THE CONFLICT OF PAPAL LEADERSHIP IDEALS FROM GREGORY VII TO ST. BERNARD OF CLAIR-VAUX WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE SCHISM OF 1130

by

HAYDEN V. WHITE

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1955

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Palmer A. Throop, Chairman
Assistant Professor Frank Grace
Assistant Professor Dwight C. Long
Professor Benjamin W. Wheeler

THE CONFLICT OF PAPAL LEADERSHIP IDEALS FROM GREGORY VII TO ST. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE SCHISM OF 1130

by HAYDEN V. WHITE

This thesis attempts to outline and analyze the values effecting the formulation of papal leadership ideals from 1059 to 1153. By outlining the changes which take place concerning leadership ideals in the articulate body of the Church during this period one can make clear the differences which held in the values of the Gregorian and the Cistercian reforms. It is argued that the latter are profoundly different from the former, that they are, in fact, a reaction to the former. The schism of 1130 is the event by which the Cistercians seize control of the leadership mechanism in Rome and install their own representative on the papal throne.

The literature of the period is divided into three parts. These are (1) the pre-Gregorian, (2) Gregorian and (3) post-Gregorian or Cistercian. The literatures are examined in an attempt to discover what individual writers consider to be the ideal virtues of the leader and the relation of the personality of the leader to his office. The system of classification used was that devised by Weber, Troeltsch, Kluckhohn and Parsons. Leadership is either charismatic or official, the former being represented for the most part in monkish and ascetic writers while the latter is found to be representative of priests, canon lawyers and bureaucrats. The writings of Peter Damiani, Humbert of Silva Candida, the canon lawyers, the imperial partisans, biographers and pro-papal apologists of the period 1059 1153 fall into these categories. In period (1) the official and charismatic concepts of leadership are intermixed. In period (2) the official comes to predominate. Period (3) is characterized by a resurgence of the charismatic ideal as the Cistercians, reacting to Gregorian legalism, reassert the ascetic hierarchy of values. The pontificates of Paschal II and Calixtus II are given special attention. The former represents the open seizure of power by the papal curia in the name of Gregorian leadership ideals, while the latter represents the forceful re-entry of the monks as an organized group into the direction of papal policy. The papal schism of 1130-38 is a counterattack on the part of the curia to regain control of the leadership mechanism. The victory of Innocent II is a victory of reaction to Gregorianism, and this victory is signified in the composition of the De Consideratione by St. Bernard in which the papal office is shown to be a purely charismatic power based upon the ability of the individual pope to conform to ascetic values.

Thus, through an analysis of the values which dominate the concepts of papal leadership from 1059 to 1153, the thesis contributes to an understanding of the ideological issues of the schism of 1130-38, shows how schism was inherent

in the composition of the Gregorian hierocracy, and demonstrates the development of schism from the reign of Urban II through that of Paschal II to Honorius II.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
II.	THE CONSTITUENT IDEAS OF THE GREGORIAN REFORM: THE BREAKUP OF THE UNITAS CHRISTIANA AND THE IDEOLOGICAL ORIGINS OF THE SCHISM OF 1130	26
III.	GREGORY VII AS LEADER: PAPAL LEADERSHIP IDEALS DURING THE GREGORIAN REVOLUTION, 1073-1099.	129
IV.	PAPAL LEADERSHIP IDEALS DURING THE REIGNS OF URBAN II AND PASCHAL II, 1088-1118.	175
V.	THE PONTIFICATES OF GELASIUS II AND CALIXTUS II, 1118-1124: THE APOGEE OF THE GREGORIAN PAPACY.	286
VI.	THE SCHISM OF 1130: THE FIRST STAGE: THE ELECTION OF HONORIUS II, THE DEFEAT OF CURIAL LEGALISM, AND THE TRIUMPH OF CHARISMATIC IDEALS IN ROME.	371
VII.	THE SCHSIM OF 1130.	420
VIII.	THE AFTERMATH OF THE SCHISM OF 1130: THE FORMULATION OF THE CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP IDEAL BY ST. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX.	516
BIBLIOGRAPHY.		607

CHAPTER I

THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Chronological and Methodological Considerations

This paper is an attempt to define the relationship holding between ideologies and events during that period in the history of the medieval Papacy termed "the schism of 1130-1138." This problem was deemed worthy of extented research because the present writer felt that there existed no monograph which fully explored the relationship between the political issues of the time and the ideas presented in the tractates which emerged from the schism. Furthermore, we are now in possession of evidence which renders all previous studies invalid.[1]

Previous histories of the schism of 1130-38 have been concerned with establishing either the chronology of the political events or the legality of the claims of one or other of the contestants.[2] Thus the schism of 1130 has been relegated to the position of merely a political fight between the members of the Roman nobility or is presented as merely one phase in the history of the concept of papal electoral process. In a number of instances the schism has been used as a battleground upon which partisan loyalties might be put forth. This is especially true in the case of Protestant historians who have sought to attack certain Catholic heroes who participated in the schism events.[3] Catholics on the other hand have put forth a large corpus of literature in the defense of what has only lately been defined as the orthodox view of the schism. In both cases historical accuracy has not been

the beneficiary of the activity.

The political historians who have dealt with the events have been concerned primarily with the establishment of chronology. For them the schism becomes merely the occasion for the proliferation of political accounts which are to be assessed as either valuable or worthless in proportion to their biases. Whole corpora of data are thus dismissed as "biased" and therefore unworthy of prolonged study.[4] Specialists in canon law have studied the schism documents with the hope of definitively establishing the legality of the claims of one of the contestants over the other. Their approach is thus oriented around the evaluations of various versions of the papal electoral law of 1059 and its subsequent development.[5] In both cases results have been inconclusive, because the political events and the legal issues lie embedded within violently partisan contemporary documents. To eleminate the biased documents is to eliminate the evidence.

The most profitable approach to the problem seems to lie in an evaluation of the biases which caused the schism in the first place. Political historians have been hesitant in doing this because they have sought to establish the events themselves and not the accounts of the events. Legal historians attempt to do the same. Both groups have been hindered by the conclusions reached by the first researchers in the field, because both Mühlbacher and Vacandard attempted to prove that the schism resulted from a purely political conflict between the two most prominent families of the Roman nobility.[6]

However, if one examines the sources closely, it becomes apparent that the sources are difficult to analyze because the schism of 1130-38 was not caused by mere political conflicts. The partisans of Innocent II may accuse Anacletus II of desiring the Papacy for purely secular motives, but this is rather a minor point in the schism literature as a whole. Objective evaluation of contemporary documents demonstrates that the central issue of the schism of 1130 was ideological and that the conflict of the schism years centers around the problem of defining a new concept of legality of leadership within the Church. The necessity of this redefinition of leadership values reflects a larger struggle which was taking place in the Church as a whole during the twelfth century. This struggle had to do with a pietistic or monkish attempt to recapture its role in the direction of Church policy. The present paper will argue that the Gregorian Reform instituted a radically new concept of papal leadership values which precluded the establishment of monkish ideals for the Church as a whole even though ostensibly the reform was meant to establish monkish ideals as the index to the life of the Church. The establishment of a sacerdotal hierocracy by Gregory pushed monkish-ascetic values as leadership concepts into the background. The schism of 1130, it will be argued, was in reality the culmination of an attempt on the part of the monks to reestablish themselves as potent forces in the direction of the Papacy. Thus envisaged, the political struggles of the Roman nobility will become an effect instead of a cause of the schism of 1130. The establishment of this thesis hinges

upon the validity of the method used in the analysis of the documents produced by the schism itself. Let us first outline the historical problems posed by the events of the schism and then discuss the methodology which will be used in the analysis of those events.

On the night of February 13, 1130, Pope Honorius II expired in the monastery of St. Gregory in Rome. He had been taken to the monastery by a minority group of the College of Cardinals in order to protect him from the restive mobs of the city. The monastery was protected by the arms of the powerful Frangipane family.[7] His death was not announced immediately to the Romans, nor was the news sent to the majority of the College of Cardinals. Instead, this minority of sixteen cardinals met in secret session and elected a scion of the Frangipane family, Gregory Papareschi, as pope.[8] The minority of the cardinals were led by the Papal Chancellor, Aimerich, and was composed of members of the Papal Curia who had only recently become cardinals.[9] This minority argued that they were custodians of the power of electing the pope by virtue of their superior morality. The majority of the College, they held, had forfeited their rights to participate in the election because of their immorality.[10] They also argued that the right of electing the pope resided in the order of cardinal-bishops.[11] The new pope was crowned the following day in the Lateran and took the name Innocent II.[12]

On the same day that Innocent was consecrated, the majority of the College of Cardinals met in the Church of San Marco in Rome and elected one of their number to the pontifical power.

This was Peter Pierleoni, member of another powerful Roman family, who took the name Anacletus II.[13] The electors of Anacletus II claimed the right of election because they constituted an absolute majority of the College of Cardinals.[14] A few days later, the forces of Pierleoni and the Frangipane clashed in the streets of Rome. The victory of Pierleoni arms forced the withdrawal of Innocent II into Trastevere. Shortly thereafter Innocent was forced to withdraw from the city of Rome itself. He departed to Pisa, Genoa, and thence to France where he was received by St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter the Venerable of Cluny, Hugh of Grenoble, and Norbert of Magdeburg.[15] What seemed to be the victory of Anacletus II in Rome was, in reality, only the end of the first phase of a struggle which was to last for eight years and which would eventually end in the extermination of the cardinals who had supported him.

In France a general council was convened at Etampes by Louis VI in order to determine which of the two candidates for the papal power had the more valid claim.[16] The dominant figure at the council was St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Here Bernard emerged as the driving force behind the Innocentian party. It was he who established the claim of Innocent II in the face of all Anacletan arguments.

St. Bernard had been asked by the council members to choose which of the two candidates was to be pope.[17] Previous writers have noted this tradition without comment, but one can see upon reflection that the choice of this abbot to decide the issue of a contested papal election was revolutionary.

Seen in the light of Gregorian tradition, such an action was unthinkable. Papal elections were decided in Rome, and the right of papal election had been vested in the College of Cardinals for at least a half century.[18] Bernard completely ignored the whole papal electoral tradition as it had developed since 1059. He stated that Innocent's election was the only valid one, because it was "purer in motive, more regular in form, and earlier in time."[19] He glossed over the fact that Innocent had only a minority of the cardinals' votes by arguing that Innocent's adherents represented the "maior et sanior pars" of those to whom the election belonged.[20] The council adjourned, and Bernard entered upon the task of destroying the adherents of Anacletus.

Bernard's judgment was accepted by most of the influential prelates of his time. Those who did not concur were either frightened into accepting his position (such as Hildebert of Lavardin and Henry I of England) or destroyed (such as Gerard of Angoulême).[21] It was largely through Bernard's activity that Innocent II was victorious, and it was through this victory that the powerful new monastic orders of the twelfth century were made the most potent forces in the direction of papal affairs.[22] The victory of Innocent II was the victory of monks over secular clergy and of monkish-ascetic ideals over sacramental-hierocratic ones. Innocent's victory marks the end of the Gregorian Papacy.[23] Anacletus was the last of the Gregorians.

The Anacletans had the support of two centers of strength in the Church: the Curia itself (and Rome generally) and Monte Cassino. For military aid they could depend upon the arms of Roger II of Sicily whom Anacletus had crowned king and to whom he had given his sister in marriage to seal the alliance.[24] Devoted to the cause of the Anacletans in France were such clerics as Hildebert of Lavardin and Gerard of Angouleme; but the activities of the Cistercians, the Premonstratensians, the Carthusians, and the Cluniacs undercut any influence that Gerard might have had, and Hildebert was won over to Innocent in the early days of the schism.[25] Among the intelligentsia in general it may be said that Anacletus' strength was to be found among the canon lawyers and dialecticians. Most of these had direct connections with the Roman Curia if they were not members of it at the time of the split. Peter of Porto and Peter of Pisa emerged as the leaders of the Anacletan party in Rome, and it was they who structured the Anacletan propaganda machine.[26] Significantly, they chose to base Anacletus' claim solely upon the legality of process with which his election had been effected. They argued that the Innocentians, meeting at night and in secret, had shown bad faith in the election, had forfeited the right of election thereby, and were in schism as a result.[27] These canonists would not deign to discuss the issue of the morality of the two candidates, arguing that since the time of Gregory VII (since the ecclesia primitiva had been resurrected), the morality of the papal leader had nothing to do with the authority which he received by the legal process of election.[28]

To this argument the Innocentians retorted that the tradition of papal election which did not take into account the morality of the candidate was a false tradition. They argued in effect that papal election by the College of Cardinals was only valid when the will of the entire Church had been satisfied. They further maintained that the most important aspect of the papal election was not legal process but the morality of the candidate, and they made the issue of morality the test for determining the right to leadership over the Christian community.[29] These conclusions were revolutionary.

The revolutionary character of the events of 1130 can be grasped only in the light of a study of the Gregorian Reform and its aftermath. Viewed from the standpoint of institutional history, the Gregorian Reform was important for its creation of a leadership hierarchy for the entire Church which existed outside of the criticism of any member of the Christian community. Bishops, archbishops and popes had been placed outside the pale of criticism by their inferiors as early as 1059.[30] The Gregorian Reform had been fought in order to free the papal office from any interference by the emperor on the grounds of legal or moral authority.

Humbert of Silva-Candida (d. 1061) may be considered the architect of the papal office to which Gregory VII succeeded and gave empirical reality. Humbert was the author of the papal electoral law of 1059, the author of the De Sancta Romana Ecclesia, the canon law collection Sententiae, and power behind the framing of the letters of Leo IX.[31] In these works can be

found all of the elements necessary for the justification of Gregory VII's idea of the papal power. In the Sententiae particularly the idea is put forth and sustained that the See of Rome since it is founded by God and not the Apostles is responsible only to God, cannot err, and should be free from any and all outside interference in the prosecution of its task here on earth.[32] These ideas had been put forth for the purpose of liberating the See of Rome from imperial jurisdiction. Henry III had reformed the See of Rome on two authorities: his office as emperor and his charge that the See of Rome was morally corrupt. Humbert answered both arguments by asserting that the imperial authority was given by the pope and that the pope was answerable to no man but to God only for his morality. It thus followed for the papalists that only proper electoral procedure was necessary for the assumption of the papal power and that if the pope erred in morals God would punish him, not man. Once elected, the pope was answerable to no man, and no man dared to correct him.[33] If accepted, such an idea would remove the papal authority from outside interence, but such an idea also assumed that the pope in reality would not be morally corrupt.

A succession of powerful leaders and moral paragons in the papal office followed the reign of Leo IX. Alexander II, Gregory VII, and Urban II made the Humbertine assertions an administrative reality. By the time of Urban's death (1099), the Gregorian idea of the papal office was a reality generally recognized by monk, priest, and bishop. But the reign of Paschal II (1099-1118) saw a new era in the history of the Papacy

begun. During Paschal's reign one sees the emergence of a split within the hierarchy of the Church itself over the issue of papal leadership ideals. This ideological schism foreshadowed the institutional schism of 1130-1138. It developed in 1106—1112 between the Pope, who championed pietistic ideals and wished to abandoned the Church's quest for control of the temporalia, and the Roman Curia, the members of which were Gregorian lawyers who argued that the mission of the Church on earth was absolute control of both temporal and spiritual power. Paschal pursued his own goals up to the time of the "humiliation of Sutri" of 1111-1112.[34] After the Pope's capture by the Emperor Henry V and his surrender of the papal privilegium, however, the Curia Romana rose to assume complete control of the papal office. The curia set itself up as the final arbiter of what was correct and what was not in the functioning of the papal power, but they did not assume the power of arbitration over the Papacy on the basis of morality. Instead, the curia argued that it was the final authority as to what constituted orthodoxy of doctrine in the Pope himself.[35] The last few years of Paschal's reign were marked by a continual struggle between the Pope and the curia for control of the papal policy. The Pope himself became increasingly melancholy, giving evidence of wishing to resign from the papal power in one instance.[36] The Curia was driven by a passionate desire to bring to a close the struggle with the Empire which had been begun under Gregory VII. To achieve its goals it was willing to coerce even the Pope himself. Paschal's refusal to die only prolonged this schism in the head of the

Church. Meanwhile new forces were rising to challenge both pope and emperor for control of the leadership mechanism.

The preaching and the popular response to the First Crusade (1095) was only one manifestation of a general ascetic movement which had gripped Europe in the closing decades of the eleventh century.[37] Other manifestations of the movement were the rise of new heresies of a chiliastic nature and new monastic orders devoted to the ideal of paupertas.[38] The new monastic orders differed from both the Papacy and the older orders such as Cluny and Monte Cassino in their devotion to goals which were purely otherwordly. They regarded the papal program as formulated by the Gregorians as merely "vanity and a striving after wind," and they looked upon Cluny and Monte Cassino as a degradation of the monastic ideal.[39] When the Gregorians in the curia actually seized control of the papal power from the ascetic and otherworldly Paschal II, the new monastic orders extended their crusading and reforming ideas to include even the Papacy itself. The curia particularly became an object of criticism and the reform of the curia became one of the aims of such powerful leaders as Hugh of Grenoble, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Norbert of Magdeburg.[40] But the tendency to attack the Papacy was suppressed as long as that body stood under the attack of the Emperor Henry V. When, however, the Concordat of Worms was signed in 1122 and Henry V died in 1125 without heir, all Christendom watched and waited to see if the Papacy would enter upon a full scale program of moral reform. The new monastic orders sought to help the Papacy along

its new path by reforming the Papacy itself.

Social and political conditions in the city of Rome aided them in their cause. Civic politics in the city were in their usual tumultuous state. Since 1118 the city had been split into two camps. One faction was led by the Pierleoni family and supported by the Papacy, while the other was led by the rebel Frangipane family.[41] The opposition of these two families has been viewed by most historians as the cause of the schism, but to so argue is to overlook the split which developed in the curia as a result of pietist infiltration of that body. This infiltration began just after the conclusion of the settlement of Worms, resulted in the overthrow of the Gregorians in the curia, a coup d'etat in electing Honorius II as pope, and the final exclusion of the Gregorians from participation in the papal power by the schism of 1130.[42] The fact that a rivalry existed in Rome between the Pierleoni and Frangipane gave the pietists the arms necessary to their seizure of power, but the causes of the schism of 1130 cannot be found in this rivalry. They must be looked for in the ideological schism between Gregorian concepts of the nature of papal leadership and those of the pietists in the new monastic orders.

