themselves as so unworthy of every degree of grace. The more they thus descend, the more they are elevated and wondrously strengthened. Hence it is said of that man that he will have great power, that is, according to Joachim, in preaching God's word.108

Ubertino sees this Angel as signifying either the Franciscan Spirituals or the Angelic Pope. In any case, this figure would attain greatness through humility, a sure criticism of the contemporary papacy. And though 1260 was long past, Ubertino's notions about Jesus ushering in the "new *status*" make it quite clear that Joachite view of history was by no means dead.

Also at about this time, i.e., the early fourteenth century, there was a very curious application of apocalypticism by a group known as the Apostolic Brethren, or the Dolcenites. Although there were, as we have seen above, many groups and individuals who were willing to criticize the status quo using apocalypticism, none were willing to take up arms to bring
about those changes. The Dolcenites were one of those very rare groups who were actually willing to do so. As a movement they were established around 1260 by one Gerard Segarelli of Parma, who defied Church prohibitions on the creation of new religious orders. In 1300 he was executed by the Inquisition and his place was taken by Fra Dolcino, a far more educated and capable leader, whose skill, oratory, and knowledge of Scripture eventually helped him amass over 4,000 followers. In 1304 he and the Dolcenites retreated to hiding places in the Alps to await the coming of the Last World Emperor. When no Last World Emperor appeared, Dolcino and his followers took matters into their own hands and began a series of armed raids and uprisings. This prompted Clement V to assist the people of the Novara area to organize a crusade against the Dolcenites. In March of 1307 they were finally, decisively defeated in battle at Mount Rebello, and Dolcino himself was summarily executed by being hacked to pieces and then burned. The Dolcenites held many strange beliefs, but we will focus on their eschatology, which has been conveniently summarized for us by the Inquisitor Bernard Gui (c.1261-1331), who devotes a section of his Book of the Inquisitor to them. Summarizing some of Dolcino's letters, he notes:

All of the above [i.e., all religious and all the leaders of the Church] will be destroyed by the divine sword through the emperor to be revealed and through the new kings he will create. They will be slaughtered and destroyed throughout the earth. He [Dolcino] explains and asserts that the emperor to be revealed is Frederick, who was then king of Sicily, the son of Peter, the king of Aragon. This Frederick is to be revealed as emperor, to create new kings, to fight against Pope Boniface and kill him along with the others marked for destruction. He adduces many texts from the Old and New Testaments to prove these things, expounding and interpreting them in his own evil way. He says that at that time all Christians will be at peace and there will be a single Holy Pope chosen and sent by God in a wonderful manner. He will not be chosen by the cardinals; they will be slaughtered along with the others.107

Frederick II of Sicily bore the name and kingdom of the earlier emperor Frederick II, and so was a natural focus for apocalyptic hopes among those who had not abandoned Frederick's cause. Dolcino goes on to perpetuate the new theme of cooperation between the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope:

Those who belong to the apostolic state of life and the clerics and religious who will join them will be subject to that pope. By divine aid they will have been spared from the sword mentioned above...and they will bear fruit among others down to the End of the world. Frederick, the king of Sicily, son of Peter of Aragon (the emperor to be revealed), along with that Holy Pope who
will come after Boniface who will be slain by the Emperor, as well as the new kings whom the revealed emperor will create, will all remain until the time of the Antichrist who will appear and reign in those days.108

Here as in the Liber de Flore we see a cooperation of Last World Emperor and Angelic Pope before the coming of the Antichrist. Dolcino was apparently influenced by both Joachite thought and Vaticinia of the Spirituals as well, for in another of his letters he identifies a string of four popes: Celestine V as a good pope, Boniface VIII as a bad pope, an unnamed bad pope, and a final good pope. Curiously, Dolcino apparently even came to eventually identify himself as the Angelic Pope, who would be raised up by Frederick II. Although there was some initial peasant support for his movement, the savagery with which he was executed by the civil authorities demonstrates how little receptiveness for violent apocalypticism there was in medieval society.

Both the Vaticinia and the Franciscan Spirituals lived on in new forms in the fourteenth century. Small groups of Fraticelli or "Little Brothers" attempted to maintain their own strict interpretation of the Franciscan Rule and their own practice of evangelical poverty. They were chiefly divided into two groups: the Fraticelli de paupere vita, who followed Angelo of Clareno and favored the Spirituals; and the Fraticelli de opinione, who followed Michael of Cesena (c.1270-1342) and were more moderate. Both groups tended to regard John XXII (1316-1334) as a Mystical Antichrist and stressed a strong apocalypticism. It is from these groups that a new, second set of Vaticinia comes. Like the first set, which had been rendered obsolete by the passage of time, this second set is a series of fifteen illustrated descriptions of popes, also rooted in history and continuing in eschatology. The last truly historical in this second series appears to be Number 10, who seems to Benedict XII (1334-1342), which argues for a composition date around 1340. Numbers 11 through 14 in this series are Angelic Popes. Number 13, for example, shows a pope being given keys by an angel while with his other hand he holds a fan over a peacock, and is described thusly:

XIII. Title. This man alone will clearly open the book written by the finger of the living God.
You are called to lofty things, O Prince of white hairs. Why are you in pain? Rise up and be strong. Slay Nero and you will be safe. Heal the wounded, take hold of the whip and destroy the flies. Throw the merchants out of the Temple. Adopt the illuminated teaching, announce the Just One, avoid the circumcised, direct the Dove, repress the thirsty.109
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Here we see a very clear example of the desire for purification of the Church by the Angelic Pope. "Avoid the circumcised" may be a misreading; the original Latin reads *vita* when it perhaps should read *vivifa*. This would render the phrase "convert the Jews," a reading far more in line with the program of the Angelic Pope as we have seen it. "Slay Nero" also implies a very negative view of the *imperium* on the part of these supporters of the *sacerdotium*. The final pope in the series is depicted by a basilisk with a human head and bears the caption:

**XV. Title.** You are dreadful. Who can resist you? (Ps. 75:8)

This is the final wild beast, dreadful in aspect, that will drag down the stars. Then the birds will flee and only reptiles remain. Wild and cruel, it will consume everything. He will await you, after a time, times, and half a time.

From this it is quite clear that the Fraticelli expected the Antichrist to ascend to the papal throne, bringing about the end of the papacy along with the world. These *Vaticinia* proved to be as popular as the first set, and since the described Angelic Popes did of course not come, by the end of the fifteenth century the second set was placed before the first set to create a new series of thirty popes, completely detached from any kind of real historical context.

The figure of the Last World Emperor on his own was by no means abandoned at this time. As we have seen from the example of the Dolcenites, the name "Frederick" was still one to conjure with, and there were several prophecies circulating about him in the fourteenth century. As an example of these, we shall cite the work of the Franciscan John of Winterthur (c.1300-c.1349). His *Chronicle* has this description of a Third Frederick under the year 1348:

In these times many men of different kinds, indeed of all kinds, spread it very freely abroad that the Emperor Frederick II with whom I began the second part of this work would return in great strength to reform the totally corrupt state of the Church. Those who thought so added that even if he had been cut up into a thousand pieces or burned to ashes he must come, because it was divinely decreed that it must so happen and could not be changed. According to this claim, when he has been brought back to life and restored to the highest position of his empire, poor girls and women will be married to rich men and vice versa. Nuns and sisters living in the world will marry, and monks will take wives. He will give back to orphans, widows, and all who have been despoiled whatever was taken from them, and will give a full measure of justice to all men. He will persecute the clergy so harshly that
they will spread cow dung over their crowns and tonsures if they have no other cover so that they do not seem to be tonsured. He will drive the religious, especially the Franciscans, from the land, because by ordering the papal trial against him they threw him out of the empire. After he has governed the empire that he has resumed more justly and gloriously than before, he will cross the sea with a great army and on the Mount of Olives or at the dry tree will resign the Empire.\textsuperscript{113}

We can see that although during this time the \textit{sacerdotium} was subject to the French \textit{regnum}, the idea of the \textit{imperium} was still very much alive in John of Winterthur's prophecy as it was in Dante Alighieri's writings. The account that John relates certainly has a very different program of ecclesiastical renewal than we have seen, especially in the systematic program of clerical marriage and supression of the Friars Minor. His account is very opposed to the \textit{sacerdotium}, but it does end in the traditional pattern of the Last World Emperor, with the resignation of the Empire in Palestine atop the Mount of Olives. In a sense, the prophecy that John records is one of the first salvos fired in a war of competing nationalistic prophecies, ultimately between Germany and France. We shall examine some of the French prophecies below.

Let us examine a prophet whose work shows signs of many different prophecies coming together. That writer was Cola di Rienzo (c.1314-1354), one of the most strange and intriguing figures of the later Middle Ages. Born of humble parentage in Rome, his studies as a young man included the classics and law, and from these he developed a deep love for the glories of ancient Rome. He was sent in 1343 as an envoy to Avignon to petition Clement VI to return the papal seat to Rome. Clement demurred, but he was impressed by Cola and made him a notary. In 1344 Cola returned to Rome and began his public career. His speeches and ideas about Roman greatness won him popularity, and in May 1347, supported by popular elements, he staged a \textit{coup d'état} and seized control of the city, declaring himself tribune. His Roman chauvinism coupled with some of his more bizarre official ceremonials incurred papal and popular displeasure, and he withdrew from power, excommunicated, in December 1347. Evading papal authorities, he took refuge near Mount Murrone with a group of hermits who were most probably connected with the Fraticelli. While with them he absorbed a great deal of prophetic literature, most notably the
Oraculum angelicum Cyrilli. He was greatly influenced by prophetic thought, and applied it directly to the political situations of his day. In 1350 he tried to enlist the aid of the Emperor Charles IV (1347-1378) in Prague, and was imprisoned as an excommunicate. He was transferred to Avignon two years later for trial by the Inquisition. After he was vindicated, he was sent back to Rome as a papal senator in 1354, this time at the head of an army of mercenaries, to pave the way for increased papal influence in Rome pursuant to a possible return. However, his rule as senator proved so arbitrary and unpopular that he was eventually killed during a popular uprising in October of that year. Cola was a strange, contradictory figure, one of those rare types like Fra. Dolcino who used prophecy as a justification for political actions. One of his letters written to Charles IV in 1350 details his view of the program of prophecy. It describes his time spent with the Fraticelli, and tells how one day a hermit came to visit the group because "a divine revelation had informed him that I [Cola] was staying there." The hermit conferred this message on Cola:

He said that there would soon be great changes, especially for the reformation of the Church to their state of pristine sanctity. There would be great peace, not only among Christians, but between Christians and Saracens. Under a soon-to-come pastor the grace of the Holy Spirit would purify them. He asserted that the time was near when the age of the Holy Spirit would begin, when God would be known to men. He also said that God had chosen a holy man to execute this spiritual work. He would be made known to all by divine revelation and together with the emperor-elect would reform the Church in many ways, separating the pastors of the Church from the unnecessary goods of failing earthly delights. When asked, he added that a man killed by a certain Church ruler or dead for four days would arise. At his voice great terror and flight would occur among the pastors of the Church in which even the Supreme Pontiff would be in personal danger. This same Angelic Pastor will assist the falling Church not less than Francis had done. He will reform the entire state of the Church, and will build a great Temple of God from the Church's treasures, dedicated in honor of the Holy Spirit and called Jerusalem. Infidels, even from Egypt, will come there to pray.

Here several prophetic streams flow together. We have a cooperation of the Angelic Pope and the Last World Emperor, whom he expected to be Charles IV. Renovatio mundi is not so much stressed as renovatio ecclesiae, but concurrent with that would be a conversion of unbelievers. In another letter, Cola even applied the words of the Oraculum angelicum...
Cyrilli to himself.114 Joachite, Fraticelli, Oracular prophecy--Cola’s thought and actions were influenced by all of these.

This theme of cooperation of the Angelic Pope and the Last World Emperor did not remain solely the provenance of the German imperium. France had been the power to humble the sacerdotium, and it was to France that these prophecies eventually came. We can see this most clearly in the work of the Jean de Roquetaillade (c.1310-c.1365). Jean was a learned Franciscan who in 1340 had a series of visions. His ecclesiastical superiors did not approve of his ideas and imprisoned him; he was eventually called to the court of Clement VI and imprisoned there for the rest of his life. All of this controversy was due to Jean’s fondness for the Spirituals, his hatred of the Dominicans, and, of course, his prophecy. He wrote many works on the subject, among them a Commentary on the Angelic Oracle of Cyril. Following the pseudo-Joachite works, some of his writings contain series of Angelic Popes, but one work in particular, the Companion in Tribulation, compiled in prison in 1356, provides a very detailed portrait of a Last World Emperor and an Angelic Pope. Jean felt that a series of terrible and strange events would begin in 1360; for example, “the earth’s worms will have such strength and ferocity that they will most cruelly devour almost all the lions, bears, leopards, and wolves.”117 In 1365 the first of two Antichrists would appear. But after him would come a Franciscan Angelic Pope:

The twelfth instruction concerns the proximate restoration of the men of the Church and of the world through the celestial reformer who is at hand. He is the Elijah who, according to the word of God, will restore all things. With this whip (literally made of little cords, that is, of humble Friars) Christ will certainly expel all corrupt, lustful, and avaricious priests from the Temple lest they minister to Him in sacrifice. He will depose simoniacs from their ministry, and will hand over those who offend against nature to the secular arm to be sacrificed by fire so that nature can be purged. He will restore the ancient liberty of choosing prelates to the episcopal sees. He will make the ravenous wolves flee the flock, will place holy men upon a candlestick and hide unworthy ones under a bushel basket, will castigate flesh and blood considerations, will restore collapsed justice, and will apply apt medicine against all evils. He will also replant all the gospel virtues in men who have collapsed and strengthen good men in their holy resolve. He will finish the book of the restoration of the world by the art of Christ whose power will endure forever.118
We can see the very familiar notion of *renovatio ecclesiae* in the actions of this Angelic Pope. To this picture Jean adds a Last World Emperor figure who, like Jean himself, would of course be French:

The French king, who will come to see his [the pope’s] angelic brightness at the time of his election, he will make Roman emperor, contrary to the custom of German elections. God will generally subdue the world to his West, East, and South. He will be of such sanctity that no emperor or king from the beginning of the world is his equal in sanctity, save the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, our Lord Jesus Christ. The emperor will refuse to be crowned with a golden crown in honor of the crown of thorns of Jesus Christ. An emperor of the highest sanctity, he will execute all the commands of the Restoring Pope previously discussed.119

But Jean’s new addition to this program would be the cooperation of the Angelic Pope and the Last World Emperor following a French pattern of *renovatio mundi*:

Through these two the whole world will be restored. They will destroy the entire law and tyrannical power of Mohammed, both of them will pay personal visits to Greece and Asia, will end the schism, free the Greeks from the Turks, subjugate the Tartars to the faith, and restore the kingdoms of Asia. The pope will command that as long as the world shall last the cardinals will be drawn from the Greek Church...He will end the division of the Guelfs and Ghibellines in Italy, and will make arrangements for the lands of the Church in such a manner that the pope will never have to attack them. He will stamp out all avarice and pride and wipe the clergy free of heresy. As I have already said, it is soon to come to pass that infidels will invade Italy, Hungary, and many Christian provinces, and will afflict Christendom for forty-two months according to the literal sense of Scripture (Dan. 8:14). He will destroy them and free the Christian people from the hands of Mohammed. For the sake of brevity, this is enough—these things that I have briefly set forth about him. After nine years and six months (or possibly about nine months) the pope will die, and the emperor after about ten and a half years. In death, they will both shine forth with great miracles.120

The unbelievers would be converted, the world renewed, and all under the aegis of France.

A very similar program may be found in the writings of the mysterious writer Telesphorus of Cosenza. There is almost no actual information available about him, but he seems to have been a real figure, rather than a pseudonym.121 He was most probably a Calabrian hermit operating with a group of Fraticelli, probably the Fraticelli de paupere vita. His major work was *The Great Tribulation and the State of the Church*, a florlogium of various prophecies. It was dedicated to the Doge of Genoa in 1386, but E. Donckel has demonstrated that it is in reality a much earlier work, dating from circa 1356-1365. It was
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later reworked and appended to take advantage of the Great Schism beginning in 1378. The work details a quite involved program, as its *ex post facto* introduction notes:

Here begins the little book of Brother Telesphorus, priest and hermit, composed following the authoritative texts of the holy prophets and ancient chronicles. It treats of the causes, and of the tribulations to come, especially in the time of the future king of the North calling himself the Emperor Frederick III down to the time of the future pope called the "Angelic Pope" and Charles the king of France, the emperor after Frederick III. It also treats of the supreme pontiffs of the Roman Church and the condition of the Universal Church from the time of the Angelic Pope to the time of the Final Antichrist, and from his time and that of his death down to God's Last Judgment and the End of the world.\(^1\)

The introduction goes on to credit many of the sources of the work in a description of an apparition of an angel on Easter, 1386, who commissioned Telesphorus to begin his work, saying:

"The Lord has heard your prayer and says that through the Holy Spirit and an Angel He had already indicated and revealed to His beloved servants Cyril, priest and hermit of Mt. Carmel, and Abbot Joachim, and many other servants, all these things—the present and future schism, its causes, who is the true, who the false pope, its end, and after the schism the coming government of the Church. Seek out the books and writings of these men and your desire will be satisfied. Write down what you find in their books and writings, and show and reveal it to others for your and their salvation!"\(^2\)

Inspired by this heavenly commission, Telesphorus set out for Calabria accompanied by a friend named Eusebius of Vercelli to study works of prophecy. They record consulting the works of Joachim, the *Liber de Flore*, Merlin, and other prophets. From these works, Telesphorus assembled a pattern of future history. The Antichrist had been born in 1365, he felt, and would eventually surface in the person of a last German emperor whom he called Frederick III (Telesphorus was doubtless influenced in this decision by the pseudo-Joachite works and the Erythraean Sibyl). Allied with Frederick III would be a German pseudo-pope, who would crown this Frederick emperor. Satan would be released, precipitating a conflict of Antichrist and "the most sacred new religion"\(^3\) which would last until 1409. The forces of good would be lead by a French king named Charles, a "generous king of the posterity of Pippin"\(^4\) who would help an Angelic Pope defeat the evil Frederick and the false pope. The Angelic Pope would then crown Charles emperor, forever depriving the German electors claim over the *imperium*. The Great Antichrist would appear in 1378
and cause a schism in the Church, but by around 1391 or 1393 the Angelic Pope and Charles would defeat him and purify the Church. Then they would go off on a crusade to the Holy Land:

The emperor and the angelic pope who will crown him will reform the Church to a state of poverty. ... Then the emperor with the pope of the Church will make a seventh and last passage to the holy land in order to recover it.\textsuperscript{18}