Thus envisaged, the double election of 1130 attains a new significance. Instead of representing a struggle between two noble houses for the control of the papal power, the schism of 1130 seems to have been a manifestation of a much more basic division within the Christian community which had its origins in the sociology of the Gregorian movement itself.

Two parties stood opposed in the curia, in Rome, and in the Church as a whole each of which had a completely different ideal of the papal office. These ideals of papal leadership each hinged upon a different set of values. One group represented above all the formal hierocracy of the Church, the sacramental idea of office. The other supported values derived from the monastic interpretation of society and argued that leadership came from morality, not mere attendance at the sacrament. One candidate in the schism was supported by canon lawyers, dialecticians, the old monastic orders, humanists, literary figures and administrators. The other candidate drew his strength from mystics, ascetics, monks, and adherents to the Augustinian epistemological ideal of sancta simplicitas. One group sought to justify its candidate's claim to leadership by demonstrating his pietas, his simplicitas, his charitas and his devotion to paupertas. The other group sought only to show that its candidate had been elected in the correct manner. The propaganda of the schism as a result of the sociology of the schism assumes an aspect which seems to indicate that the schism grew out of a conflict of ideals rather than out of a conflict of political aims. Two leadership ideals can be discerned in the mass of literature which surrounds the struggle; these are the sacerdotal and the ascetic. If one approaches the literature of the schism in these terms, many works heretofore rejected as biased become extremely important, because each of the parties attempts to put forth a new concept of "legality" which rests ultimately upon the

values of the group as a whole. The conflict of 1130 is profitably approached as a conflict in values.

If we approach the history of the schism of 1130 as a conflict in values, a number of the problems which have faced previous students of the events fall away. We are no longer interested in the question of which of the popes was the "real" pope. We escape the problem of having to decide which pope was "legally" elected pope by studying exactly what each party meant when it used the word "legal." One party argues that "legality" is equal to correct procedure. The other argues that "legality" has nothing to do with formal procedures but is connected in some vital way with the problem of morality. The widespread effects of this fissure within the Church indicates that such reevaluation of values of leadership was believed necessary. In essence the schism of 1130 seems to have been the time when the Church reacted to the Gregorian ideal of the papal office and its concurrent leadership values. Only such a revolutionary reappraisal could have produced such a fissure in the body social of the Church as that existed from 1130-1138. Let us now consider the methodological problems involved in the analysis of such a fissure.

Since it is deemed necessary that we look into the origins of the schism of 1130 and since such a task would involve us in an analysis of the whole of Church history from the Gregorian Reform to the time of Alexander III, we have sought to limit

the quantity of material to be handled by concentrating only upon those documents which afford us some insight into the concept of papal leadership ideals. We have assumed that a schism in the Church is merely a religious equivalent of societal changes similar in scope and function to a revolution in the body politic. We hope to analyze a schism in much the same way that a social scientist would analyze a political revolution. Both revolution and schism attempt to substitute one group of leaders for another in positions of importance by recourse to force, that is, by recourse to actions outside the normally recognized means of leadership substitution. The attempt to substitute one leadership for another indicates an attempt to substitute one frame of values by which the institution will be governed for another. The revolutionaries will succeed or fail in relation to their abilities to convince the mass of the necessity of changing the values of the leadership particularly and the institution as a whole.

Values may be defined "as a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action."[43] "Human life," Kluckohn argues,"is --and has to be-- a moral life precisely because it is a social life, and in the case of the human species cooperation and other necessities of social life are not taken care of by instincts as with the social insects."[44] Thus, the value orientation of the group, what the Germans might call

the Weltanschauung or Ideologie, determines the scope and intensity of group action. An institution we may define as a societal manifestation of value structures or as a humanly organized social entity united by values generally agreed upon for the orientation of human activity towards the attainment of certain human goals.[45] The value orientation of the group may be discerned by a study of the ways in which members of the group or institution act, conceive of nature, of man's place in nature, of mans relation to man, and of what the institution seems to consider the desirable and the non-desirable in relation to man, environment, and interhuman relations.[46] Most societies put forth a body of written materials which express their values by attempting to describe the goals which unite the society and the means thought to be the most desirable for the attainment of the goals. Here we will find the ideologies of the groups expressed. Here we will find formal statements concerning the explanatory systems, norms of behavior, and ideals of the group. Values of the group may also be expressed in certain corpora of unwritten data such as folkways, myths, technology, etc.[47] Analysis of the written codes of conduct and traditions gives us access to the total value structure of the group and allows us to interpret its goals.

Since the attainment of certain goals seems to be the reason for the existence of institutions, the institutions must provide ways of attaining its goals or programs. The leadership ideals of the institution depend upon what the membership in the institution conceive to be the most desirable

goals at any one time in the history of the institution; that is, it is obvious that an institution may keep the same general goals before it over a period of a thousand years but will change in its ideas of what constitutes the best way of attaining those goals. The Catholic Church is organized to minister to the spiritual needs of the Christian communitas; exactly what constitutes the best way of administering to those needs is debatable. If the debate over means becomes too heated, schism is the result. At the same time, it is important that the means for attaining the goals of the institution generally agreed upon by the members determines the character and training of the leadership of the institution. It is the task of the leaders of any given institution to convince the mass that their program is the most efficacious in the attainment of the goals for which the institution is organized. When the leaders can no longer convince the mass that they represent the best way of attaining the goals, the mass reacts in such a way as to encourage new leaders to present their programs for its approval. If the goals of the mass change and the leadership fails to perceive this change or if the leadership seems to be foresaking the ideal goals of the institution in the eyes of the mass, a schism results. New charismatic leaders emerge which direct the revolution. If the old leadership refuses to surrender the the leadership mechanism to these new leaders or refuses to change its ideals, the mass and the new leaders will appeal to force to settle the issue.

The new leadership will bring the old under formal

attack; it will attack the past record of the old leadership, the basis of its authority, its morality, or any other aspects of the leadership's power which will discredit it. Because the new leadership generally feels that the old no longer represents the will of the group and will not freely surrender control of the leadership mechanism to the new group, the old leaders are considered to be usurpers of "legally constituted" authority. The old leadership group will consider the new to be a rebel group; it will also look upon its opponents as usurpers of "legally constituted" authority. A propaganda war will follow in which each party will attempt to sway the mass into believing that its own program is the right program. The success or failure of the revolutionary group hinges upon its ability to identify itself with the desires of the mass. Therefore, a key concept in the propaganda of revolution is the leadership concept. By studying the leadership literature of any conflict such as a schism or revolution we can thus hope to achieve some insight into the conflict of values which lies at the base of the disturbance.

At this point one might validly ask what constitutes the nature of leadership in the medieval Church. The leader of any societal group may derive his authority from any number of sources. Max Weber, in his studies in the sociology of religion, has argued that leadership in the religious community tends to break down into two broadly defined types. He argues that in times of relative stability in an institution, the

leader will acquire his authority through a regularized process of training, election, and conferment of office. Status in the group is attributed, and authority is derived from the office which one occupies in the hierarchy. Such formal leadership authority Weber has termed Amtscharismatic.[48] But Weber further noted that in times "of psychic , physical, economic, ethical, religious or political stress," natural leaders emerge from the mass who claim the power of solving the problems confronting the mass through the exercise of some inner grace which they hold as a result of their peculiar personality traits. These natural leaders may occupy no office in the hierarchy or, if they do occupy an office, will give a radical new interpretation to the office they hold in order to allow their personality full scope in applying their particular solutions to the problems confronting the group. Weber has written at length on the kind of conflicts which the emergence of these charismatic leaders precipitate. Concerning the charismatic structure of an organization, he writes:

> In contrast to any kind of bureaucratic organization of offices, the charismatic structure knows nothing of a formal or of an ordered procedure of appointment or dismissal. It knows no regulated 'career,' 'advancement,' 'salary' or regulated and expert training of the holder of charisma....It knows no agency of control or appeal, no local bailiwicks or exclusive functional jurisdictions; nor does it embrace permanent institutions like our bureaucratic'departments,' which are independent of persons and of purely personal charisma.
>
> Charisma knows only the inner determination and inner restraint. The holder of charisma seizes the task that is adequate for him and demands obedience and a following by virtue of his mission. His success determines whether he finds them.[49]

In the sociological composition of the medieval Church the identification of the charismatic authority with the prophet type is easily made. Without detailed examination of the sociology of religious institutions, one may state that it is peculiarly the nature the Church of the medieval period to consciously seek to resolve the conflicts which are bound to occur between the prophet and the priest. If the priest represents the sacramental ideal and is basically conservative, the prophet represents the revolutionary personality. Reform is usually the program of the prophet, while tradition is the sustaining force of priestly authority. Just as the Old Testament prophets such as Isaiah, Amos, Josea, and Ezekiel came out of the desert in order to challenge the authority of the priests, a whole series of medieval "prophets" arose periodically in order to purge the Church of unclean elements. These "prophets" were generally mystics and ascetics who derived their authority solely from the conviction that they had seen God and had been given a certain message by Him to deliver to the people. When the prophet arose, he naturally constituted a threat to the established, official authority of the priesthood. The prophet comes to somehow change the traditional law in the name of a higher law (lex Dei). As Weber puts it:

> The charismatic hero does not deduce his authority from codes and statutes, as is the case with the jurisdiction of office; nor does he deduce his authority from traditional custom or feudal vows of faith, as is the case with patrimonial power....The charismatic leader gains and maintains authority solely by proving his strength in life. If he wants to be a prophet, he

> must perform miracles....Charismatic domination means a rejection of all ties to any external order in favor of the exclusive glorification of the genuine mentality of the prophet and hero. Hence, its attitude is revolutionary and transvalues everything; it makes a sovereign break with all tradition and rational norms: 'It is written, but I say unto you.[50]

Seen in the light of this description of the leader, we must ask why it was that the schism of 1130 assumed such universal proportions in the life of the twelfth century when other schisms (especially those instigated by Henry IV and Henry V) were dealt with by the papal leadership relatively easily. We can only answer that the reasons seem to lie in the peculiar ideological differences which separated the two parties in the schism. That is to say, while previous schisms in the Church from the time of Nicholas II to Calixtus II were primarily political in nature, instigated from without the leadership of the Church itself, the schism of 1130 has the special character of defining the leadership of the Church through a conflict which is internal. The schism of 1130 erupted within the Church leadership itself and constitutes a terminal point in the history of the Papacy. Only if we regard it in the light of an ideological struggle can we account for the changes it wrought in the sociological, psychological and intellectual life of the time.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER I

[1]The first attempts to deal with the schism of 1130 were those of Richard Zoepfel, Die Papstwahlen und die mit ihnen im nächsten zussamenhange stehenden Ceremonien in ihrer Entwicklung vom 11. bis zum 14. Jahrnuhdert (Gottingen, 1871), 285ff.; Ferdinand Gregorovius, Storia della citta di Roma nel medio evo (Roma: Aequa Editrice, 1940), VII, 90-103; Wilhelm Bernhardi, Lothar von Supplinburg (Leipzig: Jahrbuch der deutschen Geschichte, 1879), 302ff.; and Engelbert Mühlbacher, Die streitige Papstwahl des Jahres 1130 (Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagnerschen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1876), 69. The works of Mühlbacher and Bernhardi remain the best of this group. Later studies of the Papacy which included studies of the schism were Fausto Palumbo, Lo scisma del MCXXX (Roma: Miscellanea della Deputazione Romana di Storia Patria, 1942); Paolo Brezzi, Roma e l'impero medieovale (Roma: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1947), 301ff.; Augustin Fliche and Victor Martin, Histoire de l'Église depuis des origines jusqu'à nos jours (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1950), IX, 50-70; Hans Walter Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalter, III (1939), 371-412, Johannes Haller, Das Papsttum: Idee und Wirklichkeit (Basel: Benno Schwabe und Co. Verlag, 1952), III, 25ff.; and Herbert Bloch, "The Schism of Anacletus II and the Glanfeuil Forgeries of Peter the Deacon of Monte Cassino," Traditio, VIII (1952), 159-264. None of the studies mentioned set the schism into its proper context. See especially the criticisms of all previous studies in Bloch, Ibid.,160,161, note 6, and Haller, op. cit., 486. Of the new evidence to be evaluated most important is the Tortosa MS of the Liber Pontificalis, discovered in 1914 and published by Joseph March, Liber Pontificalis prout extat in codice manuscripto Dertusensi textum genuinum complectens hactenus exparte in editum Pandulphi (Barcinone: Typis "La educacion," 1925). This work constitutes a major item in that it is one of the few works of the Anacletans which we possess entire. Above all, it shows us the origins of the schism. For further evaluation, see Chapters VI and VII below.

[2]The chronology as established by Mühlbacher, op. cit., 82ff., can be considered definitive.

[3]See the work of Wilhelm Martens, Die Besetzung des päpstlichen Stuhls unter den Kaisern Heinrich III und Heinrich IV (Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1887), 322-325.

[4]For example, the "Invectiva" of Arnulf of Séez was deemed almost wholly worthless by the editor, Julius Dietrich, MGH, Lib., III, 82-83, while the two Catholic biographers of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Abbe Vacandard and Watkin Williams, look upon this work as the prime source for the evaluation of Anacletus. See E. Vacandard, "Saint Bernard et le schisme

d'Anaclet II en France," Révue des questions historiques, XLIII (1888), 63ff.; Watkin Williams, St. Bernard of Clairvaux (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935), 98ff.

[5]The definitive study of the papal electoral law of 1059 is by Anton Michel, Papstwahl und Königsrecht oder das Papstwahl—Konkordat von 1059 (München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1936), 89ff. See the comments of Erich Caspar, "Bernahrd von Clairvaux," Meister der Politik: Eine weltgeschichtliche Reihe von Bildnissen, herausgegeben von Erich Marcks und Karl von Müller (Berlin: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1923), III, 205; Robert Holtzmann, "Zum Papstwahldekret von 1059," ZRG, KA, XXVII (1938), 135ff.; Williams, op. cit., 104; and Commission de l'histoire de l'Ordre de Citeaux, Bernard de Clairvaux (Paris: Editions Alsatia, 1953), 352-53.

[6]See above, note 1.

[7]See the letter of Peter of Pisa to Didico of Compostella in Watterich, Vitae Pontificum Romanorum, II, 188.

[8]"Epistola Electores Innocentii ad Lotharium," PL, CLXXIX, 37-38.

[9]The credit for having noted this fact must go to Hans Walter Klewitz, who subjected the pontificate of Honorius II and the history of the College of Cardinals to the closest scrutiny. See his list of cardinals of the two sides in op. cit., 373, note 1.

[10]See the epistle of Hubert of Lucca, "Ad Norbertum," PL, CLXXIX, 40.

[11]See a similar letter written by Walter of Ravenna, "Ad Norbertum," Ibid., 39.

[12]Watterich, op. cit., 189.

[13]Ibid., 185.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux, traduction nouvelle de la deuxieme édition allemagne (Paris: Le Touzy et Ane, Editeurs, 1912), V, i, 676ff. See also Mühlbacher, op. cit., 173-79; Bloch, op. cit., 168-74.

[16]Hefele-Leclercq, loc. cit.

[17]Ernaldus, "Vita Sancti Bernardi," PL, CLXXXV, 270.

[18]See below, Chapters II and III.

[19]Ernaldus, loc. cit.

[20]Bernardus, "Epistola CXXVI," PL, CLXXII, 277.

[21]Bloch, op. cit., 169-73.

[22]See below, Chapter VII.

[23]Klewitz, op. cit., 373-74.

[24]Bernhardi, Lothar von Supplinburg, 493ff.

[25]Mühlbacher, op. cit., 129ff.

[26]Klewitw, op. cit., 374ff.

[27]Watterich, op. cit., 188.

[28]See below, Chapter VII.

[29]See Bernardus, "Epistola CXXVII," PL, CLXXII, 281-82.

[30]See below, Chapter II.

[31]See below, p. 52ff.

[32]See below, p. 53-55.

[33]See below, p. 54-57.

[34]See below, p. 191ff.

[35]See below, p. 228ff.

[36]See below, p. 245ff.

[37]Carl Erdmann, Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens (Stuttgart: Forschungen zur Kirchen und Geistesgeschichte, 1935), 322ff.

[38]Herbert Grundmann, Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zussamenhangen zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiosen Frauenbewegungen im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik (Berlin: Historischen Studien, 1935), 483.

[39]See below, p. 245ff.

[40]See below, p. 304ff.

[41]See below, p. 337ff.

[42]See below, p. 376ff.

[43]Clyde Kluckhohn, "Values and Value-Orientation in the Theory of Action," Toward a General Theory of Action, ed. Talcott Parsons and Edwin A. Shils (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), 395.

[44]Ibid., 388.

[45]Ibid., 57-58.

[46]Ibid., 411. Compare the discussion of A.O. Lovejoy, The Great Chain of Being: A Study in the History of an Idea (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936), Chapter II.

[47]See especially Ernst Cassirer, The Myth of the State (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946), 3-53; Susanne K. Langer, Philosophy in a New Key: A Study inthe Symbolism of Reason, Rite and Art (New York: Penguin Books, 1948), 1-42.

[48]Max Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, translated and with an introduction by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952), 294-95.

[49]Ibid., 246.

[50]Ibid., 250.

CHAPTER II

THE CONSTITUENT IDEAS OF THE GREGORIAN REFORM: THE BREAKUP OF THE UNITAS CHRISTIANA AND THE IDEOLOGICAL ORIGINS OF THE SCHISM

It is perhaps in the nature of a value judgment to argue that any extensive investigation in the field of medieval intellectual history must begin with a word concerning St. Augustine. Yet it is difficult to conceive of any problem of import in medieval intellectual history in which the ideas of this thinker did not take a prominent place. Windelband has maintained that the resurgence of philosophic activity in the eleventh century was in a sense occasioned by the reinvestigation of the "metaphysical significance of logical genera" and the reaction to this movement of the adherents to the Augustinian "metaphysics of inner experience."[1] There can be little doubt that the intellectual recrudescence of the eleventh century was a most fruitful period in the history of western man's intellectual adventure. Whether this "renaissance" sprang from purely intellectual interests or was occasioned ultimately by the social changes of the time is, of course, impossible to say. There can be little doubt, however, that the Gregorian Reform was, if not the wellsprings of the movement, at least one of the channels into which speculative thought was directed. The two movements--intellectual and social--are so closely allied that one dare not attempt an analysis of one without consideration of the other. But whether one approaches the problem of analysis from the standpoint of history of philosophy or the sociology of knowledge, one is always led back

to the corpus of Augustine's writings. It is the Ursprung of medieval thought. The key to the understanding of the period with which we are concerned may be found in a consideration of the changes worked upon the Augustinian idea world by the Gregorian Reform movement.