Curiously, this isn't the end. Telesphorus felt that Joachim's second \textit{status} had indeed ended in 1260, and that the fourteenth century was part of the third \textit{status}, which obviously was not free of evil and strife. So he noted that there would be a series of four Angelic Popes during a time of peace which would last until 1433. Then Gog, the Final Antichrist, would be released along with the opening of the Gates of Alexander, letting loose the unclean tribes to the North. This last Antichrist would cause the French emperor to surrender his crown at the Holy Sepulchre, as stated in the Tiburtine Sibyl. The end of the Final Antichrist would usher in the "seventh age of peace and happiness."\textsuperscript{127} The only surviving institution would be the \textit{papacy}, the "contemplative church" of Joachim's vision, which all men would obey. Telesphorus thus provides an elaborate summary of nearly all of the prophetic trends which preceded him. At the same time refurbished he them within a nationalistic framework that would carry political prophecy into the future, as well as firmly reflect the contemporary position of the \textit{sacerdotium} and \textit{regnum}. 
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CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The figures of the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope did not develop in a vacuum. As we have seen, their development was intimately conditioned by and connected to contemporary developments in political affairs and political theory. Christian eschatology was inevitably altered to reflect contemporary events. The birth of the figure of the Last World Emperor would have been impossible without a Christianized Empire, and the sacred nature of this figure unquestionably reflected the sacred character of the Byzantine emperor. Furthermore, his centrality to the eschatological pattern of events of sacred history in Pseudo-Methodius and the Tiburtine Sibyl reflected the centrality of the Byzantine Emperor in the affairs of both imperium and sacerdotium. But new ground was broken through the actions of Pope Gregory I, and the attentions of the papacy shifted westwards to new mission grounds. The Donation of Constantine provided a rationale for a transfer of empire which was realized in the coronation of Charlemagne. As the notion of imperium became the property of the Franks, so, too, the figure of the Last World Emperor became Frankish in the writings of Adso. Christianity found a home in the new land of Europe, and Christian eschatology was shaped by this new land.

The investiture Controversy proved to have lasting consequences for the development of political theory, as the sacerdotium, after a period of prolonged corruption, found itself dominated by the new holders of the notion of imperium. When reform came at the hands of the imperium, the sacerdotium eventually attempted to dominate its own affairs. The increasing authority gained by the papacy during this struggle would pave the way for its inclusion in prophecy just as the figure of the Byzantine Emperor had in previous centuries. But the increasing importance of the German imperium catapulted it directly into the
prophecy of Benzo of Alba, who did not hesitate to cast Henry IV as the Last World Emperor. This era also witnessed the Crusades, which had a catalytic effect on future eschatology. And as Ekkehard of Aurea noted, albeit scornfully, the idea of the Last World Emperor had grown such that there were individuals who believed that a historical figure such as Charlemagne could be actually resurrected to fill it.

The issues raised during the Investiture Controversy remained largely unresolved, and conflicts of sacerdotium and imperium continued with the Hohenstaufen emperors. The pivotal authority of the German imperium could be seen in field of prophecy, from a German scorn that a Frenchman could ever be the Last World Emperor, as we have seen recounted in Otto of Freising's work, to the direct mention of a German Last World Emperor in the Play of Antichrist. The importance of the imperium was reinforced by several reworkings of Sibylline materials. But as the sacerdotium came increasingly to the fore in this struggle it finally appears in eschatology in the works of Joachim of Fiore and his followers and imitators. Joachite thought diffused into the Franciscan Order, and many Franciscans became proponents of the idea of an Angelic Pope. Works such as the Super Hieremiam Prophetam provided a convenient forum from which members of the sacerdotium could make attacks on the imperium. The Merlin prophecies among several others were demonstrably hostile to the German imperium. Frederick II proved to be a controversial figure; to a friend like Nicholas of Bari, he was the Last World Emperor incarnate; to Gregory IX, he was the Antichrist. The political conflict between Gregory and Frederick was notable for the willingness of both parties to make use of eschatological elements, and in this phase we see an intriguing confluence of the two threads of political thought and eschatology.

Eschatological interpretations of contemporary events continued in our last phase, the struggle between the sacerdotium and the French regnum. It became very easy for interested individuals to cast Celestine V in the role of the Angelic Pope and Boniface VIII in the role of diabolocal oppressor or Antichrist. The figure of the Angelic Pope increasingly became used as an object of both criticism of the contemporary papacy and hope for its eventual renewal, as Bernard McGinn notes:
As the papacy became increasingly trapped in the web of politics and administration that its own success had woven for it, as the popes became less and less the instruments of reform and more and more its opponents, real or imagined, apocalyptic hopes began to provide a refuge in the future from the realities of the present.¹

These hopes were not only not appeased by contemporary figures, they were often actively opposed; Boniface is said to have remarked upon finishing a Joachite text, "Why are these fools awaiting the end of the world?"² In contrast, the figure of the Angelic Pope became increasingly popular, appearing in the Oraculum angelicum Cyrilli and the works of Robert of Uzès. This conflict witnessed the first use of the new prophetic format of lists of future popes, which would prove surprisingly flexible and enduring and which would be used by Joachites and Franciscans alike. And as the works of John of Winterthur demonstrate, the idea of a Last World Emperor was by no means moribund. Indeed, with the subordination of the sacerdotium to the French regnum came a new pattern in the development of the figures of the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope—the theme of cooperation. We see these two figures working together in a program of renovatio mundi in the Dolcenites, Cola di Rienzo, and Jean de Roquetaillade. Finally Telesphorus of Cosenza neatly summarized nearly all the prophetic trends which proceeded him, charting a new course for eschatology in the future.

Telesphorus of Cosenza by no means had the last words on the subject. The Last World Emperor remained a popular figure for speculation after Telesphorus' day, and became the subject of increasingly partisan views by both France and Germany, perhaps due to the ever-weakening idea of imperium in the face of ever-increasing growth of national regnum. As we have seen from John of Winterthur, the Germans came to expect a Third Frederick,³ while the French, following Telesphorus, expected a Second Charlemagne.⁴ Competition between these visions occasionally grew quite heated. Prophecy also continued during the Great Schism (1378-1417), which shocked the European psyche with first two, then three conflicting popes. As Bernard McGinn notes, "The Schism bulks large in almost every apocalyptic text of the period after 1380."⁵ Earlier prophecies concerning confusion in the papacy preparatory to the coming of an Angelic Pope seemed to have been vindicated.
Nor did the Reformation put an end to political prophecy; the imperium's harsh criticisms of the papacy found a ready audience in the Protestant Reformers, while hopeful Catholics could expect the coming of a holy Angelic Pope to save the Church. Political prophecy, largely nationalistic but also with religious overtones, continued to be used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Last World Emperor and Angelic Pope have not vanished even today. Consider the following quotation:

Prophecy for Today is a summary of the Catholic tradition concerning the End-of-Time era. This period begins with the turmoil which leads to the emergence of the Great Monarch, a Catholic king who, out of the wars and revolutions of his time, triumphs victorious over the enemies of God to assume control of the entire world. Under his rule, mankind enjoys a great worldwide peace. And during this time there reigns on the throne of Peter a saintly pope, called the "Angelic Pastor," who helps bring about the conversion of virtually the entire world. After the Great Monarch and the Angelic Pastor comes the time of the Antichrist with its dreadful conditions.

This quotation is from the rear cover of the book Prophecy for Today. It reads much like many of the prophecies we have studied, but is unusual in that the book itself was first published in 1956, and has been recently republished in 1984. This is where I first encountered the puzzling figures of the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope, and where I first resolved to track down their origins. Clearly, these figures are by no means dead, and live on in the minds of religious extremists even in our own age.

The Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope were born into the medieval era of a unified Church/State, a Christian Commonwealth. They took their form, shape, and character during periods of conflict between the two elements of that Commonwealth. Yet with the close of the Middle Ages came new forms of government and Christianity for Europe. Despite these changes, the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope survived. History records such curious events as the Christian defenders of the Siege of Vienna in 1683 being encouraged by excerpts of the Pseudo-Methodius printed on broadsheets, or the visionary who claimed a revelation that Archduke Franz Ferdinand, whose assassination sparked World War I, had been originally intended by God to be the Last World Emperor, but who had been allowed to die out of divine mercy to spare the world the terrible events that we have seen accompany the advent of the Last World Emperor.
What accounts for the continued presence of these two figures? I can give no single, obvious answer. It is certain that the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope represented popularly-accepted, rather than formally-accepted figures; I find it significant, for example, that of our writers of political philosophy, several were officially canonized, while of our writers of political prophecy, none were officially canonized, despite the fact that some very influential figures wrote about them. In some respects, political prophecy fulfills a very human desire for perfection in the halls of power, which is all too often lacking in real life. It also works to allow the extraordinary into the ordinary, particularly the often very mundane but disorderly process of politics. Knowledge of the "future" can give a person a sense of security and authority over events that are actually frighteningly beyond his control. Contemporary events which occurred during the writing of this thesis seem to bear much of these ideas out. In the chaos and upheavals of Eastern Europe of the past year, a process completely unexpected and uncontrollable, it was interesting to discover in the popular press articles presenting lists of a number of pretenders to the thrones of various Eastern European countries, and speculating about the possibility of monarchist restorations, notions which would have seemed ludicrous but a year earlier. One of these individuals, Otto von Habsburg, although personally eschewing monarchist ambitions, is nonetheless the heir to the defunct Austro-Hungarian Empire, the last stunted descendant of the old German imperium. These pretenders bear close examination; it is entirely possible that one or more will enter into prophecy as a Last World Emperor-to-be, as Archduke Ferdinand did! Perhaps another reason for the persistence of these figures is that they were born out of conflicts of imperium and sacerdotium, and while our society's definitions of what constitutes "church" and "state" have changed greatly since those days, echoes of the conflict of secular and sacred continue. An excellent example that occurred during the writing of this thesis concerned New York Auxiliary Bishop Austin Vaughan's reprimand of Governor Mario Cuomo over the issue of abortion. I found it striking that the contemporary press described the issue by evoking the figures of Gregory VII and Henry IV with the
words, "To some disinterested observers, the warnings about damnation seemed rather medieval, like a penitent monarch shivering in the cold at Canossa."\(^1\)