The exact nature of the Gregorian Reform is difficult to define in monist terms. The approach of Gerd Tellenbach strikes the present writer as perhaps the most inclusive. Tellenbach's arguments have been summarized by R.F. Bennet in his introduction to Tellenbach's monograph in the following manner:

> The Investiture Contest...was a struggle for right order in the world, and it becomes necessary to discover what, to the mind of the eleventh century, this 'right order' was. The idea that a 'right order' existed and that it should be recognized and put into effect by man was widely held, but there was no agreement as to the precise nature of the 'order' itself; there was no common tradition, but several points of view.[2]

Tellenbach sought to distinguish between three main attitudes or concepts of right order by which society should be organized in the thought of the pre-Gregorian period. He lists:

> 1) the ascetic, based on withdrawal from the world; 2) the sacerdotal, based on conversion of the world by the priestly hierarchy; and 3) the monarchic, based on the conversion of the world by the action of a divinely instituted kingship to which the clergy should be subordinate.[3]

This break-down was documented by a thorough study of the three concepts of "right order" in society and an analysis of the value structures upon which each was based.

Adherents to the monkish-ascetic hierarchy of values tend to withdraw from society and the world--both of which are regarded as fundamentally evil. These monks or ascetics

can be reconciled to the monarchical idea of order as a result of this withdrawal tendency. Tellenbach summarizes the position thus: "The sacerdotal point of view, which exalted the power of the priest and his duty to convert the world and lead it to the kingdom of God, could not accept the monarchy in this way."[4] This is so because the priestly hierarchy seeks to convert and control the same body of believers which the monarch wishes to order and control. Since the monk shuns society, he will have little conflict with the political power. There are then, in reality, only two main lines of social thought in medieval history: withdrawal, which is reconcilable with the theocratic monarchy, and conversion, which is not, because it must involve the lay society to the priestly authority. Tellenbach concludes that Gregory VII's pontificate "marked the final rejection by the official Church of the old attitude of mistrust towards the world...His historic role was to enunciate logically and unequivocally the opposite principle, the conversion of the world by the priesthood."[5]

If Tellenbach's thesis is correct, one may logically ask what is the nature of the monastic reform movements which follow Gregory's reign. Surely there must be some conflict between the sacerdotal hierarchy of the post-Gregorian period and the politically powerful Cistercian, Franciscan or Dominican orders. Or is one to assume that these orders come into being with a reform program which supports the aims of the hierarchy in Rome? One notices that a series of schisms continue in the Church long after Gregory's death and that

while these schisms are instigated by the Holy Roman Emperor during the period 1085-1122 they take a completely different character after this time. In particular the influence of the Cistercian reform movement upon papal politics shows evidences of a real anti-Gregorian reaction, a reaction which resulted in the schism of 1130! Let us note how the schism of 1130, as a conflict in leadership ideals, grows out of the sociology and ideology of the Gregorian Reform movement as that movement itself had been generated by ideas that were definitely anti-Augustinian.

Augustine's metaphysics hinge upon his acceptance of the idea that behind the flux and chaos of temporal events and all of the inabilities of the senses to comprehend those events there runs an underlying spiritual unitas.[6] According to Windelband, Augustine arrived at this certainty through a "metaphysics of inner experience."[7] One finds the idea of epistemological certainty of a spiritual logic inhering in all of Augustine's thought. The total impression one receives from the Confessions revolve around the idea that behind the contradictions of human experience lies the unity of God's will. God's purpose can be seen in the most diverse of experiences--once man has submitted himself to the inner enlightenment. The ratio scientiae of classical philosophy had given way to the ratio sapientiae, or, as Windelband has it; "Psychical conceptions had taken the place of physical as the fundamental factors in the conception of the world."[8] "Formal logic and formal ethics" have been rejected for the promise

of spiritual salvation by submission to the will of God, and intellectual resolution has surrendered to the emotional certitude of revealed truth. It is the "inner experience" which gives meaning to life, gives order out of chaos, reveals the unitas underlying all of God's creation.[9]

The whole of the unitas Christiana is exposed in Augustine's monumental De Civitate Dei. In this work the sum total of existence is united in a Christianized "chain of Being" which unites the real and the apparent, good and evil, matter and spirit.[10] The dualities of existence were united under the aspect of eternity as it were, in terms of a purpose which existed outside of time, in eternity, in terms of an immanent teleology which had its meaning only in God.[11]

It will be remembered that the City of God was composed with the idea of justifying and explaining the fall of the Roman universal state. In the concept of the two cities--the city of man and the city of God--Augustine undertook to explain the real nature of man's societal or political activity. He concluded that man found his salvation, not in the polis, as classical civilization had argued, but outside the walls of the earthly city--in God.[12] Augustine thus relegated the state to the position it had occupied in Old Testament times. Rejecting the tradition of Tyrtaeus, Solon, Aeschylus, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Augustus and Symmachus, Augustine argued that man found his reward not in political activity but in the contemplation of the spirit.[13] Secular society and creative politics were defined in terms which left little doubt as to

their real value to the Christian man. Christian society generally accepted Augustine's view of political life until the time of Gregory VII.

The acceptance of the Augustinian interpretation of political activity had been effected largely through the triumph of a new institution which grew out of the primitive Church--that is, monasticism. Primitive Christianity had been forced by degrees to effect a compromise with the state. There can be little doubt that Christ's message, as revealed in the New Testament, was equivocal concerning the relation of the individual to society. On the one hand Christ preaches a kingdom and a system of values which are "otherworldly;"[14] on the other hand, he specifically states that the enlightened ones should go forth to teach all nations, to spread the word of God, and to preach the terms of salvation implied in the Incarnation, Crucifiction, and Resurrection of Christ. Thus a dichotomy is erected. A point of reference is established outside of time by which time is given meaning and temporal existence is made important. But since temporal existence is the result of and the cause of sin, the pattern of temporal existence, that is, society, must be avoided. The ideal of Christian life is withdrawal from society and complete spiritualization of the individual's desires. The reality is the necessity of informing the world of the Christian message and ministering to its spiritual needs. Out of the two impulses spring the two main orders of the Chruch: the secular and the regular clergy.[15]

The Roman Catholic Church was the institution which sought to bridge the gap between the two tasks given to Christian society. Its history is the history of vacillation between two ideals--between the ideal of withdrawal and the ideal of conversion. It provides organizations in the forms of the two orders in which individuals which consider one activity more efficacious than the other may devote their lives to its propagation. Reform movements can be seen as attempts on the part of adherents to one ideal to make its values supreme as the governing principle of the Church. Augustine had sought to justify the activity of both orders in his City of God by positing two Churches: the universal priesthood of believers, the saved, and the formal institution which administered the sacraments to society.[16] The former, the spiritual Church, was an internal or spiritual organization, without formal bonds and dependent upon no external symbols of authority. The latter, the sacramental institution, was that organization which manifested the external signs of inner grace by its service at the sacrament. Both Churches are united in Christ--the God-man--and both have specific roles vis a vis the State.[17]

According to Augustine, the State has a necessary role in God's plans, albeit a minor one. The formal Church had need of external protection and the right historical atmosphere in which to expand. Augustine and his student, Orosius, both argue that the Pax Augusta was divinely ordained so that the proper atmosphere might exist in which the saviour of man-

kind might be born, grow and die in His peculiar way.[18] The State was an external arm of the Church which protected it from the incursions of alien religions. The Church existed to feed the internal man while the State existed to order the external man. Thus both king and priest had a socially responsible role, and both were united in their service to a higher law (auctoritas, lex dei).[19]

Historically the Church rapidly found itself forced to assume a specifically social role, one in which the priesthood was gradually given more and more of the functions of the State. One sees in St. Ambrose of Milan a new type of prelate--administrator and priest--dictating to the Emperor Theodosius on questions both religious and political.[20] One sees the office of the Roman dispensary (annonae) converted into the deaconate of the See of Rome.[21] Leo I had to act as diplomat to the Huns.[22] And whether he would have it or not, Gregory I was called from the cloister to organize society in new and radical ways.

Many looked upon the assumption of a purely social role by one order of the Church as a betrayal of Christ's ideals. As early as the second century Tertullian rebelled against the influence which pagan philosophy was assuming in the Christian idea-world and the laxity which seemed to be creeping into the Christian ethic. "What is Athens to Jerusalem?" he demanded indignantly, and there were few of his brethren who could give him a satisfactory answer.[23]

The spirit of Tertullian found practical expression in an institution in which organized withdrawal from the world could be practiced: this was monasticism.[24] Monasticism, with its ideal of asceticism and contemplation, was an answer to the failure of creative politics as well as a rejection of classical thought.[25] The flight of the mystic to the desert was part of a general abandonment of classical institutions which one finds in the crises of the third and fourth centuries. Just as the coloni lift the land and the curiales their offices, the hermit expressed his disillusionment with societally organized religion.[27] If the social changes of the late Roman Empire can be characterized as anti-urban or as the abandonment of a urban ethos with all this implies, monasticism may be seen as a return to a prophetic ideal. The archetypes of Elijah, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Nathan are not unsimilar to the St. Anthonies of the early Christian period.

The hermit or ascetic of the early Christian period views society, especially urban society, with suspicion. He will regard the state casually so long as it does not bother him or incur upon his devotions. The state is regarded as merely another manifestation of concupiscence, since it exists to protect the body, and therefore, it is more to be avoided than opposed. By the same token, the ascetic will tend to avoid the contact with socially organized religion, the priesthood.[27] The priest exists to serve the same society which the state rules. The priest is an active servant of

that society, seeking to teach, preach or force the entire society into salvation. The mystic, feeling that only individual enlightenment is possible, thriving on solitude, regards the priest's task as essentially inferior if laudable.

The priesthood and the state can be distinguished yet another way--in their view of the time process. Christianity accepts the linear view of temporal development. It argues that the will of God moves in a line from the ex nihilo creation to Adam to Abraham to Moses to Christ and thence to the Last Judgment, that historical events happen only once and that history does not move in cycles but manifests a purposive development--a teleology--the will of God manifesting itself in time. Both the priesthood and the state are existentially conditioned by the time process. Thus they try to work within time--aiming always at that point in the future in which all temporal reality will be transformed by God's judgment.[28] Presumably at this time, both State and Priesthood will wither away or at least be transformed in some definitive sense which will give them a timeless quality.

The ascetic or mystic with his ideal of withdrawal from the world, seeks also to escape from the realm of time into Eternity, where abides God. Whereas the priesthood is externally oriented, time bound, and socially conscious, the ascetic is internally oriented, individualistic and anti-temporal. The ascetic seeks to effect a complete escape from society and time and seeks the kingdom of God in the world of the Spirit--thus following Christ's message (he feels) to the letter.[29]

But what of Christ's injunction to "go and teach all nations?" How could this injunction be carried out if one were to reject society? To resolve this dichotomy, the mystic-ascetic-monastic has developed his own concept of teaching and leadership: this is the charismatic leadership ideal of teaching by example.

It may be argued that the societal conscience of western monasticism--one of the characteristics which distinguished it from its eastern counterpart--was defined by St. Augustine. In a sense the De Moribus Ecclesiae provided the justification for the monastic life just as the De Civitate Dei had provided the justification for the concept of the two cities and the Confessions the justification for the "metaphysics of inner experience." Until the appearance of Augustine's work on monasticism, thought on that subject had been dominated by the ideas presented in the Vita Sancti Antonii. In this work the ideals of eastern monasticism were given a popular example in the life of a saint. Basic to its author's idea world was the belief that mystical ascesis was not only the best way to salvation but was also the true road to knowledge.[30] On one occasion the monk, Anthony, although devoid of formal education, confused the heretics merely by the power of inspiration. On another, he demonstrated the superiority of Christianity over paganism, not by argumentation with the philosophers but by the simple act of healing some afflicted persons.[31] He thus, in the mind of his panegyricist, demonstrated "the superiority of faith over science

and the life of action over thought."[32]

To the eastern monk, faith was equal to ignorance and activity to solitary withdrawal from society for the purpose of practicing ascetic exercises.[33] As a result, these early biographies of the hermit-mystics stressed retreat from the world. Anthony's entrance into the cities to purge the pagan philosophers was undertaken only under divine compulsion.[34] So it remained from Anthony to Bernard of Clairvaux; the mystic preferred the life of withdrawal.[35] He entered into society only when the priest (organized religion) and king (organized politics) had failed and society was in need of the teaching by example and the sureness that is born of contact with a holy man.[36] Eastern monasticism thrived on its solitude; society and communal life in general had no interest for it.

The De Moribus Ecclesiae, in a sense, softened the anti-social tendency of eastern monasticism and gave monasticism in general the foundations for a social world view. Augustine's great contribution to theology was "his emphasis on the fact that the problem of salvation lay not so much in the destruction of specifically human emotions as in the reorientation of them with a view toward the supreme good."[37] That supreme good was to be found in the Godhead, "the search for whom (secutio) may thus be described as the appetitus beatitudinis, of which love (charitas) constitutes the dynamic."[38] The result of the attainment of union with God is the realization of creative peace, the kingdom of God within. In this internal

pax is realized the individual formation of the pax societatis for which the whole of the Christian community strives as a group. In the monastery this pax might be attained by a few to an ultimate degree.[39]

The Augustinian view of love (charitas) was grounded in the idea that men should treat their fellowmen as ends rather then means. The good derived from such action was peace. This view of love forms the basis of the monastic society as it developed under Augustine's influence, for monasticism eulogizes the rule of mutua charitas or fraternitas as the lubricant of social action.[40] Monastics could easily transfer the ideal for the monastic society to the whole of Christian society. The Christian community per se was, they might argue, a community of being--of states of soul--in which charitas and benignitas were the bonds of unity. The monk could also argue that the ideal leader was the man who best incorporated those same ideals. The monkish leadership ideal is based purely upon spiritual qualities, which the monk interpretes to mean moral qualities.[41] Thus envisaged, the monastic ideal of leadership contrasts sharply with that of the priest, who conceives of a hierarchy of sacerdotal offices, and the prince, who conceives of a hierarchy of political offices. Needless to note, all three conceived of their hierarchies as divinely ordained, and this divine ordination of all three hierarchies was recognized by all until the Gregorian Reform.[42]

The Monastic View of Society and the Concomitant Leadership Ideals

In the monastic community, the normal rules of competition are discarded and a higher type of communal organization, directed toward the attainment of communal peace, is sought.[43] Thus, the traditional leadership ideals of society have no meaning in the ideal cloister. It followed for the monastic of the Middle Ages that if the anchorite might achieve the pinnacle of sanctity the whole of the Christian community might be freed from sin by adoption of an ideal of life based upon self-abnegation.[44] The asceticism of the anchorite was regarded by many as the key to an ideal existence insofar as it represented a complete escape from the sins of the world by a withdrawal from society. The basic idea of leadership in the monastic community, transferred from hermetic existence, is that of leadership through example.[45] The lives of the saints written during the early period of monasticism stress this idea in the mystic, the hermit, and the ascetic who drew around them devout men inspired by their actions of piety. This had been the whole point of the Vita Antonii and the Vita S. Simeoni Stylites.[46] The ideal monkish leader is the man who can inspire his following; he does not command, and he does not order. He is in short the very opposite of the sacerdote; his is a charismatic leadership.[47]

The monk, as Tellenbach has put it in his brilliant study, had consciously chosen as his vocation "war against the demons

and lusts of the flesh...He entirely avoids the earthly life, that he might not jeopardize the heavenly."[48] To the popular mind the holiness of a man was equated with the degree to which he might foresake the pleasures of the world. This withdrawal was made all the more worthy because of the paucity of worldly reward which the ascetic might expect. The momentary beatitude which he might attain was his only reward, and even this, according to the mystics, was by its nature ineffable.[49] The demands of monasticism were thus extremely high and the reward purely spiritual. By virtue of his profession the monk came to be considered the spiritual heir of John the Baptist, one of the elite of Christianity, the man who led by example rather than by words.[50]

It is evident that the monk qua monk had foresaken the world for his own benefit. His was a personal calling. As such his social role from his own point of view was nil. Any knowledge or odour of sanctity which he might acquire in his traffic with the other world was ultimately turned to the attainment of his own, personal beatific vision. Thus envisaged, the life of the monk is a-social, individualistic, and egotistical. Officially, he has not only no message for society, other than personal salvation, but little interest in society at all.[51] He is therefore led to less conflict with the prince than with the priest, who has the same end in mind but a different way of attaining it.

There is a hierarchy of values and way of judging an individual's place in life which is peculiar to the monk,

A person's worth and his standing in the monkish society is judged, from the monk's viewpoint, by the ascetic exercises and the degree to which one may divest himself of secular existence and participation in the spiritual world. The measure of a monk's office is thus internal, not easily read, because it does not consist in external symbols, badges, and honors for the attainment of the ideal. The ideal leader to the mystic is a paradox, in that he is judged ideal who attains to complete solitude. In fact, since there are no rewards for the ascetic life in this world it is likely that the true worth of a person will not be known until after the Last Judgment. Then the mystic and hermit will receive their places in the heavenly hierarchy according to the merits they stored up in their earthly period. The value system and ordering conception of monasticism are, in short, based upon a hierarchy which exists only in the next world.[52]

As far as the ecclesiastical hierarchy (the external Church as institution) is concerned, the monk's view of the ideal leader is colored by his view of the ideal monk. The leader of society is not, to the monk, the person who is formally the leader of society unless that person is also the one who is foremost in personal morality.[53] Thus, the official ecclesiastical hierarchy is not always the same as the hierarchy of sanctity. The monk looks for his inspiration to the man who most nearly approaches his own standards of sanctity. For the ascetic, this is the man who most nearly approaches the ideals of poverty, ignorance, and self-abnegation

which are preached in Scripture and had been popularized by the lives of the saints. The monkish view of society is thus non-organized (for communion with God is purely personal, not communal), based upon fraternitas (communal life and formal institutional organization is necessary only for the basic necessities), held together by charitas, (as a dynamic for action), and vis a vis society as a whole, indifferent. Its ideal organizational structure is purely a hierarchy of ability, ability being read to mean sanctity of personal life.

The Priestly View of Society and Leadership

The secular clergy, the priests, did not enjoy the wide popularity of the monks in early medieval society. The priest's role in society stemmed from the peculiar function with which he had been vested in his service at the sacraments, which were generally regarded as the instruments by which Christ transmitted His grace to the faithful. This transmission required priests, and in this requirement the individual priest had his raison d'etre.

The priest, however, received no merit for the act of dispensation in any moral sense. His office was divine but he still was faced with the problem of individual salvation. He did not have the power to transform the bread and the wine into the body and blood of Christ by virtue of any moral quality of his own.[54] The ability to perform his function came solely from the fact that his powers had been conferred by another sacrament, the sacrament of ordination. He was

"vested" with his office. He was given certain badges, he spoke a certain language, he intoned certain formulae, and his was the right to preside over certain functions. But officially insofar as he partook in the leadership of the Christian society, he did so because he held the "legal" right to act in the capacity of priest. While it was hoped that the individual priest was as holy as the ascetic-hermit, this was not a requirement for his office.[55] Baptism was as valid when it came from an immoral priest as when it came from a moral one if he had been properly ordained.[56] Thus the priestly class led by virtue of their legal right to their office. Weber has termed such leadership "Amtscharisma;" the term applies particularly to the priest who serves by virtue of the sacramental nature of his office.[57]

It had long been argued that the priest could not live as moral a life as the monk because his role was peculiarly social.[58] It was the priest's role to minister to the needs of society. While the monk sought to retreat from society completely, the priest sought to organize society for its own salvation. He was, so to speak, the mediator between God and man by virtue of his service at the sacrament. By his consecration he was thus dedicated to the service of the society that the monk had sworn to foresake.

It is exceedingly important to grasp this point. The monk gained his position in his own hierarchy of being by virtue of his sanctity, his personal morality. He demonstrated this sanctity through his ascetic practices and his

personal devotions. He constantly emphasized this personal, individual element in his Weltanschauung; it dominated the idea of the monkish community with its ideal of silence, the individual monkish cell, and aim of contemplation. The monkish hierarchy is a hierarchy of being, and one ascends it by the contact he is able to maintain with his own personal God. The leader of the monkish hierarchy is a leader by the example of his personal life; he leads by virtue of his ability. He does serve society indirectly; by his virtue he helps compile a treasury of merit that may be used to liberate souls from purgatory. But on the whole he is neither interested in, nor connected with, the formal society of the layman.

The priest, on the other hand, is a member of a hierarchy with an inherently social message. His office is existentially connected with society since after the Last Judgment presumably his office will cease to exist. He ascends to a higher rank in that hierarchy by virtue of a series of ordinations. His is a position of office, and he leads his flock by virtue of his legal possession of the right symbols and tools of that office. His view of the worth of the individual in the Chruch is, therefore, hierocratic and depends, not upon moral considerations, but upon the legality with which his ordination (whether it be priest, bishop, or pope) was performed. Hence law and dogma (formal learning) are particularly important to him.[59] Similarly, the sacerdote's office is historically oriented. He is dependent upon tradition, history, and law to establish the antiquity of his see or

parish, in fact ultimately, the authenticity of his office. The office of priest indeed had been created in a series of temporal events, the words of Christ, the founding of the Apostolic See of Rome, the rulings of certain councils. In sum, the two orders looked upon the place of the individual in the "Church" hierarchy from different standpoints (from different value systems), and their ideas of what constituted the ideals of leadership for the whole church differed greatly.

The conflict which was immanent in such a situation did not develop, however, until the idea of a reform which embraced all orders of society took root. The reform ideal of the tenth century was directed by monkish concepts insofar as it attempted to establish a monastic hierarchy of morality which would conform to the sacerdotal hierarchy of rank.[60] Henry III ousted luxury-loving Benedict IX on a "morals charge," such a pope being judged "unworthy" to occupy the See of Peter, the "official" See of Christendom.[61] But there was inherent in the early reform a more general hope that priest, monk, and layman would be re-formed into an organic whole--a real unitas in which office and being coincided. The unitas christiana itself was threatened with destruction when the reform took a different turn, that is, when the Gregorians sought to exclude the emperor from participation in the reform.

The Gregorian Reform of the papacy had evolved out of the monastic reform movement of the tenth century.[62] The ideals of piety propagated by monastic centers such as Gorz,

Cluny, and Hirsau had given to both Emperor Henry III and Pope Leo IX the hope of cleansing the entire Christian body. But Henry III and the popes named by him had worked within the framework of the traditional societal organization for the community as a whole.[63] Both depended upon monks for their inspiration. Thus in the early reform period the ideals of the monk became the ideals of the Papacy. Church leaders, popes, legates, and intellectuals all came from the cloister to preach the moral reform. In the popular mind the papacy (insofar as it was not an imperial one) was a monkish papacy.[64]

The Two Phases of the Reform and the Ideals of Papal Leadership Which They Represent: The Gregorians and Amtscharisma

Henry III had hoped to extend the ideals of the monasteries, such as Gorz, Cluny, and Hirsau, to the Church hierarchy as a whole.[65] In the reforming Council of Maguntinum (19 October 1049) the ideal of Christian unity had been formally invoked as the justification for the emperor to take part in such a reform of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Leo IX, Henry's pope in no small sense, showed his willingness to co-operate with the emperor on these terms.[66] Behind Leo, however, there were men who did not relish imperial participation in the reform movement under the terms of such a partnership. These were the Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida and the monk Hildebrand, both of whom were firm believers in the absolute primacy of the Roman See, not only over the whole

Church, but over the whole of Christendom as well. To the former is due the credit of forming the intellectual justification of the events to follow and to the latter the will to effect the changes envisioned by the former. It was their aim to establish this supremacy of the Holy See even if it meant the destruction of the traditional political organization of Christian society, the sacrum imperium, which had long been considered the official protector of the Church in the realm of the political.[67]

The Holy Roman Emperors from the time of Charlemagne had assumed the role (in Constantine's terms) of "external bishops" in the church. Otto III had fashioned himself "servus Jesus Christi, servus apostolorum," and Henry III had indicated the holiness of his office by terming himself "servus servorum Dei."[68] The Church of the Empire was conceived as a huge Reichskirche over which the king held sway not only by virtue of feudal possession but also by virtue of his divine office of rex et sacerdos.[69] Furthermore, the "Roman" claim of the German emperor to participation in Church affairs was emphasized by the assumption of the title of patricius Romanorum. This title was used by Charlemagne, and it was emphasized especially by Henry III.[70] Thus, it could be argued that the German Emperor held his authority in the Church by his divine office, which he held by the grace of God, by his position as the head of his people (a holy trust), and by virtue of his traditional descent from the Caesars. On all accounts he had a right to set the Church in order, and

Henry III had exercised this right in the name of restoring moral purity to the See of Rome.

Certain members of the Roman Curia accepted Henry's intervention in Roman affairs as natural. Peter Damiani seemed to accept Henry's role as divinely ordained, and even Leo IX seems to have accepted the papal power at Henry's bequest. But younger and more radical members of the Roman Curia found the interference of the Emperor in religious affairs most annoying. Humbert of Silva Candida, the papal chancellor, and Hildebrand, the archdeacon, conceived of the papal office as outside the realm of imperial jurisdiction. They conceived of a new order in the Church in which the Papacy alone would be all powerful.[71] Furthermore, they realized that in order to make the Papacy strong, they must first make it independent, and in order to make it independent, the papal role would have to be defined in a way which would remove it from imperial interference on any count whatsoever. The only way to do this was to raise the Papacy above purely moral considerations; the papal office would, in order to direct a real moral reformation, be itself raised above any considerations of morality. Only thus could the interference of the emperors be destroyed. This is not to say that Humbert and Hildebrand did away with a monkish view of morality, an ascetic hierarchy of values as the ideal governing the rule of the Church. Theirs was a sincere desire to effect a moral reformation. It is only that they decided to drop morality as something which the lower orders of the Church would be

able to use to interfere with papal policy. If, under the direction of Damiani and Henry III, morality was conceived to be the major prerequisite for the papal leader, under Humbert and Hildebrand, a purely legalistic view of that office was put forth.

Between the years 1059 and 1085 (the year of Gregory VII's death) papal morality was removed to a higher plane in the canon law which came out of Rome. The pope might or might not be morally responsible. The canonists held that it was not the place of the faithful to judge. The See of Rome was so divine that only God, who had founded it, might judge it. As we shall see, these conclusions were based upon (or resulted in) a profound change in the leadership ideals of the Church as a whole. Let us first note how the two leadership ideals represented by Humbert of Silva Candida and Peter Damiani (the Amtscharismatic and charismatic) clashed in the curia, how the Humbertine leadership triumphed, and how the ascetics were forced to withdraw in the face of a new leadership ideal incarnated in Gregory VII.

Humbert of Silva Candida and the Triumph of the Sacerdotal Hierocracy

The shift to a program embracing political objectives which characterizes the Gregorian program was engineered by the careful argumentation which we find in the thought of Humbert of Silva Candida. We find here not only the germs of the ideas for the destruction of the sacrum imperium and the translatio of its authority to the See of Peter,

but we also find here represented the organizational structure for the body which was to effect those events, the Papal Curia.[72] Furthermore, to Humbert must also go the credit of being the man who set forth a new idea of the papal office which would later lead to the destruction of the ascetic hierarchy of values as a dominating principle in the definition of papal leadership ideals.

All of Humbert's program had its origins in the necessity of establishing a new system of law by which the imperial authority over the Church might be attacked. In order to lead the reform and secure its continuance, the Gregorians felt that they had to control the Church down to the smallest parish. Opposing this aim on a local basis were the Eigenkirchen. The Gregorians had to destroy the sacrum imperium by showing that Rome was the heir to both Caesar and Christ. They had to destroy the Eigenkirche by an attack upon its foundations, the Eigenkirchenrecht.

The Eigenkirchen were held by feudal lords as personal property. They stood as personal miniatures which duplicated the larger imperial macrocosm of the Reichskirche. In order to gain control of the Eigenkirche (and thus destroy the basis of the Reichskirche) the Gregorians found it necessary to attack the system of law upon which the lord's claim to possession was based. This system of proprietary law (Eigenkirchenrecht), if its origins are debatable, was undeniably intermeshed with the whole idea of the sacrum imperium by the beginning of the eleventh century. It was, in sum, intermeshed with German feudalism, and the Gregorian attack against

it was construed in some quarters as an attack upon the basic elements of the societal life of the time.[73]

In order to effect the transition from the sacrum imperium to the idea of the imperium Sancti Petri, The Gregorians found it necessary to argue that the imperial authority was based upon a long tradition of misunderstanding of the nature of political rule. To restore the purity of the real Christian unitas, to return to the "golden age" of Christian life as it had existed before the emperor claimed a share in the direction of the Christian community: this was the publicized aim of the Gregorian revolution.[74] The papal attack was mounted in an appeal to a tradition of law which stood in basic opposition to German proprietary law, the tradition of Roman canon law. To this end, the Gregorians enlisted the aid of logicians, rhetoricians, and lawyers.[75] The concurrent revival of typically "renaissance" phenomena such as the "cult of Rome," the "pure Latin style," and "renovatio" theories in general was used to the Papal advantage.[76] That these new ideas stood in basic opposition to the monkish element in the Reform movement did not for the moment trouble the Gregorians, for during the reigns of Greogry VII, Victor III, and Urban II monastic propaganda motifs were stressed continually.[77] But while the external form of the early Reform movement was kept, Humbert of Silva Candida and the intellectuals who drew sustenance from his thought instituted a new concept of Papal leadership. We shall see that this new leadership ideal was put into effect by Gregory VII but was not given full recognition until the time of Calixtus II.

It was an ideal based upon the purely legal interpretation of the primacy of the See of Rome, and it was to this interpretation that the Innocentian party, led by Bernard of Clairvaux, reacted in 1130.

It was not apparent to all that, although the Gregorians came to power on a platform of moral reform, the Papacy itself was to be removed from all control by the membership of its moral standing. While Papal propagandists popularized the idea of personal morality as a requisite for the clergy, they, at the same time removed the bishop from all accusation by his inferiors, and placed the Papacy outside the scope of any accusations at all. This idea of the office of the priest was grounded in the concepts of judication which Humbert of Silva Candida put forth in his Diversorum Sententiae Patrum.

Prior to the Sentences, the standard canon law of the western Church was to be found in the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and the collection of Burkhard of Worms.[78] The former was insufficient to Gregorian purposes, because it dealt in only a very general way with the nature of the papal office, the relation of the laity to the clergy, and the order of judication among the members of the clergy themselves. Pseudo-Isidore, in sum, contained too many texts which might be used by both Pope and Emperor in the presecution of their respective claims. The collection of Burkhard suffered from the same defects.[79] While it might have served well enough for the problem of the moral reform of the clergy, it still

assumed an order of society which was reprehensible to the Gregorian faction in the Papacy.[80]

The Sentences sought to correct the defects of the earlier collections by stressing only certain canons of Pseudo Isidore and thus to give a legal basis to papal demands which were later to be firmly enunciated in the Adversus Simoniacos and the Papal Election Decree of 1059.[81] The total effect of the argument presented in the Sentences was to place the office of the Pope firmly outside of any legal responsibility to the rest of the Church membership whether it be the Emperor, the bishops of the Church, monkish reformers, or prophets. The sole exception was to be the Papal Curia, which, according to Humbert, was not outside the Papacy but was an integral part of it.[82]

Michel has argued that the Sentences are neither "spiteful or hateful" towards the State.[83] He bases his assertion on an analysis of Canons 226-228, which specifically discuss the priestly authority and the power of the king.[84] But we can see in the canons on Roman primacy and judication that the real offensive against the state and the lower orders of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is effected.

The Sentences of Humbert of Silva Candida begin with the discussion of the claim of Roman primacy. There are twenty canons contained in the first title of the collection. Most are from Pseudo-Isidore and stress the canons of Pseudo-Anacletus, one of the most popular sources of the pre-Gratian canonists.[85] There was nothing offensive to the secular

power in the use of the Anacletan canons, for they claimed only magisterial primacy for the Roman See. So, too, with the three canons which argue the primacy of the Roman See on the basis of the death of the Apostles Peter and Paul on the same day in Rome.[86] Here Humbert was merely counteracting the tendency among certain bishops to argue that Paul was their spiritual precursor and that they held their right to preach from Paul's commission to preach to all nations. Damiani was tempted to so argue in trying to justify the prophets right to admonish the pope. The Anonymous of York revived the argument c. 1100 during the York-Canterbury affair.[87]

However, canon 8 of Title I emphasized an aspect of the papal office which had not been popular in recent years and established a theme which was constantly developed and repeated until it grew to the crescendo of the Papal Election Decree of 1059. In this section, Humbert introduced his reading of the Pseudo-Sylvestrian Decretals, part of the Symmachan Forgeries which had been issued by the supporters of Pope Symmachus I in his contest with the Archdeacon Lorenzo.[88] This canon 27 which Humbert quoted out of the Sylvestrian Decrees argued that no one might presume to judge the primam sedem.[89] This canon had supposedly been promulgated in a Synod held in Rome with the knowledge and approval of the Emperor Constantine himself. Such a canon was a fitting supplement to the Constantinian Donation in securing the inviolability of the Roman See.

Further on, in Canons 60 and 63, Humbert, again taking Pseudo-Sylvester as his guide, established his orders of judication for any legal transactions within the Church as a whole. "Nullus laicus crimen clerico audeat inferre, et ut presbiter non adversus episcopum, non diaconus adversus presbiterum, non subdicaonus adversus diaconum, non acolitus adversus subdiaconum, etc..." had argued Pseudo-Sylvester.[90] The authority for such a view had been found in Scripture: "Neque praesul summus a quo quam iudicetur, quoniam scriptem est: 'Non est discipulus super magistrum,'"[91] The theme was developed in Title VII: "Quod Ordines Inferiores non Possint Accusare Superiores."[92] The purpose of these canons was to establish a rigid hierocracy in which any judication had to be carried out by the head of the hierocracy, the See of Rome.

Ostensibly, the order of judication was merely for the implementation of the reform. It seems unlikely that many of the bishops of the Empire would see the snares which awaited them in canons such as those proposed by Humbert. But this power of judication was the tool which would allow the See of Rome to send out its legates, to enter into individual sees and abbeys, and to work the will of Rome in the smallest church. Magisterial authority was being buttressed by juridical authority under the mask of the reform program. Title IX demonstrated that "the sheep might not accuse the shepherd,"[93] and this in turn was followed by a claim to complete control of all bishoprics by the pope in Rome.[94] Since, in Canon 2, it had been established that there was no appeal beyond the

Holy See, the threads of policy of centralization began to appear in Humbert's collection.[95]

The stage was set for the declaration of independence of the Roman See after the lines of judication had been established. The facade of seeking only monastic reform was maintained in Title IV: "De Monachorum Monasteriorumque Libertate." Here the liberty of the monasteries was proclaimed and the conditions for the living of the cenobitic life were eulogized; but, just as firmly, it was clearly established that the monks were not to interfere in the business of Church administration. Preaching and baptism were the work of the priests; and although Humbert let it be known that the Roman See would quarantee the right of the monk to pursue the contemplative life, he made it clear that they in turn were to remain in their cells.[96]

Naturally, this idea precipitated a certain resentment. Monks had led the reform in its early days. They were the shock troops of the movement, and while they might have desired (in the ideal) to be removed from participation in the care of the Church administration, there can be little doubt that the mystic seems to like the right of judging where and when the canons of right behavior were being violated. Like the Angel of the Lord, he is wont to descend upon the violator breathing fire and brimstone and damning him in the continuation of his sins.

Humbert seemed to sense that instability could come from the monkish quarter no less than the imperial (or lay) quarter in establishing his idea of papal independence.

Title V: "De Ordine Accusiationis deque Accusatorum Personis" anticipated such a state of affairs by positing the revolutionary idea that the See of Rome was above judgment from any earthly source, whether that source by the emperor, the bishops of the entire Church, or the mystic-ascetic-hermit. The See of Rome alone had received its mandate from Christ himself argued Humbert, again quoting Pseudo-Anacletus. In Canons 30 and 34, the Cardinal-Bishop of Silva Candida admitted that while other sees may have been established by certain of the Apostles, the Roman See was superior to them by virtue of the fact that Christ himself had appointed the first Bishop of Rome. Thus, the Roman See had not received its authority from Peter; rather, Peter was just the first of a long line of bishops who held a single power and whose commands bore the same weight. Humbert wrote:

> Haec vero sacrosancta Romana apostolica ecclesia non ab apostolis, sed ab ipso domino salvatore nostro primatum optinuit, secut ipse beato Petro Apostolo dixit: "Tu es Petrus..."