It is natural for most people to desire some kind of superiority in their leaders, and equally natural for most to assume that human actions, particularly those of society-at-large, have some kind of significance. Furthermore, it has also always been natural for some people to desire to have a single government ruling the world, and also for some Christians to have a unified, pure, perfect church. As long as these things remain human desires, the figures of the Last World Emperor and the Angelic Pope, in some form or other, will always remain with us, until such time as the world actually does end.
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1. Eusebius (1857a), col. 882, "Quamobrem cum nos, Constantius ac Licinius Augusti, felicibus auspiciis Mediolanum venissemus, et quaecumque ad commodum utilitatemque republicae pertinebant, inter caetera quae universis multifarum profutura judicavimus, seu potius prae reliquis omnibus haec constitunenda esse censuimus, quibus divini numinis cultus ac veneratio contineretur: hoc est, ut Christianis et reliquis omnibus libera facultas a nobis tribuatur quamunque voluerint religionem consecrarent: quo scilicet quidquid illud est divinum ac coeleste numen, nobis et universis qui sub imperio nostro degunt, propitium esse possint." Translation by F. Dvornik.
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19. Ibid., p. 695, "Si leges civiles, quorum potestatem nobis deus pro sua humanitate creditit, per omnia firmas servari ad securitatem subiectorum studemus, quanto plus studii in observatione sacerorum canonum et divinarum legum, quae pro salute animarum nostrarum constituta sunt, collocare debemus?"


22. Mansi (1759-1798), VIII, col. 831-832, "Et omnibus nobis tacentibus, pietas ejus tanta ac tales ad eos locuta est cum omni mansuetudine et tranquillitate, ut si alter mihi dicaret ab ejus pietate haec dicta, vix crederem, nisi ipse auribus meis audisset; qua cum magna gratia Dei ex benedito ejus ore prolata sunt. Nam Davidicae mansuetudinis et Mosiacae patientiae, et apostolicae clementiae instar in eo conopexi: etsi enim non sisdem sermonibus, quibus beatus Paulus, sed tamen eadem mente qua ille sanctam ecclesiam vestram scripsset." Translation by F. Dvornik.
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29. Ibid., col. 326-327, "Sacerdotalen namque et apostolicum tuae pietatis animum, etiam hoc malum ad justiam ulationis debet accendere, quod Constantinopolitanae Ecclesiae puritatem pestilenter obscurat, in qua inveniuntur Clerici quidam haereticorum sensui consonantes, et intra ipsa Catholicorum viscera assertionibus suis haereticos adiuvantes. In quibus deturbandis, si frater meus Anatolius, cum nimis benignne perceper, segnior invenitur, digamin pro fide ventra, etiam istam Ecclesiae praestare medicinam, ut tales non solum ab ordine clericatus, sed etiam ab urbis habitatione pellantur: ne ulterius sanctus Dei populus perversorum hominum contagio polluat."

30. Ibid., col. 325, "Cum enim Clementiam tuam Dominus tanta sacramenti sui illuminatione ditavorit, debes incunctanter advertere, regiam potestatem tibi non ad solum mundi regimen, sed maxime ad Ecclesiae praesidium esse collatam; ut ausus nefarios comprimendo, et quae bene sunt statuta defendas, et veram pacem his quae sunt turbate, restitue."


34. Leo I (1846), col. 149-150, "De tot mundo unus Petrus eligitur, qui et universarum gentium vocationi et omnibus cunctisque ecclesiae patribus praeponatur; ut quavis in populo dei multi sacerdotes sint multique pastores, omnes tamen proprie regat Petrus, quos principaliter regit et Christus."

35. Ibid., col. 152, "Firmitas, quae per Christum Petro tribuitur, per Petrum apostolis conferatur."

36. Ibid., col. 148, "indignus haeres beati Petri."


38. Leo I (1846), col. 145, "Non de nobis, sed illo praesumimus, qui operatur in nobis."

39. Ibid., col. 671, "Vices enim nostras ita tuae credidimus caritati, ut in partem sis vocatus sollicitudinis, non in plenitudinem potestatis."

41. See Thiel (1867), p. 237, "Mihi crede, nescio quemadmodum te ecclesiae totius asseras principem."

42. Mansi (1759-1798), VII, col. 1077, "si dixeris; sed Imperatoris catholicus est: salva pace ipius dixerimus, filius est, non Praesul Ecclesiae; quod ad religionem competit, discere conventit, non docere: havet privilegia potestatis suae, quae amministrandis publicis rebus divinitatus consecutus est; et eius beneficiis non ingratus contra dispositionem caelestis ordinis nil usurpet: ad sacerdotes enim Deus voluit, quae Ecclesiae disponenda sunt, pertinere, non ad saeculi potestates: quae si fideles sunt, Ecclesiae suae, et sacerdotibus voluit esse subjectus; Non sibi vindicet alienun ius, et ministerium quod alteri deputatum est." Translation by F. Dvornik.

43. The term had been used earlier by St. Ambrose to address Theodosius I (Ambrose (1845), col. 1061: "Quid enim honorificientius quam ut imperator filius Ecclesiae esse dicatur"), but Ambrosius, of course, was not pope.

44. Felix III (1847), col. 272: "...in me qualicumque vicario beatus Petrus apostolus, et haec in illo, qui ecclesiam suam discerpi non patimur, ipse etiam Christus exspectit."

45. Schwartz (1934), p. 20, "Duo sunt quippe, imperator auguste, quibus principaliter mundus hic regitur, auctoritas sacra pontificum et regalis potestas, in quibus tanto granius pondus est sacrodotum quanto etiam pro ipsius regibus hominum in diuino redditiur sunt examine rationem. Nostri etenim, fili clamentissime, quoniam licet praestesecus humano generi digne, rerum tamen praesulibus diuinarum deuotus colla summittis atque ab eis causas tuae salutis expetis hincque sumendis caelestibus sacramentis esique, ut competit, disponendis subdi te debere cognoscis religionis ordine potius quam praesesce, itaque inter haec illorum te pendere iudicio, non illos ad tuam uelle redigi voluntatem." Translation by F. Dvornik.


47. Ibid., p. 14, "Fuerint haec ante adventum Christi ut quidam figuraliter, adhuc tamen in carnalis actionibus constituti pariter reges existerent et pariter sacerdotes, quod sanctam Melchisedec fuisset sacra profita historia. Quod in suis quoque diabolus imitatus utpote qui semper quae diuno culti conuenirent, sibimet tyrannico spiritu uindicare contendit, ut pagani imperatores idem et maxim pontifices dicerentur; sed cum ad uerum uentum est eundem regem atque pontificem, ultra sibi nec imperator pontificis nomen inoposuit nec pontifex regale fastigium uindicavit. Quamuis enim membra ipsius, id est ueri regis atque pontificis secundum participationem naturae magnifice utrumque in sacra generositate sumpsisse dicantur, ut simul regale genus et sacerdotale subsistant..."

48. Ibid., p. 14, "Quoniam Christus memor fragilitatis humanae quod suorum saluti congrueret, dispensatione magnifica tempueurit, sic actionibus propriis dignitataibusque distinctis officia potestatis utriusque discreuit, suos uolens medicinali humilitate saluari, non humana superbia rursus intercipi, ut et Christiani imperatores pro aeterna uita pontificibus indigenter et pontifices pro temporalium cursu rerum imperialibus dispositionibus uenteretur, quatenus spiritus actio a carnalis distaret incursibus et iede militans deo minime se negotiis saecularibus implicatus, ut et modestia utriusque ordinis curaretur, ne extolleretur utroque subfultus, et competens qualitatis actionem specialiter professio aptaretur."

49. Walter Ullman notes "Only once Gregory spoke of the emperor as 'piisimus dominus filius noster' (Reg. vii. 24, p.469, line 19), but this was addressed to Anastasius of Antioch, and not to the emperor himself." Ullmann (1955), p. 38.

50. Gregory I (1891-1899), v.37.
51. The quote is from the historian Rufinius (1849), col 468, "Vos enim nobis a Deo dati estis dii, et conveniens non est ut homo judicet deos." Translation by W. Ullman.

52. His Regula Pastoralis provides many good examples. See Ullman (1955), pp.40-41.


54. See Gregory I (1849), ix., 47; ix., 213; ix. 215, etc.

55. Ibid., ix. 67, "societas reipublicae christianae." Translation by W. Ullman.


57. Gregory I (1891-1899), II, p. 309, "Praeterea scire vestram gloriám volumus, quia, sicut in scriptura sacrà ex verbis Domini omnipotentis agnoscimus, praesentis mundi iam terminus iuxta est et sanctorum regnum venturum est, quod nullo unquam poterit fine terminari. Adpropinquante autem eodem mundi termino multa imminent quæ antea non fuerunt, videlicet inmutationes aeris terroresque de caelo et contra ordinacionem temporum tempestates, bella, fames, pestilentiae, terræ motus per loca. Quæ tamen non omnia nostris diebus ventura sunt, sed post nostros dies omnia subsequentur." Translation by B. McGinn.


61. This idea was based on an interpretation of the second chapter of St. Paul’s second letter to the Thessalonians.


64. Ibid., p. 91. ". . . omnes indignatio et furor regis Romanorum super eos qui abnegaverint dominum Iesum Christum exardiscit, et sedebit terra in pace, et erit pax et tranquillitas magna super terra qualis nondum esset facta, sed neque fiet similis illa eo quod novissima est et in fine saeculorum."

65. Ibid., p. 92-93. "Post ebdomada vero temporis, cumque iam præhenderint civitatem Ioppen, emittit dominus Deus unum ex principibus miliciae suæ et percuciet eos in uno momento temporis, et post haec discendit rex Romanorum et demorabitur in Hierusalem septimana temporum et dimidia, quod est anni et dimedium, et cum supplebuntur decem et demedium anni, apparebit filius perditionis."

66. Ibid., pp. 93-94. "Et cum apparerit filius perditionis, ascendit rex Romanorum sursum in Golgatha, in quo confixum est lignum sanctæ crucis. In quo loco pro nobis Dominus mortem sustinuit, et tollit rex coronam de capite suo et ponet eam super crucem, et
expandit manus suas in caelum et tradit regnum christianorum Deo et patri et adsumetur crux in caelum simul cum coronam regis. Propter quod quia crux, in qua dependit dominus noster Iesus Christus propter communem omni salutem, ipsa crux incipiet appare ante eum in adventum ipsius ad arguendum perfidiam infidelium, et complebitur propheta David, que dicit: 'In novissimis diebus Aethopia praeventis manus eius Deus,' eo quod ex semine filiorum Chuseth filiae Phol regis Aethopiae ipsi novissimi preveniunt manu sua Deo. Et cumque exalabatur crux in celum sursum, etiam tradet continuo spiritum suum rex. Tunc distruetur omne principatum et potestam, ut appareat manifestus filius perditionis."

67. For an excellent examination of the Sibylline tradition in general, see McGinn (1985a).


69. See Alexander (1967).

70. See Sackur (1898), pp. 164-70 and also Rangheri (1973) pp.708-709.

71. P. Alexander feels that the account in the Tiburtine Sibyl was a later version of the account in Pseudo-Methodius. See Alexander (1971), note 35.


73. The Sibyl notes how these "unclean nations" had been shut up by Alexander, a reference to the Alexander legends that certainly could not have been in a fourth century edition.

74. Sackur (1898), p. 186, "Cum autem audierit rex Romanorum, convocato exercitu debellabit eos atque prostat vetustum vestigium locum et postea veniet Jerusalem, et ibi deposite capitis diademate et omni habitu regali reliquit regnum christianorum Deo patri et Iesu Christo filio eius."

75. See Konrad (1964), p.46.

77. Ibid., p. 255, "Ad imitationem imperii nostri, unde ut non pontificalis apex vilescat, sed magis amplius quam terreni imperii dignitas et gloriae potentia decoreretur, ecce tam palatinum nostrum, ut p precedent est, quamque Romanae urbis et omnes Italie seu occidentali regionum provinciae, loca et civitates sepefato beatissimo pontifici, patri nostro Silvestrio, universalis papae, contradentes atque relinquentes eius vel successorum ipsius pontificem potestati et ditioni firma imperali consuera...nestrum imperium et regni potestatem orientalibus transferrir ac transmutari regionibus et in Byzantiae provenia in optimo loco nominie nostro civitatem aedificari et nostrum illic constiui imperium; quoniam, ubi principatus sacerdotum et Christianae religiones caput ab imperatore celeste constitutum est, iustum non est, ut illic imperator terrenus habeat potestatem."


79. See the accounts of Theophanes (1883-1885), I, 475 in 800 and 802.


CHAPTER III

1. As a simple example, I refer the reader to Karl Morrison's problem study The Investiture Controversy: Issues, Ideals, and Results [Morrison (1971)], in which a number of widely divergent essays are presented. Commenting on them, Morrison notes on page 5 'Polarization of opinion could hardly be clearer than in the statement by James Bryce that the papacy won unconditionally and that by Arnold J. Toynbee that it lost absolutely.' For longer, more scholarly examples of this complete polarization, I recommend that the reader compare Ullman (1955) with Morrison (1969).

3. Brian Tierney notes how Humbert's inflexibility helped cause the final schism between the Western and Eastern churches; see Tierney (1964), pp. 33-34.

4. Humbert (1891), pp. 225-6, "Unde qui sacardotalem et regalem dignitatem vult irreprehensibiliter et utiliter conferre, dicat sacerdotium in praesenti ecclesia assimilari animae, regnum autem corpori, quia invicem se diligunt et vicissim indigent suamque sibi operam vicissim exigit et impendunt. Ex quibus sicut praeminet anima et praecipit, sic sacerdotalis dignitas regali, utputa caelestis terrestri. Sic ne praepostera, sed ordinata sint omnia, sacerdotium tanquam anima praemoneat quae sunt agenda; regnum deinde tanquam caput sui coporis omnibus membris praeinance et ea quo expediat praecedat. Sicut enim regnum est ecclesiasticum sequi, sic laicorum quoque reges suos ad utilitatem ecclesiae et patriae; sic ab una earum potestate populus ocuerit, ab altera debet regi..." Translation by B. Tierney.

5. MGH Constitutiones et Acta (1893), I, p. 547. "1. Primo nanque inspectore Deo est statutum, ut electio Romani pontificis in potestate cardinalium episcoporum sit, ita ut, si quis apostolicae sedi præmissa canonica electione eorum et sequentium ordinum saecularium clericorum consensu intronizatur, non papa vel apostolus sed apostaticus habeatur... 6. Ut per laicos nullo modo quilibet clericus aut presbyter obtineat aeelesiam nec gratis nec precio." Translation by B. Tierney.

6. Erdmann (1937), pp. 8-9, "Cum enim regnum et sacerdotium, ut in christo rite administrata subsistant, vicaria sui ope semper indigent, oportet nimirum, domne mi et pater amantissime, quatinus ab invicem minime dissentiam, verum potius Christi glutino coniunctissima indissolubiter sibi cohereant. Nanque sic et non aliter conservatur in vinculo perfecte caritatis et pacis et christiane concordia unitatis et ecclesiasticum simul status religionis. Sed non, qui deo annuente regni aliquandiu iam sortimur ministerium, sacerdotio, ut oportuit, per omnia ius et honorem non exhibuimus legitimum. Quippe nobis a deo date potestatis vindicem non sine causa gladium portavimus, nec tamen in reos, ut iustum fuit, iudicia illa semper censura exvaginavimus. Nunc autem divina miseratione a:quantulum compuncti...Peccaminus in celum et coram nobis et iam digni non sumus vocatione vestre filiationis. Non solum enim non res ecclesiasticas invasimus, verum quoque dignis quislibet et symoniaci felle amaricatis et non per ostium sed aliunde ingredientibus ecclesias ipsas vendidimus et non eas, ut oportuit, defendimus. At nunc, quia soli absque vestra auctoritate ecclesias corrige non possimus, super his, ut etiam de nobis omnibus, vestrum una et consilium et auxilium obnixse querimus, vestrum studiosissime præceptum servaturi in omnibus." Translation by T. Morrison and K. Morrison.

7. Gregory VII (1865), pp. 127-128, "Litterae tuae ad nos tarde propter moram nuntii tui allatae sunt. Quas quidem multo benignus manus nostra susceptisse, si tua incauta conditio non adeo beatum Petrum offendisset. Nam, sicut a maioribus patris tuae cognoscere potes, regnum Ungariae sanctae Romanae ecclesiae proprium est, a rege Stephano olim beato Petro cum omni iure et potestate sua oblatus et devote traditum...qualiter gratiam beati Petri aut nostram benevolentiam sperare debeas, tu ipse, si
iustitiam vis attendere, non ignoras: videlecit te non aliter eam habiturum nec sine apostolica animadversione diu regnaturum, nisi sceptrum regni quod tenes, correcto errore tuo, apostolicae, non regiae, maiestatis beneficium recognoscas. Neque enim nos timore vel amore aut aliqua personali acceptione, quantum Deo adivante poterimus, debitum homonem eius, cuius servi sumus, inrequistum relinqueremus." Translation by E. Emerton.

8. Ibid., p. 528, "Perlatum est ad nos de fraternitate tua, quod satis invitus et mestus audivi, quodque, si vel de extrempo christianae plebis membro ad audientiam nostram deferretur, severiore districtorís discipline censura esse procul dubio castigandum. Cum enim, apostolica auctoritate et veridicis sanctorum patrum sententiis incitati, ad eliminandam symoniacam heresim et praecipiendam clericorum castitatem pro nostri officii debito exarsimus...Tibi quoque, cui est pluries Constantiensis ecclesiae clericus et populus amplissime dilatus, ob eadem causam speciales litteras eude, bulla nostra inpressas, collibuit; quarum fultus auctoritate, tutius animiosque praeceptis nostris obtemperares et de sanctuario Domini heresim symoniacam et fedam libidinosae contagionis pollutionem expelleres."