Then in the same passage the right of judication and appeal to Rome was reaffirmed:

> Si quae vero causae difficiliores inter vos orte fuerint, ad huius sancte sedis apicem eas quasi ad caput referte, ut apostolico terminentur iuditio, quia sic domino velle ab eoque ita constitutum esse ante dictis testimoniis declaratur. Haec vero apostolica sedes cardo et caput ut factum est a domino, et non ab alio constituta, et secut cardine hostium regitur, sic huius sanctae sedis auctoritate omnes ecclesiae, domino disponente, regruntur.[97]

The independence of the See of Rome was to be established on the basis of the Donation of Constantine,[98] the

Pseudo-Symmachan Forgeries, and the use of certain canons of the Pseudo-Fabian. Particularly, the Donation of Constantine was used to establish the pope's political independence from the emperor.[99] However, the Sentences did not stress the worldly goods to which the Papacy laid claim.[100] This final break with the emperor was made in the Adversus Symoniacos and in the Election Decree of 1059.[101] Pseudo-Fabian served the purpose of establishing the papal hierocracy and centering its power in the Papal Curia.

Using Pseudo-Sylvester as his authority, Humbert discussed, in Title XVI of the Sentences, the subject of the accusation of bishops by inferiors.[102] Here Humbert intoned:

> Quem posea nec clerus populus perturbare debet; quia episcopi, qui throni Dei vocantur non sunt lacerandi, sed magis portandi ac venerandi, de quibus ait beatus Paulus Apostolus: "Seniorum ne increpaveris, sed obsecra ut patrem: legimus namque ipso domino dicente non esse discipulum super magistrum." Hoc est, non sibi doctrinam, nec aliquam machinationem demini discipulos.[103]

The reading was unmistakable. Humbert developed the theme: no bishop might be accused of any crime on moral grounds by his inferiors. This removed the bishop from the accusations of the ascetic just as surely as earlier legislation had removed the monastic houses from the control of those bishops. But whereas the granting of privileges to certain monastic houses had been interpreted by monks as a means of improving monastic discipline, one might argue that the freeing of the bishop from any moral commitment in the pursuit of his office was a detriment to the same reform ideals. Indeed, the papal

reform had emerged from the general desire to impose monastic standards of morality, ascetic standards of morality, upon the broad mass of the secular clergy. Of course, Humbert's aim was to remove "ordering" authority from all local hands and place the sum total of that authority in the hands of the See of Rome, particularly in the hands of the Roman Curia.

Humbert was consistent with Pseudo-Isidore in arguing that moral acts of the bishops were outside the scope of judgment given to lesser persons both in the Church proper and outside of it.[104] All acts of moral incontinence on the part of the bishop were to be suffered by the inferior. If a bishop proved incorrigible he might be admonished in private; this failing, he might finally be reported to the Holy See.[105] This tradition had existed for hundreds of years, but the ascetics still demanded the right to criticise the bishops and to appeal to the See of Rome for their wholesale dismissal on the grounds of incontinence. Such an appeal, made by Damiani in the Liber Gomorrhianus and vividly locumented with specific examples, was, however, refused by Leo IX, and the book itself was condemned by Alexander II for its harshness.[106] Such condemnation, while reflecting the essential good sense of Leo and Alexander's policy, did not escape the censure of monks who were unable to understand such apparent laxity on the part of popes who had ascended the papal throne as champions of reform programs.

Humbert had, no doubt, wished to use the Sylvestrian decretals as a jumping off place for his own excursions into the subject of papal immunity from any charges whatsoever. In the earliest of the works attributed to him, Humbert had maintained that the See of Rome was answerable to God alone for its moral actions.[107] This same idea was repeated in the De Sancta Romana Ecclesia,[108] but in this work, as in the Sententiae, an important reservation had been introduced into the immunity clause. It was here that Pseudo-Fabian was utilized.

In Canon 50 of the Sententiae Pseudo-Fabian repeats the idea that the pope may not be charged with immorality by his inferiors ("Similite statuentes apostolica auctoritate, ne pastorem suum oves quae et commissae fuerant, nisi in fides erraverit...").[109] This same reservation (if he does not err in faith) appears in the rest of Humbert's writings and is applied to the pope particularly in the De Sancta Romana Ecclesia, the document which was seemingly meant to create an autonomous curia.[110] This clause stood as the basis of a king of "curial constitutionalism" within the hierarchy of the Church and served to set the curia off from the pope as that body which would in fact judge whether the pope were guilty of heresy or not. But before we see how this principle was applied in practice by the curia, let us first consider the papal leadership ideals which Humbert embraced as a result of his thoroughgoing legalism.

Humbert has argued that the See of Peter is answerable

to no one on moral grounds, because the power which inhers in the see has nothing whatever to do with the merit of the individual who happens to be occupying the office. The individual popes will come and go, but Peter's power is eternal and resides in the See of Rome. In other words, authority is derived from the *office* which the pope holds, not from the merit of the individual who occupies the office of pope.[111] The See of Peter is seen as a specifically *legal* entity, a combination of responsibilities and privileges which existed apart from anything having to do with personal claims to leadership. The *officium* of the See of Peter reminds one (as it is found in Humbert's thought) not a little of the concept of the *imperium*, the legal concept of power, which one finds enunciated in Roman political thought and law.[112] The See of Peter is a seat of power, divine in itself, and the *auctoritas* of the individual pope is derived from his assumption of that power. Hence, the only prerequisite for a claimant to that authority is the legal process which grants the power to the individual.

This idea of an abstract power distinct from the holder of the power results in Humbert's arguing that the pope is essentially the same as Peter, has the same power and has the power to legislate just as did Peter. This leads to the assertion that when the pope speaks it is the same as Peter speaking.[113] Here then is pure *Amtscharismatic* leadership theory in the form of the idea of papal leadership. In the life of Leo IX, written by Humbert at about the time of the

issuance of the papal electoral decree of 1059, it is stated that Bruno of Toul has committed a number of sins, but then he asks whether any man may live a pure life and concluded that it would be folly to ask of a pope a purity which no man can attain.[114] Humbert is a realist. He is a lawyer, not a saint, and to him, it is much more important that a man realize his limitations and be penitent. It is better that a man be a good administrator than to have a false notion of his purity of soul. Authority resides in the individual who has been legally chosen, not in the prophetic type who has only moral indignation to back his claim to power. Morality has nothing to do with the leadership of the Christian community; legality has replaced it as the governing principle of Church organization.

Now this was a strange argument to be put forth by a man who had come to Rome with Leo IX to depose a former pope on a charge of immorality. From the point of view of those who wished to erect a strong and centralized Church government, a dangerous precedent had been established. The Holy Roman Emperor had come to Rome and deposed the pope on a charge of immorality. But what constituted morality? It was a changing thing directly dependent upon the zeal with which any one group wished to apply monkish ethics to the whole of society. Could the Emperor not arbitrarily move on Rome and depose any pope with whom he disagreed if the ordering principle of the Church community were tacitly admitted to be the vaguely defined and vacillating concept of morality?

Humbert himself sought to describe Henry III's actions in reforming the Papacy as a unique incident in the Adversus Simoniacos. He argued just as did Isaiah when the prophet described the advance of the Assyrians upon Israel as God's using the heathen Assyrians as a scourge of his people. Humbert notes that God made the Emperor move upon Rome as punishment of the Roman's allowing the papal office to fall under the control of laics.[115] Whereas Damiani had admitted that the Emperor had the right of "ordering" the papal office by virtue of his position as God's representative in the world as head of the laity,[116] Humbert sees the imperial action as a special incident, hingeing upon God's anger with the Romans rather than upon Henry's exercising of a legal function.[117] For Humbert, the Emperor has no right to order the papal government because the pope does not hold his power from any moral superiority. The ascetic hierarchy of values cannot be applied to this office. Thus, when Emperor and monk move upon Rome in the name of morality, they are violating the law of God who has established Rome in a unique position, outside the scope of moral ordering which applies to all other orders of society.

Humbert has re-defined the papal office in terms which are purely legal. That office is now definitively allied to the sacramental hierarchy, and thereby it is given a peculiarly worldly role. No longer will the Church hierarchy accept the monkish admonition to withdraw from the world. That is not its function. The Papacy is to be a

priestly office; its authority is sacramental in character, and its role is defined as societal. It must go into society, order it, organize it, and lead it to salvation. While Humbert was willing to keep the idea that morality itself was the key to salvation of all society, he argued that the Papacy was above such considerations insofar as society itself was concerned. The monk might be the ideal of the community, but he could no longer appeal to his own morality as an authority for the ordering of society as a whole. This was the function of a priestly hierarchy, connected by a series of legal relationships, and surmounted by an independent Papacy answerable to God alone for its own morality.

The practical effects of Humbert's conclusions are patent. He has created the basis of a great papal administration. Instead of a fluctuating hierarchy of morality in which mystics and monks may challenge the virtue of any other member of the hierarchy, Humbert erects a complete hierarchy of offices in which the relationships are defined and said to be eternal. The Papacy itself is the office par excellence. It is the center of all authority from which all other offices derive theirs in varying degree. The practical result was the creation of that administrative bureaucracy which reached its height under Urban II and found its final expression under Innocent III. The curia was given a raison d'etre as the organ into which local affairs were centered. And yet the curia's position vis a vis the pope had not been clearly stated. While under Innocent III the curia was the administrative

assistant to the popes, there was a period in which the curia argued that it participated in the authority of Rome in equal measure with the popes. We shall see in a later chapter how, from 1106 to 1130, the curia ruled the Papacy, not only in fact but also with a kind of legal justification. This justification came from the role which had been accorded the curia by Humbert of Silva Candida and was directly related to Humbert's idea that the popes were beyond judication "except in matters of faith."

There is every reason to believe that Humbert of Silva Candida conceived of the curia as participating in some sense in the papal power. We have noted that when he appropriated Pseudo-Fabian for his own purposes of removing the pope from the charges of immorality by his inferiors he did not remove the phrase which stated that this was true "so long as the pope did not err in matters of faith." Why was this restrictive clause left in Humbert's Sententiae if he were trying to create an absolutely independent Papacy? It must be remembered that Humbert's view of the papal office was Amtscharismatic; that is to say, it was an abstract entity which depended not at all upon any single individual. There is no reason therefore not to surmise that Humbert conceived of the papal office as a whole which included both Pope and Curia in a relationship which was complete in itself. It was to this complex of power that the Church referred for its leadership.

The power of the cardinals in the Church and their unique

relationship to the pope was stated in a letter written by Humbert for Leo IX in 1054. In the letter to the Patriarch of Constaninople, Humbert had first set forth the Amtscharismatic leadership principle, arguing that Peter and Peter's successors held their power not by any merit of theirs but solely according to the will of God which had vested authority in an office.[118] He likened Rome to a cardo, a hinge, about which the entire Church revolved, and he specifically stated that the clergy of Rome, the cardinals, shared in this power.[119] This was the reason why the cardinals were so called, because they were the hinge around which the papal power revolved.

Historically, however, Humbert's Sentences did not establish the power of the cardinals over the whole of the Church, but it did supply the legal justification of a later revolt against the popes by the cardinals under Paschal II. If the pope were to be held responsible to the rest of the Church for deviations from the faith, who was to judge the pope guilty or innocent of heresy? Clearly not the Emperor. Prophets? Mystics? Hardly. The only body which was conceivably capable of judging the pope was the curia. In the De Sancta Romana Ecclesia, Humbert seems to see the curia as a kind of revived Roman Senate who could, if necessary, judge the pope for heresy.[120] Was such a view consistent with the spirit of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals? Only if one assumed that it was Rome which was answerable to no man, only if one assumed that it was the office, the authority of the See of Rome which was

independent, and assumed that the curia was an integral part of that authority, could one further argue that the curia might judge the individual occupant of the See of Peter for heresy. It is significant that Humbert's assertions were not tested until after the Investiture Struggle was settled at Worms in 1122. Michel Andrieu has argued that the cardinals had power only insofar as they were invited by the pope to participate in Petrine authority.[121] As we shall see, the development of pope-curia relations from 1059 to 1130 does not support such a view. Humbert of Silva Candida had attempted to establish an office completely separated from the lower orders of the Church, but he had left undefined the relations holding within the office itself, because that office had two aspects, a leader (the pope) and an elite (the Roman clergy) who, by virtue of their Romanity participated as surely as did the pope in the power given to the See of Rome as a totality. We shall see this idea of the curial participation in the papal auctoritas clearly stated in 1106 when the Roman Curia clearly assumes control of papal affairs and threatens Paschal II with the charge of heresy if he does not abandon his attempts to diminish the papal power in the realm of secular activities. Even in 1106 the cardinals did not act without the authority of precedent.

In the Descriptio Sanctuarii Lateranensis Ecclesiae (as yet unedited) which dates from c. 1080 it is affirmed that the cardinal-bishops and the cardinal-priests have the right of judging all of the other bishops in the Church.[122]

In the collections of Anselm of Lucca and Deusdedit, both of which it will be remembered were composed before the schism of 1130, argue a similar position.[123] In another document, only recently established as having been composed in the period 1080-1100, the Constitutio de Iure Cardinalium,[124] it is positively stated that the cardinals have the right of supervising monasteries and "unlimited rights of disciplinary jurisdiction over the Roman clergy and of contentious jurisdiction over suits between clergy and laity."[125] By 1100, the curia had become a power in its own right, a training ground for future popes, and the real (administrative) center of the Church. The increasing importance of the offices of bibliothecarius and cancellarius,[126] the rise of the order of cardinal-deacons,[127] the power of the office of archdeacon,[128] and the deference given to the Roman clergy in papal decrees from Nicholas II up to Innocent II clearly indicate a movement towards a kind of "curial constitutionalism."[129] Humbert's idea of a papal power abstract and apart from any individual pope was the probable source of this separatist movement within the complex of pope-curia relations.

We have noted that Humbert argues the papal plenitude of power derives from the fact that Rome is chosen for a special role in the world. If authority is not vested in any one individual, but in a place (locus), then it follows that the clergy of that place (the Roman clergy) has a special role in the Church and participates in the authority

established there. The pope was pope because he was bishop of Rome and the curia had its original power by virtue of the fact that it was the clergy of Rome.[130] It is the Lateran, not St. Peter's, which is the focus of papal power.[131] This new emphasis upon Rome as the seat of authority could not fail to grant new authority to any office or group which was existentially connected with Rome. Hence, the clergy of Rome and the pope form a whole, one dependent upon the other for the administration of the Petrine power.[132]

The Amtscharismatic aspect of Humbert's concept of the Petrine power is further developed in the increasing emphasis given to the definition of external symbols of leadership authority. Leadership is attributed, not earned, as in the old fashioned prophetic tradition. The bishop is not bishop because he is the moral leader of his flock; he is bishop because he has been properly elected, consecrated, ordained, and given the symbols of office. The hierarchy of the Church is thus externalized. In the Adversus Simoniacos, Humbert argues that the ring and the staff are not only symbols of power but constitute power in themselves.[133] The episcopal throne is defined as actually having power apart from the individual bishop who may occupy that throne.[134] Thus, there is no break in the relationship holding between Rome and the bishoprics between the time when a bishop dies and the time when his successor is eliminated. There is no break in continuity in which the king may interpose his will, because the power of the see resides in the throne, in the

office, not in the man. A hierocracy of offices is thus created in which the relationships holding between the various parts of the hierocracy is legalistic, not moralistic, in nature. This hierocracy is eternal, immutable, and derives its authority from the greatest office of all, the See of Peter.

Thus envisaged, the office of the pope assumes a purely administrative aspect. It is the office of pope which gives all other offices their authority, and it is the function of the pope-curia to administer, define the scope, and admonish the occupants of these offices in objective terms. These offices exist to administer to society, not to reject it.[1] They have a societal purpose, and therefore, the Church has a societal function. The wheel which Henry III and his monkish allies had set in motion had taken a full turn. The ascetic hierarchy of values as the ordering principle of society has been rejected. The head of the new administrative hierocracy is not distinguished by his moral ability, but by his administrative ability and by the fact that he has been legally invested with his authority. In this context the leader of the Church community will not be judged by his virtue or vice but by his ability to manipulate legal, philosophical, and theological corpora of knowledge, in organizing society. Thus, will the Papacy be brought into conflict with the State, for no longer will the Church ideal be one of withdrawal from society but the fashioning of it for purposes that it will define for itself. Nowhere does

this fact become more patent than in the Vita Leonis IX written by Humbert of Silva Candida himself.

The Vita Leonis IX of Humbert of Silva-Candida as Statement of the Gregorian Leadership Ideal in Action

For many years the Vita Leonis IX found in the Codex Sancti Maximi et Sancti Huberti was considered to have been written by Archdeacon Wibert of Toul, friend and secretary of Leo IX.[135] This biography is one of the most complete, polished and significant documents in the study of the origins of the Gregorian Reform. It is, above all, a Streitschrift of the Gregorian offensive. Its author skilfully interveaves the main themes of the Gregorian concept of the papal office into what is ostensibly merely a standard account of the life of a saint. Erdmann, in his Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedanken, has shown how the author of the work masked papal demands for complete control of the temporal as well as the spiritual spheres of power by development of the theme of ideal pope as leader of the militia saecularis.[136] The success of the author is testifed to by the dominance which his work enjoyed over all other lives of Leo.

Earlier lives of saints had been written to edify the mass by eulogization of the traditional ascetic virtues. Holiness of personal life, retreat, divine ignorance, and martyrdom had all been praised as the virtues of the ideal leader of the Christian community who, through his virtue,

led society onto the paths of righteousness through *mimesis*. The *Vita Leonis IX*, however, like the *Vita Sancti Lucii*, seeks to popularize abstract ideas which were then challenging the traditional concept of societal organization. The *Vita Sancti Lucii* eulogized a Rome in conflict with the secular power for the preservation of the spiritual role of the Church.[137] The *Vita Leonis IX* presents the reader with the new kind of papal leader who will attain these ends.

The *Vita Leonis IX* sets forth three main ideas. These are: 1) that the papal authority carries its own virtue, and once it is conferred the possessor of that authority is answerable to no one for his personal morality; 2) that the papal authority is a peculiarly Roman thing, existing only there and conferable only by the clergy and people of Rome; and 3) that the ideal papal leader should be a warrior-administrator in order to successfully wage the war with the State upon the plane necessary for its success.

There are two parts to the work. The first is devoted to a discussion of the birth, background, and education of Bruno of Toul, later Leo IX. This part of the narrative closes with Bruno's election to the papal power. The second part discusses Bruno's career as papal leader, his death (or, according to Humbert, his martyrdom), and the holiness which he achieved as a result of that martyrdom for the Roman cause. Both parts are important for our study, for the first shows the training desired for the making of the ideal leader, and the second shows the leader in action.

Humbert begins his work with a statement of the reasons for its composition. He states that he writes in order to refute Leo's detractors and at the same time to set up the virtues of the man as an inspiration to all.[138] It will be recalled that Damiani had openly criticised a pope who led troops in the field, so we must suppose that Humbert's work is set forth as much to mollify dissatisfaction within the leadership of the reform as to propagandize against the Empire. In order to do this Humbert was faced with a stylistic problem. It was necessary for him first to demonstrate that Leo incarnated traditional religious virtues (in the general sense) as much as was possible for any man, and then he had to show how the new leadership of the Church was consistent with those virtues. As a result of this attempt, the whole of the Vita follows an irregular course. Humbert first will show some miracle which takes place in the traditional lives-of-the-saints manner and will then follow this with the facts of Leo's life which show him to be the incarnation of the new leadership. But, as we shall see, it is Leo's leadership abilities as warrior-administrator which carry the most weight with the author, and it is these which concern us here.

Leo is shown as the chosen of God, predestined to assume a high office in the Church. Supposedly, Leo's mother had a vision which told her this.[139] Furthermore, the vision was confirmed by St. Benedict himself in yet another vision during Leo's childhood.[140] This is most

important, for it represents a departure from traditional lives of the saints in which the existential event is a conversion. With the conversion of both Augustine and Jerome apparent truth (represented as pagan scientia) gave way to real truth (Christian sapientia), and the saints laid aside their worldly pursuits in order to retire and meditate. The same thing happens in St. Bernard's life of Saint Malachiae. In this latter life, Malachiae, who also is inherently good, has been studying the liberal arts, is converted, and takes himself off to a holy man in order to pass his days living in an abandoned coffin, meditating the wisdom of God.[141] But Humbert presents Leo as predestined to lead the Church from the beginning. At every stage of his life the hand of God is manifested in order to direct the boy's training. A series of visions and miracles testify to the fact that what Leo does is done by the will of God.[142] This is most important, for there is no "conversion" in Leo's life, no blinding flash in which the whole of reality if comprehended in one stroke of mystical ecstasy. There is no rejection of the liberal arts as detrimental to the realization of God's will; in fact, the very opposite occurs: training in the liberal arts is seen to be the God-ordained way in which Leo is prepared for the career which awaits him.

According to Humbert, Bruno was born into a noble German family in Alsace. He was the son of the powerful Count Hugo of Dachsburg and Egisheim, the brother of Adelheid who was the father of Conrad II.[143] Bruno was, therefore, of the highest German nobility. But not only was he noble,

he was from a learned family as well. Humbert makes only scant mention of the education of Bruno's mother and father, but in view of the space he devotes to describing Bruno's education, it may not be unimportant. He states that Bruno's mother and father, aside from being most holy, were well versed in both the Latin and German languages.[144] Apparently this is mentioned in order to explain why it was that Bruno was sent to the local episcopal school to be educated in the liberal arts.

The founder of the school had been one Berthold of Toul, builder, scholar, and cleric whom Humbert describes in glowing terms for his accomplishments as teacher.[145] Under this teacher Bruno flourished.[146] It is in connection with his comments upon Bruno's education that Humbert is led to the eulogy of the liberal arts.[147] Soon, however, Berthold decided to send the boy to the cloister of St. Stephens, where for a time Bruno lived under the rule of St. Chrodegang of Metz, although he apparently did not enter the order itself.[148] This tenure was short lived, for the parents decided to further their son's education by sending him to live at the court of Conrad II.[149] In the court of the Emperor, Bruno is supposed to have received the final training which made him pre-eminently fitted for possession of the papal power.

We may pause here to note that no attempt is made to make Bruno appear as either a monk or a monk-ascetic type. We are given no indication that he ever practiced the virtues of poverty, self-denial, or other ascetic exercises which

distinguish the charismatic leader. Indeed, we are told exactly the opposite. Far from affirming that Bruno leads by his holiness, Humbert states that he sinned quite often, for, as Humbert notes, how can he "assert that in this miserable life which is one long temptation, he at all times lived without sin; for that cannot be asserted even of the babe of the day."[150] Bruno's life is a complete departure from that attested necessary for the leader of the Christian community in the heyday of monasticism. Instead of rejecting secular studies, Bruno thrived on them; instead of rejecting the world, Bruno conquered it. Nowhere is there to be found that rejection of bodily and mental development which the great ascetics from St. Anthony to St. Bernard eulogize. The young Bruno of Toul who presented himself to the court of Conrad II was distinguished "by grace of mind and body,"[151] proficient in music,[152] and trained in courtly tact.[153] It was only fitting, therefore, that he should distinguish himself as courtier, warrior, and diplomat in the service of the Emperor, and this, according to Humbert, is exactly what occurred.

At the court of Conrad II Bruno is seen as confidant and councillor of both the Emperor and Empress, although at the time of his stay there he had hardly attained the age of twenty-three.[154] Conrad, recognizing the leadership abilities of the young man, sent him on an expedition into northern Italy, in which expedition Bruno led troops against Milan with no small success.[155] This was in 1026. A few months

after the close of the Italian campaign, Conrad offered Bruno a bishopric as his reward, and, according to Humbert, Bruno, "realizing that he must render unto Caesar the things that were Caesar's and to God the things that were God's," asked to be granted the bishopric of Toul which had recently fallen vacant. Furthermore, Humbert adds, the people of Toul ardently desired that Bruno should be their next bishop.[156] In this way Humbert no doubt wished to destroy any idea that Bruno had received an office at the king's hands. Conrad insisted that Bruno take a seat befitting his rank and abilities, but the young man was firm in his original intention, "wishing to begin with the most humble of offices."[157] As a result, on 20 May, 1026, Bruno was consecrated Bishop of Toul.

Now unlike his fellow bishop Malachiae (as described in St. Bernard's life), Bruno did not begin his career as a bishop by service to the poor and needy, nor in a spirit of ascetic self-denial. On the contrary, he continued as the servant of Conrad's foreign policy. Humbert says that Bruno's skill in the sciences "both human and divine," led Conrad to send him to the French court of Robert the Pious in order to negotiate differences with that prince which had arisen over possession of Lorraine.[158] There Bruno was so successful that (according to Humbert) "men still speak of his success in the undertaking, of his grace in mind and body, and of his tact."[159] Nor was this all: Humbert states that it was through Bruno's diplomatic prowess that the whole kingdom of Burgundy was added to the Holy Roman Empire.[160]

Thus, Bruno's leadership abilities are established; Humbert is now ready to make his election to the papal power a logical step in God's plan.

The election of Bruno of Toul to the Papacy as Leo IX serves as the axis upon which the biography turns. All preceding events have led up to it, and all subsequent events follow from it. His training as a youth and young man prepared him for it, in Humbert's view, and the wisdom of the training was borne out in the events of the pontificate. Finally, Bruno's election is made the stage upon which Humbert can erect his idea of the nature of the papal office.

There is little reason to believe that Humbert's account of Leo's election is more than fantasy. It is, at best, distortion of the events in the interest of propaganda or idealization of the events to give legal justification to a later idea. According to Humbert, Bruno of Toul had led a pilgrimage to Rome in the course of which plague had broken out. Now this pilgrimage to Rome is supposed to have been evidence of Bruno's personal devotion to St. Peter.[161] Bruno is depicted as having wiped out the plague by saying the mass every day for the afflicted and displaying relics to them.[162] These wonders, notes Humbert, spread throughout the patrimony of Peter, and at a later date, when the clergy and people of Rome were to choose a pope, Bruno's name was fixed firmly in their minds.[163] It will be noted that Bruno's actions were portrayed as sacramental in character, rather than as the kind of miracle worked by men

like St. Anthony and St. Malachiae, in which the personal holiness of the saint finds special favor with God and thus results in God's entering into the time process in order to change the logical course of events.[164] Bruno cures by the sacraments, which are to the priesthood the highest of miracles. Whether this was intended to be a conscious eulogy of the sacramental hierarchy is impossible to state. It is ultimately unimportant to our thesis; nonetheless, it seems significant that Humbert did depart from traditional interpretations of the miracle-working power of the saints in this instance.

Bruno himself was supposedly given a clue to the fate which awaited him in a dream in which he was being followed by an old hag until he turned and made the sign of the cross, at which instant the old hag was transformed into a fair maiden. The Abbot Odilio of Cluny interpreted the vision for Bruno, telling him that the old hag represented the state of the Church as it was and the fair maiden represented the Church as it could be through the application of the proper type of reform.[165] The opportunity of being the instrument of this reformation was presented to Bruno shortly thereafter when he was elected pope.

Humbert relates how representatives of the Roman clergy and people came to the court of Henry III, who was now Emperor, and asked him to name a candidate who might be presented to the Romans to be elected pope.[166] Bruno's name sprang immediately to Henry's mind, since, in Humbert's words,

"nothing (in Henry's court) was done without Bruno's advice."[167] Humbert says that Bruno was the unanimous choice of king, princes, bishops, both German and Roman, but that Bruno, feeling himself unworthy of so high an office, refused the honor offered him. But the crowds persisted, and, after three days meditation, Bruno returned with his answer. He would accept the papal power, he stated, but only upon one condition: that he should first journey to Rome and if, when he arrived there, the people of Rome chose him as their bishop, he would become their pope. "If not," he concluded, "I shall not consider myself elected."[168]

Only the people and clergy of Rome acting in a spirit of unity could confer the papal power. Here and here alone was the power of conferring the highest office in the Church, indeed, in the world. And not because of Bruno's sanctity, or more specifically, not because of his ascetic leadership attributes. Bruno is made pope solely because the people of Rome so will it. His assumption of office is meant to be the final stage in a divine plan which began with his birth and followed through his early education and training in the imperial court. And Bruno recognizes whence his authority proceeds: not through any merit of his own, but because he has been chosen by the Romans in a free election. Here was the Humbertine theory of office incarnated in the life of a specific pope; Humbert himself had done the incarnating.

By way of summary, we may list the basis of Humbert's leadership ideals:

(1) Office is completely separate from personality considerations, insofar as morality is concerned.
(2) Thus legality and process are more important than moral purity in the leader.
(3) Place (locus) and external symbols of office hold authority in and of themselves.
(4) Relative to the Papal officium, it is locus which gives authority to the successors of Peter. The Popes occupy the same office as Peter; therefore, they are Peter's equal and their commands carry the same weight as does Peter's.
(5) The See of Peter is the only specific office founded by Christ. There were only two orders founded, priests and bishops, but the office of the Pope of Rome is the only office in which place and authority are intertwined by Christ's command.
(6) Since all men err, one cannot expect the Pope not to do so also, but in order to perform his function, the Papal office must be free from all judgment. Therefore, the Pope, and all other bishops, are free from all charges of morality, deviations from the faith excepted.
(7) The errant pope is answerable only to God, but in matters of heresy he is answerable to the Curia. The Roman clergy, by virtue of their participation in the Roman primacy, may judge their own bishop.
(8) The See of Peter holds the plenitude of power, both secular and spiritual.

All of these concepts are based upon Humbert's allegiance to certain more fundamental ideological positions:

(A) Metaphysical: Assumption of the existence of a hierarchy of being which is reflected in the Church as a hierarchy of office.
(B) Epistemological: The assumption that all events are related in a series of externally evident connections. Socially, this means that the relationship holding between the various orders of society are determined by a series of external ceremonies, for example, the acts of consecration, ordination, coronation, the laying on of hands, etc.

The leadership ideal which Humbert is led to define from these considerations is that of a pope, who, with the aid of his curia, men trained in special fields of learning, is primarily interested in the resolution of conflict among various offices over which he has absolute jurisdictional

as well as magisterial control. Thus, he is primarily interested in law, the interpretation of law, and the definition of the "internal harmony" of all law by the use of certain technical tools, logic, dialectic, etc.

Peter Damiani: The Ascetic Hierarchy and the Reaction to the Humbertine Concept of Office

It has been argued that the same group which championed the Gregorian Reform was also the group which reacted most violently to dialectic. Generally, such an assertion is made under the assumption that there is an organic development in the Papal Reform movement stretching from Peter Damiani and Humbert of Silva Candida through Gregory and his champions, such as Manegold of Lautenbach, to Urban II and the thinkers in his train. The view of Etienne Gilson, as presented in his Philosophie au Moyen Âge, is typical. After granting that such generalizations are hazardous, Gilson argues that "all Medieval doctrines tend to absorb the State in the Church, to distinguish them, separate them and oppose them in the same manner and with the same nuances that they tend to absorb philosophy in theology and nature in the supernatural."[169] Grouped with Gregory and represented as typically "Gregorian" are Manegold of Lautenbach and Peter Damiani, the latter being conceived "comme représentant de l'attitude politique...pour la groupe des grégoriens."[170] Gilson bases this assertion upon his analysis of the Disceptatio Synodalis of Damiani, in which essay the saint argued that

the imperial power stems from the unction given the Emperor by the Pope during the coronation ceremony.[171] Anton Michel has gone to great lengths to show the similarities between the ideas of Damiani and Humbert in his Papstwahl und Königsrecht, using the same Disceptatio as his major source; while H. X. Arquillière has argued that the peculiar structure of that essay renders at least half of it invalid as an expression of Damiani's thought.[172] Fliche calls the work "the weakest to come from the pen of the solitary of Fonte Avellana."[173] All, however, seem to agree that the ideas of Damiani are substantially the same as those found in the concept of "Christianitas" expounded by Gregory VII.

On the other hand, at least one authority has indicated that Damiani was "not a man of the new age," meaning that he did not comprehend the full meaning of the Humbertine and Gregorian revolutions.[174] If one may take Humbert's ideas as the ideological foundation of Gregory's practices (not wishing to demean the originality of Gregory's contribution to the development of the papal machinery), it seems quite apparent that Damiani was not only "not a man of the new age" but championed ideas which were fundamentally opposed to it. These ideas reasserted themselves, through the medium of the Cistercian Reform in the twelfth century and in no small measure contributed to the formation of parties in the schism of 1130.

Four essays of Damiani reveal his epistemological position and the basic ideals from which his ideas on

leadership stem. These are the De Sancta Simplicitate, the De Perfectione Monachorum, the De Vera Felicitate ac Sapientia, and the De Divina Omnipotentia.[175] These works combined with the letters and sermons give a full view of Damiani's position. The political and social ideas which emanate from these moral tractates are contained in the Liber Gratissimus and the Disceptatio Synodalis, as well as the letters and sermons.

The introduction to the De Perfectione Monachorum is a lamentation on the necessity for monks to go forth into the world to cleanse it when they would prefer to remain in their cells.[176] Then we are presented with a general discussion of Damiani's concept of office. Inherent in his discussion is the idea that there is a hierarchy of merit and office descending from God to the lowest of men, and that each member of the order is judged by the responsibilities and privileges which have been granted to him by his Creator (personarum et officorum, conditionum et ordinum actus instatera providae discussionis examinat, et diversas habet lances per singulos ordines).[177] Naturally, Humbert would have disagreed with such an assumption, as would Gregory I, Augustine, and St. Thomas Aquinas.

The basis of the hierarchy which Damiani envisioned was different from that seen by Humbert. Although even kings are weighed upon a special scale because of the weight of their office,[178] even they are not excused from the moral law. Furthermore, it is quite apparent that the apex of the Damiani hierarchy of ecclesiastical worth is not graced by

a figure who holds his position by virtue of a law, an office, or a set of legal circumstances. Instead, the monk, who has been given the responsibility and privilege of realizing the ultimate in Christian life,[179] is revealed as the man who possesses the highest wisdom, and, as a result, the right to lead others of the Christian community. His life is contrasted to that of kings, soldiers, workers, but always we are left with no doubt that among men the nearest approximation to the good life is to be realized in strict adherence to the rule of St. Benedict.

The monastic life is thus established as superior because it demands more than the other orders of society are called upon to contribute. The first nine chapters of the work are nothing more than a eulogy of the hermit and ascetic, who through his exercises may achieve a union with the Godhead.

He begins his attack with a castigation of those who "disdaining the honor of being learned in ecclesiastical discipline seek out secular studies and by such activity abandon a chaste spouse for prostitution."[180] He appeals to the writings of Gregory and Jerome and the rest of the Fathers to demonstrate the abhorrence with which secular knowledge was held in the golden age of the Church.[181] Granted that the Fathers studied rhetoric themselves, this was only for the purpose of liberating sacred doctrine from certain superfluities which it had accumulated in the course of its historical development.[182] Damiani admits that the study of the secular sciences might have been necessary for some; he makes the point that he has said all of these

things "against those monks who are entangled in the battles of the worldly sciences in order to demonstrate how much their vanity removes them from the way of right living."[183]

Did Damiani have anyone particular in mind when he wrote those lines? The De Perfectione Monachorum was composed c. 1058-9.[184] In 1054 Humbert, a former Benedictine monk, had written the Sentences.[185] In 1057 the Adversus Simoniacos was issued, a work called by Reinke the first important use of dialectic in the papal cause.[186] In 1059 the Papal Election Decree was propagated, if not wholly the work of Humbert then inspired by Hildebrand, himself a former monk.[187] Around the same time Guaiferius, a Benedictine from Monte Cassino, no doubt at the instigation of the Roman Curia, had undertaken to write a life of the Martyr-Pope Lucius I, in which the miracles of that Pope were made to appear the working of a saint against a decadent and oppressive Roman Empire bent upon destroying the Church.[188] The Abbot of Monte Cassino himself was now a cardinal, and Damiani wrote to warn him of the impossibility of mixing the holy life of the monk with the intrique of the Curia.[189] Was not the De Perfectione Monachorum a plea for a return to the ideals of charity and humility which had dominated the ideals of the first generation of the Reform under Henry III? Certainly the whole of the work is a long plea for monkish ideals. Was it not also a direct attack upon the new ideas dominating curial policy?

In the last chapter of the work we are presented with ample evidence to answer this question in the affirmative.

In an analysis of this chapter we shall also perhaps be given a clue towards the understanding of the position taken by Damiani in the Disceptatio Synodalis, which was regarded by Fliche as showing a complete lack of understanding of the revolutionary nature of the Papal Election law of 1059.[190]

In the last chapter of the De Perfectione Damiani addresses all of the Church as one (omnes vos generaliter alloquor), begging them to "persevere in fraternal charity, to unite in the practice of love against the ancient adversary (adversus antiqui hostis insidias unanimiter conspirate)."[191] This foundation of charity will persevere when the edifices built upon lesser foundations have crumbled. Was the following a reprimand to Humbert and Hildebrand no lessthan to errant monks of any order?