9. Ibid., p. 529, "episcopum sedes apostolicae decreta contemnere."


11. Gregory VII (1865), pp. 219-220, "Decerat regiam dignitatem tuam, cum te filium ecclesiae confiteris, honorabilis magistrum ecclesiae, hoc est beatum Petrum apostolorum principem, intueri. Cui, si de dominicis ovibus es, domina voce et potestate ad pascedum traditus es, dicente sibi Christo: 'Petre, pasce ovae meas,' et iterum: Tibi tradite sunt claves regni caelorum; et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in caelis; et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in caelis.' In cuius sede et apostolica administratione dum nos qualescunque pecatores et indigni divina dispositione vicem suae potestatis gerimus, profecto, quicquid ad nos vel per scripta aut nudi verbis miseris, ipse recipit. Et dum nos aut elementa percurrimus aut quotidianum voces auscultamus, ipse, ex quo corde mandata proderint, subtilli inspectione discernit. Quapropter providendum esset tuae celsitudini: ne erga sedem apostolicam in verbis et legationibus tuis aliqua inveniretur discrepantia voluntatis; et in his, per quae christianafides et status ecclesiae ad aeternam salutem maxime proficiat, non nobis sed Deo omnipotenti debitum non dedegares reverentiam; quamquam apostolis eorumque successoribus Dominus dicere dignatus sit: 'Qui vos audiet, me audit, et qui vos spernit, me spernit.'"


13. Erdmann (1937), pp. 15-16, "H. non usurpative, sed pia dei ordinatione rex Hildebrando iam non apostolico, sed false monacho...tu humilitatem nostram timorem fore intelekti ideoque et in ipsam regiam potestatem nobis a deo concessam exurgere non timuisti, quam te nobis auferre ausus es minari: quasi nos a te regnum accipierimus, quasi in tua et non in dei manu sit regnum vel imperium...Me quoque, qui licet indignus inter cristos ad regnum sum unicuss, tigitisti, quem sanctorum patrum traditio soli deo iudicandum docuit nec pro aliquando crimine, nisi a fide, quod abist, exorbitaverim, deponendum asseruit; cum etiam Iulianum apostatam prudentia sanctorum episcoporum non sibi, sed soli deo iudicandum deponendumque commiserit. Ipsa quoque verus papa beatus Petrus clamat: 'Deum timete, regem honorificate,' tu autem, quia deum non times, me constitutum eius in honoremos."

14. Ibid., p. 19, "regnum et sacerdotium deo nesciente sibi usurpavit. In quo piem dei ordinationem contempsit, quod non in uno, sed in duobus, duo, id est regnum et sacerdotium, principaliter consistere voluit, sicut ipse salvator in passione sua de duorum gladiorum
sufficientia typica intelligi innuit. Cui cum diceretur: 'domine, ecce duo gladii hic,' respondit: 'satis est,' significans hac sufficienti dualitate spiritualem et carnalem gladium en ecclesiagerendum, quibus omne nocivum foret amputandum, videlicet sacerdotali ad obedientiam regis pro deo, regali vero gladio ad expellendos Christi inimicos exterius et ad obedientiam sacerdotti interius omnem hominem docens fore constringendum; et ita de alio in alium caritate tenderetur, dum nec sacerdottii regnum nec sacerdotium regni honore privaretur.


16. Gregory VII (1865), p. 224, "Heinrico regi, filio Heinrici imperatoris, qui contra tuam ecclesiam audita superbia insurrexit, totius regni Teutonicorum et Italae gubernacula contradico; et omnes christianos a vinculo iuramenti, quod sibi fecerunt vel facient, absolvo; et, ut nullus ei sicut regi serviat, interdico."

17. Ibid., pp. 256-258.
18. Ibid., pp. 401-404.

19. Erdmann (1937), p. 70, "cur tam diu ipsam rex semper invictus pateretur intactam, cum vas electionis Paulus testetur principium non sine causa gladium ferre, et Petrus apostolorum primus non solum regem precellere, verum duces ab eo mittendos clamet esse, ad vindictam videlicet malorum, ad laudem vero honorum. Ad quorum satisfactionem visum est ipsi gloriosissimo regi principibusque eius iustum, ut iducium episcoporum divine animadversionis sententia gladium materialem in ipsum Hildebrandum precederet, ut quem presuales ecclesiarum prius a superba prelatione deponerent, eundem postmodum regalis potentia licentius persequendum decerneret."


22. I have spared the gentle reader the more fabulous and vitriolic charges.


24. Ibid., p. 679. "El ergo qui talibus ac tantis benedictionibus beneditur, qui talibus ac tantis sacramentis consecratur et deificatur, nullus est iure preferendus, quia nullus pluribus vel melioribus benedictionibus benedicitur, nullus pluribus et maioribus sacramentis consecratur et deificatur, immo nec tot nec paribus, ac per nullus est ei coequandus...Nec ideo minor est dicendus pontifice, quia consecrat eum pontifex, quia plurumque fit, ut minores consecrent maiorem, inferiores superiores, ut cardinales papam et metropolitanum suffraganei. Quod ideo fit, quia non sunt auctores consecrationis, sed ministri. Deus enim operatur sacramentum, illi exhibent ministerium."

26. Ibid., p. 365.
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54. Ibid., pp. 145-6, "Non est ergo ex impotencia spiritualis gladii, quod non possit de temporalibus animadvertere, sed adiunctus est sibi materialis gladius propter eius excellenciam. Nam quia spiritualis gladius est tam excellens et tam excellencia sunt sibi commissa, ut liberius possit eis vacare, adiunctus est sibi secundus gladius, ex cuius adiunctione in nullo diminuta est eius iurisdictione et plenitudo potestatis ipsius, sed ad quandam decemcia hoc est factum, ut qui ordinatur ad magna, nisi casus imminet, non se intromittatur per se ipsum et immediate de parvis. Est itaque plenitudo potestatis in spirituali gladioo, ut si expediat, de temporalibus iudicet. Si ergo a civili iudice appelletur ad papam, et si hoc sit secundum ius distinctconis fori, erit secundum ius plenitudinis potestatis." Translation by B. Tierney.


57. Ibid., p. 175, "Inter has ergo opiniones tam contrarias, quorum primam erroneam omnes putant, puto quod veritas medium ponit, quod scilicet prelatis ecclesiis non repugnat habere dominium in temporalibus et iurisdictionem, contra primam opinionem erroneam. Nec tamen eis debetur per se ratione status sui et ratione qua sunt vicarii Christi et Apostolorum successores. Sed eis conveniunt potest habere taliia ex concessione vel permissione principum si ab eis ex devotione aliquid huiusmodi collatum fuerit vel si habuerint aliunde."

58. Ibid., p. 189, "princeps a populo qui in talibus preest ut iudex decernens iustum et injustum."

59. Ibid., pp. 176-77, "Est autem tale regimen a iure naturali et a iure gentium derivatum. Nam cum homo sit animal naturaliter politicum seu civile ut dicitur I Politiorum, quod estenditur secundum Philosophum ex victu, vestitu, defensione, in quibus solus sibi non sufficit, et etiam a sermone qui est ad alterum, que soli homini debentur, necesse est homini ut in multitudine vivat et tali multitudini que sibi sufficiat ad vitam."

60. Ibid., p. 199, "Item fuit potestas regia secundum se et quantum ad executionem quam papalis et prius fuerunt reges quam christiani in Francia. Ergo potestas regia nec secundum se nec quantum ad executionem est a papa sed a Deo et a populo regem eligente in persona vel in domo, sicut ante... Amplius etiam potestas inferiorum pontificum et curatorum magis videtur esse mediante papa quam regia potestas eo quod immediatus dependent prelati ecclesiastici a papa quam seculares principes. Sed potestas prelatorum non est a Deo mediante papa sed immediate, a populo eligente vel consentiente."

61. Ibid., p. 184, "Et ideo dignior est sacerdotalis potestas seculari potestate, et hoc conceditur communiter."

62. Ibid., "Nec tamen si principe maior est sacerdos dignitate et simpliciter oportet quod sit maior eo in omnibus."

63. Ibid., "Et ideo potestas secularis in aliquibus maior est potestate spirituali, scilicet in temporalibus, nec quoad hoc est ei subjecta in aliquo quia ab illa non oritur, sed ambe orientur ab una suprema potestate, scilicet divina."

64. Ibid., p. 214, "quia si esset princeps hereticus et incorrigibilis et contemptor ecclesiastici censure posset papa aliquid facere in populo ut ille privaretur honore seculari et deponeretur a populo...si papa esset criminosus et scandalizaret ecclesiam et incorrigibilis esset, posset princeps ipsum excommunicare indirecte et deponere ipsum per accidens, monendo scilicet ipsum per se vel per cardinales. Et si quidem papa acquisescere nollet, posset aliquid facere in populo unde compelleretur cedere, vel deponeretur a populo..."

65. Schard (1566), p. 677, "Nullus enim potest deins statuere, super quae constat ipsum dominium non habere. Sic nec Francorum rex potest statuere super imperium nec Imperator super regnum Franciae. Et quemadmodum terreni principes non possunt aliquid statuere de uestris spiritualibus, super quae non acceperunt potestatem sic nec uos de temporalibus eorum, super que non habetis autoritatem. Vnde friuolum est, quicumque statuistis, de temporalibus, super quae non potestatem non accepsistis a Deo. Translation by E. Lewis."