> ...sancta scilicet Ecclesia, quae ad resurrectionis gloriam tendit, sic intus et extra bitumine linitur, ut et foris blandiatur in fraterna dulcedine, et intus cohaerat in dilectionis nutuae veritate. Quisquis enim intus amat, sed foris a fratibus morum inconsona asperitate discordat, intrinsecus quidem bitumen habet, sed extrinsecus non habit.[192]

Did Damiani think of the Sentences and the Election Decree of 1059, no less than the Adversus Simoniacos, when he wrote:

> ...quisquis vero se specietenus affabilem praebet, amicitiam simulat; sed in cordis occulto veritatem amicitiae non conservat, damnabiliter intus hiat cum forinsecus superducti bituminis simulatione cohaerat.[193]

Certainly Humbert during the lifetime of Henry III showed outward obeisance to the Empire; but upon the death of that king he revealed his true intentions in the Adversus Simoniacos.[194]

Thus envisaged, the De Perfectione may be seen as a plea for the reinstitution of the early ideals of the Reform. The eulogy of unitas is set forth here no less eloquently than it was in the Disceptatio, delivered three years later.

> Unitas quippe facit, ut multa sibimet invicem congruant, et diversae hominum voluntates in compagne charitatis et communis spiritus unanimitate concurrant. Quaepropter, carissimi, si cuptitis invicem in Christi charitate congruere, ei, qui vobis Christi vice praeest, humili ex corde attentius oboedite.[195]

That the struggle then developing between Church and Empire was in Damiani's mind as well as the monkish ideals he was expounding may be seen in the references to the office of king which he added to this section.

> Qui in odii fornace discordiae malleos cudat, qui regnum Israel per schismatis seminarium dividat: "Non est, inquit, nobis pars in David, nec haereditas in filio Isae."[196]

And finally:

> Sic igitur pastor it oves, dux et militum catervae uno spiritu confoederentur in exercitatione virtutum, ut charitas, quae Deus est, individuae unitatis in eis teneat principatum.[197]

Damiani was not above personally reprimanding the Pope; in the last years of his life that practice became a second profession with him. He was, however, governed always by the same motives as that papal critic of a later day, Ivo of Chartres, who, no matter what the grievance, was a firm adherent to the ideal of discipline and obedience to authority. Perhaps because he was a cardinal, Damiani assumed the right to criticize papal policy. In any event, the years in which the Humbertine revolution was effected, 1054-59 presented the saint with ample opportunity for criticism. In the

De Perfectione ideas were put forth which were echoed in the rest of Damiani's writings. In the essay De Vera Felicitate ac Sapientia the Augustinian distinction between the secular ratio scientiae which stultifies and the ratio sapientia which edifies was reaffirmed.[198] Men were admonished once more to capture the loyalty of the devout by their acts rather than their words.[199]

The clearest expression of Damiani's epistemological position was to be had in his De Sancta Simplicitate. In this essay the idioti were eulogized and their wisdom was juxtaposed to the stultification resulting from study of the liberal arts. Both dialectic and rhetoric suffered at Damiani's hands, and Damiani's ideal Christian as well as his ideal leader was revealed in the exposition of his thesis. The faith of the martyrs, who taught by their actions and not by their predication, was his ideal faith.[200] According to Damiani, it was simple and coarse fishermen whom the Lord sent to teach His message; He had no need of either philosophy or oratory in the dissemination of faith.[201] Then addressing his young student directly, Damiani offers the following formula for his life of service to Christ:

> Tu quoque, fili mi, ut praedicanti sortiaris officium, imitare vel asino, de quo dictum est, vel etiam ovis exemplum. Quae nimirum cum vivit, turpiter beat, mortua vero in instrumentis musicis suaviter cantat.[202]

The lives of Sts. Benedict, Martin, and Hilarion are recommended to the young man as worthy of emulation.

In Chapter VII Damiani describes a young man then living

in Rome, "de summis proceribus Galliarum." He goes on to describe the young man thus:

> Cui nescio an aliquid utilitatis desit, tot siquidem exteriorum bonorum floribus enitescit; nobilis ut imperator; pulcher aspectu quodammodo; sicut Tullius loquitur, ut Virgilius poetatur; tuba vehemens in Ecclesia; perspicax et acutus est in lege divina, scholastice disputans, quasi descripta libri verba percurrit; vulgariter loquens, Romanae urbanitatis regulam non offendit.[203]

But what have these attributes done for his life?

> Quid de monachico prosequar ordine? quid de regularis magisterio disciplina? In quorum videlicet notitia ita convaluit ut haec docere naviter possit, sed eius, proh dolor! talis est vita, ut eum alteri nullus invideat, ad se introducere nemo deposcat, et, ut rem diutius protraham, stulto sapienti monasterialis ad habitandum ianua clauditur, cuius passim rusticis et imperitis ac dyscolis aditus non negatur.[204]

Then St. Leo I is commended because of his ignorance of worldly things,[205] and St. John the Evangelist is lauded.[206] Similarly the revulsion which St. Gregory I and St. Jerome had for classical learning is set up as a model for young minds.[207] In the reading of such a work one cannot help but envision the Rome of Damiani's day, in which young men like Humbert, learned in Greek, law, and dialectic, young administrators like Hildebrand, canon lawyers, rhetoricians, and dialecticians were arriving in the city to take over the reins of Church government from men like Damiani and his followers. The young man described so bitterly above might have been the archetype of the papal administrator as he emerged during Gregory's term, although no doubt he would have had more of an ear for the language of the cloister.

The De Divina Omnipotentia is the last of the minor works of Damiani to which we shall have recourse in our exposition of the saint's basic position. It is interesting mostly for the circumstances under which it was written and one or two interesting asides which it contains.

A number of rather important events underlay the bitterness with which Damiani began this letter. They had to do for the most part with the growing power (and what Damiani considered avarice and pride) of the Roman Curia. As we have noted, Damiani always felt that his was the right to criticize the activities of the Pope, just as it was any Christian's right to do so. He based this right, as he declared in his letter to Alexander II, upon the passage in Isiah I, 18.[208] It is significant that the first major rupture with the Curia is shown in Damiani's correspondence dated during the period 1056-1067. It was during this period, of course, that the Humbertine offensive reached its highest pitch and in this period that Damiani's eulogy of monastic ideals was at its highest.

We emphasize the dates of these letters because we feel that in active leaders, such as Damiani and Bernard, attempts to discover harmonious philosophical systems logically expounded are usually fruitless. These men wrote as publicists, usually acting from the inspiration of the moment, quoting sources which would give prestige and weight to their position. Their positions changed from time to time, and attempts to find systematic philosophies in their writings have in the

past resulted only in confusion. What one does find in dedicated men such as Damiani, Bernard, Humbert and Gregory VII is a general value structure which, if it does change radically, can usually be explained in the light of the individual's contact with a changing environment. Damiani's personality seems to have reacted violently against the development of the Papal Curia as it was known under Leo IX and his successors.

In one of his early epistles Damiani had sharply censured Leo IX's warlike activities in southern Italy.[209] This epistle juxtaposed the charitas of cloistral life to the figure of a pope who rode forth armed like a knight. The death of the primitive Church martyrs had assured the ultimate victory of the Church; was it not more fitting that the Pope show the virtue of patientia than his prowess in war?[210] In 1058-9 Damiani wrote to Archdeacon Hildebrand, "the immovable column of the Church," protesting the petty intrigues of the Curia against Damiani's reputation.[211] Then in 1059, the year of the propagation of the Electoral Decree, Damiani resigned from his cardinalcy.[212] In the same year we have another letter affirming his intention to resign.[213] But the synod held in the Lateran in April of 1060 must have worked some change in Damiani's mind, for in that year he consented to retain his seat in the College of Cardinals.[214] Did the election decree of 1060 satisfy demands made by the cardinal to the rest of the Curia? Was the wording of the election decree of 1059 one of the reasons for his resignation and was the revision of 1060 his reason for retaining his place in the Curia?

The decree of 1059, inspired if not written by Humbert, had stressed the small clique in the College of Cardinals which was to supervise elections.[215] Furthermore, it had held that the election was to be within the jurisdiction of the Roman Church alone.[216] Concerning the qualifications of the pope, it was stated only that a capable man was to be sought.[217] Of the Emperor who, as Fliche notes, had been veritable master of the elections for the previous hundred years, a vague phrase was added which spoke of the honor due to "our dear son Henry."[218]

The decree of 1060 added important restricting clauses. That these clauses were the work of Damiani has been affirmed by one learned authority and denied by another.[219] Certainly the new clauses bespeak Damiani's puritanical zeal more than Humbert's legal peregrinations.[220] The fact that no mention is made at all of the rights of the king in the election, however, does remind one of Humbert's arguments. One might say that this argument from omission does not eliminate Damiani from a serious role in the formulation of the document, since his first interest was in the moral qualities of the leader to be elected. In any event, the saint reaffirmed his defense of the rights of the king in the following year at the Assembly of Augsburg (August 1062) in the Disceptatio Synodalis. Was the leading role played there by Damiani a result of the death of Humbert the year before (May 5, 1061)? Any demands that Damiani might have made concerning the insertion of moral provisionary clauses into the electoral law had been satisfied in 1060.[221]

Humbert and Nicholas II died within three months of each other. Nicholas died 27 July 1061, to be succeeded by the former leader of the Pataria, Alexander II (1061-1073). Under this Pope reform of the moral life of the clergy again took first rank in the activities of the Papacy, and there is reason to believe that Damiani was responsible for this renewed emphasis upon the moral aspects of the Reform.[222] With Humbert removed from the scene, Damiani once more regained his prestige as the leader (with Hildebrand) of the College of Cardinals. The two men combined their skills in the suppression of the schism prompted by the election of the antipope Honorius II.

Indeed, there is ample reason to believe that the role given to Damiani by the Curia in papal affairs and the humble role which Alexander assumed in the first few years of his pontificate vis a vis Henry IV was due in no small measure to Humbert's departure from the Curial scene. How else can we explain Alexander's acquiescence to the Imperial order to retire to his See in Lucca to await the royal decision on the legality of his election?[223] Was not the prominent role at the Assembly of Augsburg given to Damiani in the hope that the arguments of the holy man might sway the assembly to Alexander's case, now that the Curia's greatest canon lawyer (Humbert) and leader was dead? Damiani had shown his inability to handle legal cases in the way that Humbert would have done in his only attempt at that sort of thing.[224] Why should Hildebrand and Alexander choose Damiani to argue their case when they must have been aware of the

high esteem in which he (Damiani) held the institutions of the Empire? Certainly, after Alexander had been confirmed, he and Hildebrand rejected by their actions the conciliatory attitude shown by Damiani in the Disceptatio.[225]

In that document Damiani had reaffirmed his belief in the traditional forms of the unitas christiana. In this work was posited a higher auctoritas to which both Pope and Emperor were responsible. Unlike Humbert, however, the saint was not led to the conclusion that the Pope was responsible directly to that authority while the Emperor was responsible to the Pope. Indeed, the Emperor is conceived no less as the monitor of the Popes than vice versa.[226] The position was reaffirmed in the sermon In Dedicatione Ecclesiae.[227] Needless to note, both documents are based upon Damiani's position concerning the necessity of moral purity as a prerequisite for office, whether the office be imperial or papal.

Whereas Humbert had spoken of a sharp distinction between secular and regular clergy, Damiani was not willing to do so. Humbert had argued that Christ had created only two orders of office, that of the priests and the bishops. For Damiani the monastic orders were no less divinely founded: the monk was the militia divina, and the Pope as leader of all three orders had to manifest the ideals of all three. This meant that the pope must be morally pure as well as legally ordained and consecrated.[228] "Unus est sacerdos magnus, unus pontifex summus, qui introivet semel non in quaelibet sancta sanctorum, sed in ipsum coelum, ut appareat vultui Dei pro nobis."[229] All orders were one under God,

and if any of those orders deviated, either in faith or in morals, the other orders had to correct the deviation. Herein we are led to the re-exposition of the concept of the king as rex et sacerdos. We find this in the Disceptatio Synodalis.

In choosing the form of a debate between the Regius Advocatus and the Defensor Romanae Ecclesiae Damiani has caused some difficulty for historians of political thought. Some are wont to use only the arguments of the Defensor as Damiani's own, and others quote only from the arguments of the Advocatus to show that Damiani as pro-Imperial.[230] It seems strange to the present writer that those who have gone to great lengths to find supports for certain preconceived ideas have not hit upon the possibility that the Disceptatio was written as an affirmation of the rights both of the Emperor and the Pope.

In this work no position is clearly set forward which might be used in future debates as a guide to either party. Issues are not resolved to the satisfaction of one party or another. Instead the clausula dictionis resolves the argument by an appeal to an Augustinian unitas in which the fratricide of the papal-imperial struggle would be forgotten and the strength of both parties might be turned toward the moral rejuvenation of all mankind. How is this conclusion formulated?

It is interesting to note that the Defensor Romanae Ecclesiae used an argument which was popularized by Humbert

in both the Sentences and the De Sancta Romana Ecclesia, and that this argument was successfully refuted by the Regius Advocatus! This is the argument to the "golden age of the Church." The Regius Advocatus maintained that the Emperor had the right of ordering the Roman Church by virtue of his office of Patricius Romanorum.[231] The defender of the Church had answered with an appeal to the "ecclesia primitiva," in which the Pope was elected without the knowledge or consent of the Emperors, and then cited as examples the unquestioned legitimacy of Popes Cornelius, Clement, Sylvester, and St. Peter.[232] Humbert had argued with exactly the same names and idea in the De Sancta Romana Ecclesia.[233] Damiani allowed the Advocatus to refute the argument by reminding his opponent that they are not discussing non-Christian kings, who by their lack of faith "non poterant ordinare pontificem."[234]

Here Damiani abandoned Humbertine (and Gregorian) theory and argued that by virtue of the king's office, that is, (1) as leader of his people and (2) as a Christian consecrated king, the sovereign had the right to "order" the Church.[235] The king's office is essentially the same as that of the Pope; he leads by virtue of an external consecration and by virtue of his adherence to a specific set of moral standards. The Emperor participates in Roman affairs by virtue of his office of patricius, but he receives the imperial authority by the consecration. Damiani later argued in a letter to Alexander II that the Pope held the

authority of the Empire only upon the death of the king.[236] Presumably upon the consecration of the new Emperor that authority passed in its entirety to the newly crowned Emperor. Thus secular power was not the province of the Pope once a new Emperor had been created. Did Damiani mean by a similar argument to imply that the Papal office when vacated fell under the care of the Emperor? Certainly Damiani had given to the people a right in the election of the Pope, and just as certainly the head of the people must be expected to take a role in the new election in keeping with his sovereign dignity.[237] Furthermore, this speculation seems justified in the light of the final definition of the offices of Emperor and Pope which one finds in the Disceptatio.

Damiani was so much a product of the traditional thought patterns to which his generation was heir that he could only conceive of an organic relationship holding between the offices of king and pope. Whereas he had defended pure Gelasian theory in his In Dedicatione Ecclesiae,[238] the two powers were now merged into a harmonious whole--a unitas: "Pax enim nostra, quae fecit utraque unum, conflavit in eadem sensu corda duorum."[239] The office of the king is holy. The Roman Papacy is holy. The clergy and people of Rome elect the Pope. Yet the Emperor, as Patricius Romanorum, is a member of the latter (the people of Rome). Similarly, the Emperor receives his power as rex et sacerdos by the ceremony of the Papal consecration. In sum, all--Emperor,

Pope, people of Rome, clergy or Rome, and members of the Imperium Romanum, as well as members of the Christian faith of all lands were involved, ideally and historically in a divine unitas, and Damiani saw no recourse but to define the leadership of this unitas as a duality of Pope and Emperor, made into an organic whole by a "divine mystery." He expressed that idea thus:

> Amodo igitur, dilectissimi, illine regalis aulae, consiliarii, hinc sedis apostolicae comministri, utroque pars in hoc studio conspiremus elaborantes, ut summum sacerdotium et Romanum simul confaederetur imperium, quantinus humanum genus, quod per hos duos apices in utraque substantia regitur..; sicque mundi vertices in perpetuae habitatis unionem concurrant, ut inferiara membra per earum discordiam non resiliant; quotinus sicut in uno mediatore Dei et hominum haec duo, regnum scilicet et sacerdotium, divina sunt confeato mysterio, ita sublimes istae duae personae tanta subimet invicem unanimitate iungantur, ut quodam mutuae charitas glutino et rex in Romano Pontifeci et Romanus pontifex invernatur in rege, salvo scilicet suo privilegio papale, quod nemo preter eum usurpare permittitur (italics mine).[240]

How reminiscent of the ideals of the De Moribus Ecclesiae of St. Augustine and Damiani's own De Perfectione Monachorum! Thus would society be ordered on the basis of the mutua charitas, the ordering principle of the monastic cloister. Damiani's apoearance before the Assembly of Augsburg was an appeal for the re-institution of the harmony which had existed between Henry III and his monkish militia.[241] This was to be a unitas based once more upon charitas and humilitas rather than upon lex:

> Ceterum it ipse delinquentes, cum causae dictaverit, forense lege coherceat, et rex cum suis episcopis super animarum statu, prolata sacrorum canonum auctoritate, decernat....Sanctae ergo ecclesiae

> principes quam propensiori invicem debent karitate conqruere quibus iniunctum est karitatem precipue christiano populo predicare, ut ex eorum, quae procedat ex pietate, concordia sancta universalis gratuletur aecclesia ac gemino utriusque studio christianae religionis refloreat disciplina.[242]

Thus understood, it seems most strange that both Damiani's and Humbert's thought could be envisaged by one historian as springing from the same sources,[243] a respect for the canons. Such an interpretation can only be the result of a study more interested in words than in meaning, for underlying every sentence written by the monk of Fonte-Avellana was a different ideal, a different set of values, a different Weltanschauung from that which motivated the learned canonist Humbert. Such a conclusion demonstrates the dangers of purely etymological or legal studies which are undertaken without proper investigation of the psychological, as well as the logical, milieu within which ideas are formulated.

Damiani specifically rejected the science of dialectic and self-interested legalism in the Disceptatio, and these rejections were placed in the mouth of the Defensor Romanae Ecclesiae.[244] As such, the Disceptatio is a dramatic foreshadowing of the rupture in ideals which the development of the Gregorian Papacy would effect with monastic values. Unlike Humbert the legalist, Damiani did not set forth a specific interpretation of office, but he did, through his writings, reveal the ideals which govern the holding of an office of leadership. We shall summarize these ideas in the close of this section of the paper; for the moment we shall only note that they are permeated with an ideal of

moral worth as the first pre-requisite for the holding of any office. Thus, Damiani's ideas are purely charismatic.