66. Ibid., p. 678, "per diversas scripturas ostenderitis, summos pontifices esse super omnia temporalis dominos."

67. Ibid., "Petrus aut constitutus est Christi uicarius pro statu humiliatis, non pro statu glorie et maiestatis. Non eum factus est Christi uicarius ad ea que Christus nunc agit in gloris: sed ad eam imitanda, que Christus egit humiliis in terra, quia illa nobis necessaria sunt. Illam ergo potestatem suo uicario commisit, quam homo mortalis exercuit: non illum,
quam glorificatus accept. Et ut ista per scripturas, quas inducitis, ostendamus, de editem
scripturis uobis testimonium proferemus. Ipse enim Christus dicit Pilato, Regnum meum non
est de hoc mundo: et quod non uenit ministriari, sed ministrae.

68. Ibid., p. 682, "Sed certe nihil facitis inde, sed omnia uestris necessitatibus applicatis,
quae per eleemosynas et opera charitatis inuisceribus pauperum claudere deberitis. Non ne
est necesse, quod per huiusmodi sanctissima opera mortui liberent, et saluarentur uii? Non
ne cum ea ad propria expenditis, superfluecs consumitis, et ea contra intentionem dantium,
et etiam quodammodo accipientium dispergitis male utendo, uiuos et mortuos leditis, et uiuis
et mortuis damnabiliter derogatis? Non ne ei qui non vult militare auferetur stipendium?"

69. Pierre Dubois (1891), p. 105, "sub annua perpetua pensione traderet domino regi
totum patrimonium Ecclesie cum uedi比亚迪 temporalis omnium vassallorum ejsdem, de
quibus sunt multi reges." Translation by W. Brandt.

70. Ibid., pp. 98-99, "guerris sedatis secundum modos prescriptos, et regimine suorum
temporalium, possessione et districione, pro certa annua pensione perpetuo domino regi
Francorum commissis, per fratres suos et filios, prout expedire viderit, gubernandis, poterit,
cessante Romanorum et Lombadorum insidias venenosis, in sua terra natali regni
Francorum, soli reginim animarum vacando, diu et sane vivere, Romani aeris sibi non
natalem intemperiem evitando."

71. Ibid., p. 99-100, "qui, calcare sub pedibus nitentes per superbiam suam humilitatem
Gallorum, temptare presumserunt, quod alias fuerat inauditum, super regnum Francorum
et ejus supremum principem temporale dominium vendicare, summe pacis et concordie
regnum ad deditionem perpetuam damnabiliter incitando; cujus tempestatis presumptuosum
inicium, reges pacis summam inter suos vicarios largiente concordiam, salubriter conquievit."

72. Dante Alighieri (1874), pp.9-10, "Satis igitur declaratum est, quod proprium opus
humani generis totaliter accepti, est actuare semper totam potentiam intellectus possibilis,
per prius ad speculandum, et secundario propter hoc ad operandum per suam extensione. Et
quia, quemadmodum est in parte, sic est in toto, et in homine particullari contingit, quod
sedendo et quiescendo prudentia et sapientia ipse perficitur; patet, quod genus humanum in
quiere sive tranquillitate pacis ad proprium suum opus, quod fere divinum est (iuxta illud:
'Minuisti eum paulo minus ab angelis'), liberrime atque facillime se habet. Unde manifestum
est, quod pax universalis est optimum eorum, quae ad nostram beatitudinem ordinatur." Translated by H. Schneider.

73. Ibid., p. 12, "Nunc constat quod totum humanum genus ordinatur ad unum, ut iam
praestensum fuit; ergo unum oportet esse egulans, sive regens: et hoc Monarchia, sive
Imperator dici debet. Et sic patet, quod ab esse esse mundi, necesse est Monarchiam esse,
sive Imperium."

74. Ibid., p. 93, "zeolo solo matris Ecclesiae promoveri."

75. Ibid., "qui Theologiae ac Philospohiae cujuslibet inscii et expertes."

76. Ibid., p. 94, "quas profecto venerandas existimo."

77. Ibid., p. 137, "Duos igitur fines Providentia illa inenarrabillis homini proposuit
intendos; beatitudinem scilicet hujus vitae, quae in operatione propriae virtutis consistit, et
per terrestrem Paradisum figuratur; et beatitudinem vitae aeternae, quae consistit in
fruitione divini aspectus, ad quam propria virtus ascendere non potest, nisi lumine divino
adjuta, quae per Paradisum coelestem intelligi datur."
78. Ibid., p. 140, "Quae quidem varitas...non sic stricte recipienda est, ut Romanus Princeps in aliquo Romano Pontifici non subjaceat; quam mortalis ista felicitas quodammodo ad immortalem felicitatem ordinetur. Illa igitur reverentia Caesar utatur ad Petrum, qua primogenitus filius debet uti ad patrem; ut luce paternae gratiae illustratus, virtuosius orbem terrae irradiet, cui ab Illo solo praefectus est, qui est omnium spiritualium et temporalium gubernator."


80. Ibid., p. 118.


82. Ibid., p. 8, "Sanitas autem, ut aiunt peritiores physicorum describentes ipsam, est bona disposition animalis, qua potest unaquaque suarum partium perfecte facere operationes convenientes suae naturae; secundum quam siquidem analogiam est tranquillitas bona dispositio civitatis aut regni, qua poterit unaquaque suarum partium facere perfecte operationes convenientes sibi secundum rationem et suam institutionem."

83. Ibid., p. 14, "Nam quia diversa sunt necessaria volentibus vivere, quae per homines unius ordinis seu officia in hac communicatione, diversa huissusmodi exercentes seu procurantes, quibus pro vitae suffucientia homines indigent."

84. Ibid., p. 49, "valentiorem partem".

85. Ibid., p. 36, "et quoniam ipsorum simpliciter praestantior est electio."

86. Ibid., p. 21, "impossibili tamen humana ratione convicti."

87. Ibid., p. 128, "Romanum episcopum vocatum papam, aut aliorum quemlibet episcopum seu presbyterum, vel diaconum, nullum habere aut habere debere principatum seu iudiciem ver iurisdictionem coactivam cuiusquam sacerdotes aut non-sacerdotes, principalis, communis, collegii, vel personae singularis aliusui cuiuscumque conditionis existat."

88. Ibid., p. 173, "absque fidelium universitatis consensu."

89. Ibid., pp. 311-312, "Ex quibus quidem omnibus ad uniuscuiusque quasi sensatam notiam deductur, Romanum episcopum aut ipsius ecclesiam vel quemvis alium episcopum aut ecclesiam, inquantum huissusmodi, nullam potestatem aut auctoritatem iam dictarum habere super reliquis episcopos et ecclesias Divino vel humano iure, nisi quae sibi simpliciter vel ad tempus concessa fuerit per supradictum concilium generalis. Propter quod etiam apparebit, Romanum episcopum aut quemvis alium incongrue, minus debite, ac praetere, imo contra Scripturarum Divinarum et humanarum demonstrationum sententiam sibi ascribere super principem, communitatem, aut personem aliquam singularem plenitudinem potestatis; et quod ab ipsius sibi attributione idem episcopus et alter quicumque penitus est, etiam per monitionem et coactivam potestatem si oporteat, ab humanis legum latoribus seu ipsorum auctoritate principantibus cohendendus."

90. Ibid., "Demum vero ex his per necessitatem inferemus, tam determinata circa Scripturarum et fidelam catholicam quam circa ritum ecclesiasticum, cum reliquis institutis per generale concilium, solus generalis conciliii auctoritate, non autem alterius particularis collegii vel personae singularis aliusui, immutari posse, augeri, minui, vel suspendi, aut totaliter revocari."

92. Ibid., "Sed ebrii sopitique floccipendent ebionum iacturam cruoremque dimicantium vemularum, donec ursus mirabilis egrediatur de saxo agitatus a spiritu, plumarum Reginam Vastique proveniant nouam, qui stipadium conterat et sedentes dispergat."

93. Ibid., p. 292, "Donec ursus mirabilis: hic ursus Romanus pontifex est. Etenim prout urusulus licit seu lambitu parentum effigiatur, ita Romanus pontifex et quilibet verus prelatus ore seu lingua electorum preficitur; vel potest dici, quod talis pontifex, antequam eligatur, vestes despiciet preciosas velut ursus, qui est lana repertus vili et despicabili inter feras, propter quod mirabilis appellatur atque a plumoso spiritu agitatus."


95. Ibid., pp. 290-291, "Ydolo ecleesie dicturus eris, nisi induratum esset cor eis; dicens tamen dic, ut sit in testimonium verbum tuum: Quis posuit ydolum hoc in sede mea? ut imperaret gregi meo? Aures habet et non audit, clamores plagencium et descendentium ad inferna, clangorem buccine et tonitruorum voces tremendae exsuperat ululatio eorum... Os habet et non loquitur, semper dicens: Constitui super eos qui loquantur eis bona, sufficit enim ut per me vel per alios faciam bona. Ve ydolo! Ve ponenti! Quis equabitur ydolo huic in terra? Magnificavit nomen suum in terra dicens: Quis me subiciet?"

96. Ibid., p. 279, "Ibidem in sompnis vidi quod eram cum primogenito fratre meo et jure sorore meo factumque est dum iremus, pervenimus ad ianuam quandam dictumque est nobis: 'Intus est papa, si vultis eum videre.' Intrantes autem osculati sumus pedes eius, stantis in terra. Et mirans quod in terra sederet, aspexi lectum eius strictum, brevem, cum vili superlectili valde dixique: 'Quid est hoc, pater, quod ita vilem lectum haves: pauperiorem episcopos mundi non teneret.' Et dixit michi ipse papa: 'Humiliari nos oportet.' Et exse subito fuimus in descendu montis unius et vidi eum in habitu fratrum minorum."


98. PG 107:1121-68.

99. For a diagram of the use and re-use of these figures, see in Reeves (1972), pp. 132-133.


101. This manuscript may be found as Lateran 3816 in the Vatican.


104. Ibid., "generosus rex de posteritate Pippini."

105. Ibid., "claritatem glorirosi pastoris."
106. Ubertinus de Casali (1486), p. 476, "Sic et benedictus Iesus faciat electis suis in splendore lucis seu relevans mysteria novi status. Unde xviii apocalypse post bellum antichristi tam mystici quam apti: dicitur post hec uidi alium angelum descendendem de celo habentem potestatem magnam et terra illuminata est a gloria eius: Per hunc intelligitur ordo doctores predicantium casumiam factum quem uisios eis alius ab illia quos casu predicauerit futurum. Et sorte iste angelus erit idem summus pontifex de quo super ei dictum uel alius eius perfectionis successor unde et iste dicuntur de celo descendere potest intelligi de statu altissimo in quo deus imobiliter et fixe ac in celo eos locauit continue descendit in sua recedentes per ulissima humilitatis profundum et omni gradu gratia maxime tanto se reputantes indignos quo plus sic de scendit tanto elevatur et confirmant sublimius unde et de isto dicitur hemnentem potestatem magnam sic secundum Ioachi in loquendo urbern dei." Translation by B. McGinn.


108. Ibid.


112. For an extensive list of these writers see Reeves (1969), p. 333, n. 1.

113. John of Winterthur (1982), p. 280, "In his temporibus aput homines diversi generis, multos valde assertissime vulgabatur imperatorem Fridricum secundum huius nominis, a quo secundam partem presentis operis inchoavi, ad reformandum statum omnio depravatum ecclesie venturum in robore maximo potentatus. Adiciunt quoque homines predicta sencientes, quod neccesse sit eum venire, si in mille partes sectatus esset, immo si in pulvem per combustionem redactus fuerit, eo quod divinitus sit decretum ita debere fieri, quod immutari impossibile est. Secundum igitur istam assercionem, cum resuscitat ad imperii sui culmen reversus fuerit, puellae vel femine pauperi in matrimonio inuentum ad vim divitem et e converso, moniales et sorores in seculo degentes maritabit, monachos uxorabit, pupillos, orphans, viduis omnibus et singulis spoliatis res ablatas restituet cunctisque faciet justicie complementum. Clericos persequeat adeo atrociter, quod coronas et tonsuras suas stercore bovino, si aliud tegimentum non habuerint, obducent, ne appareant tonsorati. Religiosos, qui denunciando processus papales contra eum, precipue fratres Minores, ipsum de imperio repulerant, de terra fugabit. Post resumptum imperiurn iustius et gloriosius gubematum quam ante cum exercitu copioso transfretabit et in monte Oliveti vel aput arbores in adrum imperium resignabit." Translation by B. McGinn.


115. Ibid., pp. 194-195, "...et quod in breu erunt magne moutates, presertim pro reformacione Ecclesie ad statum priatine sanctitatis, cum magna pace non solum inter christicolas, sed inter christianos et eciam sarracenon, quos sub vno proxime futuro pastore Spiritus Sancti gracia perlustrabit; asserans, quod tempus instat, in quo Spiritus Sancti tempus ingreditur, in quo Deus ab hominibus cognoscetur; item quod ad huiusmodi spiritualis negocii prosecucionem electus sit a Deo vir sanctus, revelacione diuina ab omnibus cognoscendus, qui vna cum electo imperatore orbem terrarum multiplicer reformabunt, exclusi a pastoribus Ecclesie superfluitatibus deliciarum temporalium caducarum. Interrogatus subiuncit, quod quidam sub quodam pastore Ecclesie mortificatus vel mortuos quadriduanus resurget, ad cuius vocem fiert inter pastores Ecclesie terror magnus et fuga, in quia eciam summum pontifex erit in periculo personali; et quod deinde
idem pastor angelicus Ecclesie Dei quasi ruenti succurret, non minus eciam quam Francisco, et totum statum Ecclesie reformabit, fietque de thesauris ecclesiasticis templum Dei magnum ad honorem Sancti Spiritus dedicatum, quod Jerusalem vocabitur, et ibidem ad orandum infideles venient eciam ex Egypto."


118. Ibid., p. 502, "Intentio duodecima est super reparatione proxima virorum Ecclesiasticorum et orbis per coelestem reparatorum propinquum: quoniam hic est Elias qui juxta verbum Domini restituet omnia; omnes utique corruptos sacerdotes, luxuriosos et avaros Christum hoc flagello (ad literam) facto de funiculis pauperibus; scilicet cordelatis abjectis, de Templo expellet pro certo, ne ei ministrent in sacrificio; et simoniaicos deponet a ministerio Ecclesiastico, et offendentes naturam tradet brachio seculari ut sacrificentur in igne ut purgetur natura; libertatem antiquam eligiendi praetatos sedibus Episcopaliis restituet; lupos voraces effugabit a grege; sanctos viros sistet super candelabrum et indignos sub medio abscondet; intuitum carnis et sanguinis castigabit; collapsam justiciam renovabit et contra universa scelera congruam medicinam aptabit; et universas virtutes Evangelicas cum collapsis hominibus replantabit, et benos homines in suo sancto proposito confirmaabit; librum reparationis orbis arte Christi conficiet, cujus virtus usque ad finem seculi perdurabit."

119. Ibid., "Regem Francorum, qui veniet in principio suae creationis ad videndam angelicam claritatem ejusdem, assumer, contra morem Alamanica electionis, in Imperatorem Romanum, cui Deus generaliter subjiciet totum orben occidentem et orientem et meridiam; qui tantae sanctitatis existet, quod ei Imperator aut Rex similis in sanctitate non fuit ab origine mundi prae ter Regem Regum et Dominum Dominantium, Dominum Christum Jesum. Hic Imperator renuet coronari corona aurea, ad honorem spinarum Coronae Jesu Christi: hie Imperator sanctissimus erit executor omnium mandatorum reparatoris praedicti."

120. Ibid., "per illos duos totus orbis reparator et ab eis destruet tota lex et tyrannica potentia Mahometi: ambo, tam Papa, quam Imperator, Graeciam et Asia personaliter visitabunt, drenunt schisma, Grecos liberabunt a Turcis, Tartaros fidei subjugabunt, regna Asia repara bunt; et consistuet Papa ut in perpetuum quamdui mundus erit, cardinales assumentur de Ecclesia Graca...hic destruet Italia schisma Guelphorum et Gibellinorum; et terras Ecclesiae sic disponet, ut Papa eae Ecclesias in aeternum non impugnet: avaritiam omnem et superbia extirpabit, a clericis haereles annulabit; et quia, sicut dixi, jam futurum est in brevi, ut infideles Italiis, Hungaribus et multas provincias Christianas invadant et Christianitatem affligant mensibus 42 ad literam, hic est qui eos destruet et de manibus Mahometi liberabit populum Christianum. Haec sufficient causa brevitatis; qua causa breviter hic sunt dicta de ipso; qui post 9 annos et semis aut novem menses aut circa, finiet vitam suam, et Imperator post 10 annos et semis aut circa; et ambo miraculis magnis coruscabunt in morte."

121. See Donckel (1933).

122. Ibid., pp. 298-299, "Incipit libellus fratris Thelesphori presbyteri ac eremite secundum auctoritates sanctorum prophetarum et veterum chronicarum, de causis, statu, cognitione ac fine praesentis schismatis et tribulationum futurorum maxime tempore futuri regis aquilonis, vocantis se Fredericum imperatorem III usque ad tempora future papae vocati angelici pastoris et Karoli, regis Franciae, futuri imperatoris post Fredericum III superadictum. Item de Summis Pontificibus Romanae Ecclesiae ac statu universalis Ecclesiae a tempore dicti angelici pastoris usque ad tempus ultimi Antichristi. Item a
tempore et per tempus dicti ultimi Antichristi et post morem ipsius usque ad extremum Dei iudiciarum et finem mundi." Translation by B. McGinn.

123. Ibid., p. 300, "Dominus exaudivit preces tuas, dicens quod servis suis dilectis Cyrillo, presbytero et eremita in monte Carmelo, Ioachim abbati et multis aliis servis suis, praesens schisma futurum, et eiusdem schismatis causas; et quis esset orthopontifex et quis pseudopontifex; finemque ipsius et post ipsum scisma, futurum ecclesiae regimem, per Spiritum Sanctum ac angelum iamdiu indicavit et aperuit. Quaeras igitur praelictorum libros et scripta et tunc erit satisfactum voluntati tuae. Et quid in ipsis libris vel scriptis reperieris, scribe et aliis pro tua et ipsorum salute indica et revela!"


125. Ibid, "generosus rex de posteritate Pipini."

126. Ibid, p. 327, "qui imperator cum pastore angelico qui ipsum coronabit reformabit ecclesiam in statu pauperatis...et ipse imperator cum pastore ecclesie faciet septimum et ultimum passagium pro terra sancta quam recuperabunt."

127. Ibid, "tempus septimum pacis letitie."

CHAPTER VI


6. For the particular example of England, see Thomas (1971), pp. 128-146, 389-432.
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