Damiani's ideals led him to a position vis a vis the emperor which demonstrated to both Pope Alexander II and Hildebrand the impossibility of following his lead. It will be recalled that in 1063 the antipope had attempted to take Rome but that Alexander II's forces had repulsed him.[245] Alexander's victory had seemed assured at this point. But Damiani's other-worldly nature seemed to feel that no papal position was valid when not buttressed by the will of the emperor, so in a letter to Hanno of Cologne, Damiani once more asked the imperialists to the election of Alexander.[246] Now Damiani was acting as legate in France at this time, and his prestige combined with his official position to give the impression that the emperor was still the final voice in papal election. Caesaropapism had received a new stimulus from a man who was at the same time a cardinal, a legate, and the most respected monk in Italy. At this point Alexander and Hildebrand seem to have abandoned Damiani's ideas (as represented in the Disceptatio) and embarked upon a new policy modelled after that of Humbert of Silva-Candida. As the index of curial political policy, asceticism was dead, and a coldness developed between Damiani and the curia which is reflected in the letters of the time.

The rupture in ideals is reflected in the letters of Damiani. Hildebrand and his Curial cohorts expanded the Papal power and, in effect, laid the foundations for the centralization which would be realized in the formulation

of the Dictatus Papae.[247] In the years 1065-70 one letter after another reflected Damiani's growing dissatisfaction with the extension of Curial power.[248] The cardinals are admonished to live a life of poverty, to set the example by which other clerics might be inspired to the proper fulfillment of their offices.[249] Cardinals who rode abroad on horses resplendent with jewels and imperial insignia were castigated.[250] In 1067 Damiani resigned from the Curia and accompanied his resignation with a somewhat pointed essay "On the Brevity of the Lives of the Popes."[251] The same psychological circumstances prompted him to write the De Divina Omnipotentia, dedicating it to Desiderius of Monte Cassino (later Victor III) and reminding him that the life of the monk was no longer possible for a member of the Roman Curia.[252]

Here then was Damiani's reaction to the new leadership which Humbert had fashioned and Gregory was to fulfill. If he was unwilling to break openly with constituted authority, his last years were spent in what seems to be bitter secusion prompted by the developments in Rome. Hauck has seen this as reaction to the ideals of Hildebrand and Humbert.[253] He has not been generally supported in his view, but the present writer finds it difficult not to agree with Hauck in this matter. The cold legalism of Humbert was ill suited to a man of Damiani's temperament. He had on one occasion written to Alexander II, rejecting as apocryphal the canons in Pseudo-Isidore which sought to place the bishop outside of all criticism on moral grounds. Damiani had argued that

even St. Peter had submitted himself to the criticism of the other Apostles and other inferiors. He begged Alexander to delete this law and to submit the episcopal authority to the same controls to which other offices were subject. He felt that canon law was full of subtleties and obscurities behind which an errant cleric might conceal his sins.[254] Thus Damiani asks for a revision of law, not for the purpose of making the Papacy stronger, but for the purpose of implementing moral reform. In this revision Scripture was to be the guide: "Et necesse est, ut quae dubietatis caliginem legentibus generant, a luce sacrarum Scripturarum, remota omni dubietate, recedant."[255] It is interesting to remember that in his Sententiae Humbert of Silva Candida referred to Scripture only once, this is, in Canon I, title 1. For Damiani faith and authority were to be the sources of law, not reason and dialectic. In a letter to Alexander II this idea was set forth thus: "Jam vero his scenicis deliramentis, de quibus carnales homines praesumebant ex numero canonum eliminatis, ac perspicua argumentorum ratione convictis, illos canones apponamus, de quorum fide et auctoritate nulla prorsus ambiguitate diffidimus."[256] Such a view constituted an open repudiation of the Humbertine approach to Church organization and law.[257]

Thus it seems possible to conclude that there were basic differences in the Weltanschauungen of Peter Damiani and Humbert of Silva Candida. It seems further evident that the split between the two men reflect different traditions within the reform program itself. One of these traditions was based upon the priestly-sacramental. Damiani's

thought is not as systematically developed as that of Humbert, and since he is not interested in defining office as such, we must largely infer his position on this matter. Nonetheless it is obvious whence he derives his leadership concepts. He is a prophetic type and accepts the hierarchy of morality as the ideal hierarchy of the Church. Let us summarize his position systematically:

(1) Office and personal morality are existentially allied.
(2) Legality of election is important to the proper functioning of any office, but it is not the sole prerequisite.
(3) Locus, place of authority, is hardly considered by Damiani as a factor in leadership authority. Rome is admittedly holy, but the occupant of the throne of Peter is, like Peter, subject to correction by his inferiors.[258]
(4) The orders of priests and bishops are not the only orders founded by God. The monks are more important for the salvation of the Christian community in that they incorporate not only the teachings of Christ but an imitation of His life. The monks are the examples, the proof of the benefits of the Christian life.
(5) The Pope as person is answerable to God, but so is he, as person and as pope, answerable to his sheep if he does not give the people an example of the true Christian life. It is not the place of the monks to use force against the pope or his bishops, just as it is not the place of the pope to use force in any exigency. The Emperor exists to redress any overbalance of papal pride.[259]
(6) The officium of the pope is conceived as a primacy in magisterial power, not necessarily in judicial power. Insofar as the Papacy exists to correct errant priests, it has judicial power also, but in this instance its power really is no greater than that of the Emperor.
(7) The major task of the pope is to lead a moral reform; this is done primarily by example.
(8) Office, thus envisaged, is a combination of external symbols (not symbols of worldly power such as those carried by the emperor, but symbols of humility and charitas), legal process, and moral worth.

These ideals are based upon the more fundamental assumptions listed below:

(1) Epistemological: Damiani's epistemology is mystical, ascetic, transcendental, and is based upon knowledge which comes from a personal union with God. The corpus of written law upon which the pope-mystic draws is the works of the Fathers, great saints, and hagiography. Knowledge is internal, exemplified in the idea of ratio sapientia of Augustine, and cannot be taught (being ineffable) but once experienced lends a certainty to acts which creates a following by inspiration.

(2) Metaphysical: The hierarchy of being and the hierarchy of office should correspond in the ideal Church. Since personal morality (achieved in the ultimate by the anchorite) is the key to one's place in the hierarchy of being, that man who is most pure should be pope.

(3) The reference group to which Damiani appeals is the ecclesia primitiva. Similarly, his ideal pope would seem to be Gregory, but not the Gregory which Humbert eulogized, not the lawyer, the politician; rather Damiani's Gregory was the monk turned pope, the practitioner of monkish virtues in the papal chair. The ideal societal unit would be, for Damiani, the early Christian community, in which lex gave way to mutua charitas, which is, in turn, the ideal of monastic life in the West.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER II

[1]Wilhelm Windelband, A History of Philosophy with Especial Reference to the Formation and Development of its Problems and Conceptions, authorised translation by James H. Tufts (2d ed. rev.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953), 271ff.; Etienne Gilson, La philosophie au moyen âge des origines patristiques a la fin du XIVe siècle (2d. ed. rev.; Paris: Payot, 1947), 233ff.; Arnold Reinke, Die Schuldialektik im Investiturstreit: Eine geistesgeschichtliche Studie (Stuttgart: Forschungen zur Kirchen und Geistesgeschichte, 1937), 50ff.; and Charles Norris Cochrane, Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1944), 411-412.

[2]Gerd Tellenbach, Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest, trans. R.F. Bennett (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948), x.

[3]Ibid., xi, 55-60.

[4]Ibid., xi-xii, 157-58.

[5]Ibid., xii.

[6]See W.P. Tolley, The Idea of God in the Philosophy of St. Augustine (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1930), 43-47, 87. Compare Etienne Gilson, Introduction a l'étude de saint Augustine (3d ed.; Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1949), 149-153.

[7]"It should be noted that Augustine's revolt was not against nature; it was against the picture of nature proposed by classical science, i.e. from a cosmology and an antropology constructed in terms of form and matter on the basis of a 'formal' ethic and a 'formal' logic." Cochrane, op. cit., 411-12.

[8]Windelband, op. cit., 276. In this connection one need only be reminded of the famous conversion passage in Augustine's Confessionum, Book VIII.

[9]See especially Augustinus, "Epistola CXXXVII," 17, PL, XXXIII, 524, in which the "metaphysics of inner experience" is given formal statement. For a discussion of how this metaphysics was tied into a formal political theory, see Ernst Bernheim, "Politische Begriffe des Mittelalter im Lichte der Anschauungen Augustins," Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichte

wissenschaft, I (1896-97), 6ff. Compare the critical study of Bernheim's thesis undertaken by H. X. Arquilliere, L'augustinisme politique: essay sur la formation des théories politiques du moyen age (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1934), 5ff. The dispute between Arquilliere and Bernheim hinges upon varying interpretations of what idea constitutes the essence of Augustinian thought. Bernheim argues for "pax," while Arquilliere calls "iustitia" the ordering principle of existence. More basic to the mind of the present author is the epistemological position in Augustine. Etymological studies of this sort, while necessary, can have little meaning historically until they are placed in the social context in which they become meaningful. The anti-rational bent of Augustine's thought was much more important as a social force than either the idea of pax or that of iustitia, both of which were common in classical thought. It was Augustine's merit to have supplied the metaphysic and the epistemology which would allow the disillusiond classical mind to explore politics in a way which was completely new to it.

[10]See Lovejoy, op. cit., 67ff.

[11]Tolley, op. cit., 44-48.

[12]Cochrane, op. cit., 172ff.

[13]See especially Werner Jaegar, Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, trans. Gilbert Highet (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947), I, 77-114, and Cochrane, op. cit., 172, 488-509.

[14]Lovejoy defines the term "otherworldliness" as "the belief that both the genuinely 'real' and the truly good are radically antithetical in their essential characteristics to anything to be found in man's natural life, in the ordinary course of human experience, however normal, however intelligent, and however fortunate." Lovejoy, op. cit., 25.

[15]Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, trans. Olive Wyon (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1950), I, 39-43.

[16]On the idea of the universal priesthood of believers, see Augustinus, "De Civitate Dei," PL, XLI, 676. See also the commentary on this idea in E. Lewalter, "Eschatologie und Weltgeschichte in die Gedankenwelt Augustins," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, LIII (1934), 36ff.

[17]Augustinus, "De Civitate Dei," PL, XLI, 995-97.

[18]Orosius, Historiarum, PL, XXXI, 1058; Augustinus, "De Civitate Dei," PL, XLI, 608. See the remarks of Karl Löwith, Weltgeschichte und Heilsgeschehen (Zurich/Wien:

Europa Verlag, 1953), 148, 160.

[19]Augustinus, "De Civitate Dei," PL, XLI, 840.

[20]The best source for a study of Constantine's position as "external bishop" is Eusebius, "Ad Sanctorum Coetum," Migne, Patrologia, Cursus Graecae, XX, 1234, 1310-14. See also Ambrosius, "Epistola XVI," PL, XVI, 964-66, and "Epistola LI," Ibid., 1161-62.

[21]Stephen Kuttner, "Cardinalis: The History of a Canonical Concept," Traditio, III (1945), 198ff.

[22]J.-R. Palanque, G. Bardy, and P. Labriolle, De la paix constantinienne à la mort de Théodose, Vol III of Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours, ed. Augustin Fliche and Victor Martin (24 vols.; Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1947), 519ff.

[23]Cochrane, op. cit., 213-60.

[24]Monasticism "serves to emphasize in the most emphatic manner, the failure of emperors from Constantine to Theodosius to effect any real amalgamation of ideals so incongruous as those cherished respectively by the Church and the state." Ibid., 343.

[25]Ibid., 172.

[26]See Hieronymus, "Epistola XIV," PL, XXII, 351. See also "Verba Seniorum," PL, LXXIII, 749-50, 925-26, 1003, and "Vita Sancti Simeonis Stylites," PL, LXXIII, 328. Compare the comments of M. Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1926), 471-74.

[27]On this point see Max Weber, Aus den Schriften zur Religionssoziologie (Frankfurt am Main: Georg Kurt Schaurer Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1948), 260-65.

[28]Löwith, op. cit., 148-60. See also Paul Tillich, "Historical and Non-historical Interpretations of History," The Protestant Era (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 17ff., and Reinhold Niebuhr, Faith and History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), 16ff.

[29]Tellenbach, op. cit., 42-50.

[30]"Nos Christiani mysterium vitae nostrae non sapientia mundi habemus repositum, sed in virtute fidei." "Vita Beati

Antonii," PL, LXXIII, 160. Compare Cassianus, "Collatio XIX: De Fine Coenobitae Eremitae," PL, XLIX, 1138.

[31]"Vita Beati Antonii," PL, LXXIII, 157-61.

[32]See especially Cochrane, op. cit., 341ff., and the sympathetic analysis of Samuel Dill, Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age (London: The Macmillan Company, 1926), 355ff.

[33]"Nam cum haereticus quidam qui Eumonii perfidiam sectabatur, sinceritatem catholicae fidei arte dialectica subvertere conaretur, magnamque jam hominum multitudinem decepisset, rogatus a catholicis viris, qui ruinae tantae subversionis gravissime movebantur, beatus Macarius, ut simpliciatem totius Aegypti ab infidelitatis naufragio liberaret advenit. Quem cum haereticis arte dialecta fuisset aggressus, et Aristotelicis ignorantem spinis vallet abducere, beatus Macarius...concludens: 'Non est in verbo regnum Dei, sed in virtute.'" Cassianus, "Collatio XV: De Charismatibus Divinus," PL, XLIX, 995-97. The tradition persisted. See "De Vitis Patrum," PL, LXXIII-IV, especially "Historia Lausica," Ibid., LXXIII, 95, 1122, 1175; "Excerpta ex Severo Sulpico et Cassiano," Ibid., 822; "Verba Seniorum," Ibid., 1052. See the comments also of Michael V. Dmitrewski, Die christliche Freiwillige Armut vom Ursprung der Kirche bis zum 12. Jahrhundert (Berlin: Abhandlungen aur mitteleren und neueren Geschichte, 1913), 72-73.

[34]"Vita Beati Antonii," PL, LXXIII, 164.

[35]See Bernardus, "Epistola CIV," PL, CLXXII, 258-60.

[36]"Vita Beati Antonii," PL, LXXIII, 168.

[37]Augustinus, "De Moribus Ecclesiae," PL, XXXII, 1345-47.

[38]Cassianus, "De Coenobiorum," PL, XLIX, 237. See also the comments of Cochrane, op. cit., 342.

[39]Augustinus, "De Civitate Dei," PL, XLI, 648, 642, 657, 636, 444-45. Cassian argued that society itself was the result of sin, that the way to salvation was through flight from society, that is, monasticism. See Cassianus, "Collatio VIII: De Principatibus seu Potestatibus," PL, XLIX, 755-57, and "Collatio XI: De Perfectione," PL, XLIX, 848-49.

[40]Cassianus, "Collatio I: De Monachi Intentione ac Fine," PL, XLIX, 481-85, 489-96.

[41]Weber, op. cit., 255ff.

[42]Tellenbach, op. cit., 117ff.

[43]See the various monastic rules in PL, CIII, 441-447, 476, 577.

[44]Cassianus, "Collatio XVIII: De Tribus Generibus Monachorum," PL, XLIX, 1094. Compare the comments of Cochrane, op. cit., 343.

[45]Weber, op. cit., 165-77.

[46]Cassianus, "Collatio XV: De Charismatibus Divinis," PL, XLIX, 994. See also "Vita Sancti Simeonis," PL, LXXIII, 327.

[47]See above, Chapter I, pp. 16-21.

[48]Tellenbach, op. cit., 42-43.

[49]See William James, The Varieties of Religious Experience (New York: The Modern Library, 1902), 371-72, and Cuthbert Butler, Western Mysticism (London: Constable and Co., 1922), 181ff.

[50]A Cistercian monk of the twelfth century expressed the monastic ideal in these terms: "Sit monachus quasi Melchisedech, sine pater, sine mater, sine geneologia; nec patrem sibi vocat super terram. Imo sic se existemet quasi ipse sit solus, et Deus." Arnulfi, "Speculum Monachorum," PL, CLXXXIV, 1178.

[51]Augustinus, PL, XXXIII, 993; XXXVIII, 1070; XLII, 226; and Bernardus, PL, CLXXII, 912; CLXXIII, 614, 716.

[52]Tellenbach, op. cit., 44-45.

[53]The idea is well expressed in one Guafradi Abbatis, "Declamationes ex Bernardo," in Sanctus Bernardus, Opera Omnia (Venetiis: 1781), III, 273ff.

[54]The question of the moral purity of the priest had been faced during the Pelagian heresy controversy. The Council of Carthage had settled the issue. See the canons of that council in PL, III, 1022-23.

[55]See Gregorius Magnus, "Liber Sacramentorum," PL, LXXVIII, 222, 492.

[56]Tellenbach, op. cit., 49-50.

[57]Weber, op. cit., 245-55.

[58]The arguments are summarized in Petrus Damianus, "Liber Gomorrhianus," PL, CXLV, 163.

[59]Weber, op. cit., 179.

[60]Ibid.,260.

[61]Tellenbach, op. cit., 172-77.

[62]Albert Brackmann, "Die Ursachen der geistigen und politischen Wandlung Europas im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert," Historische Zeitschrift, CXLIX (1939), 229-39; Albert Brackmann, "Gregor VII und die kirchliche Reformbewegung in Deutschland," Studi Gregoriani, II (1947), 9ff.; Ernst Landers, Die deutschen Kloster vom Ausgang Karls der Grossen bis zum Wormser Konkordat und ihr Verhältnis zu den Reformen (Berlin: Historische Studien, 1938), 35-49. See also the studies of Lucy M. Smith, "Cluny and Gregory VII," English Historical Review, XXVI (January, 1911), 30-31, and Joan Evans, Monastic Life at Cluny, 910-1157 (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), 37-41. Both of these works argue that the relation between Gregory VII and Cluny was minimal. Both are, however, wrong, as may be seen by a perusal of G.B. Borino, "Quando e dove si fece monaco Ildebrando," Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati (Citta del Vaticano: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1946), 218-62, and the same author's "Ildebrando non si fece monaco a Roma,"Studi Gregoriani, IV (1952), 441-56. For further study of the relationship holding between Cluny and Gregory VII, see Karl Jordan, "Die Entstehung der römischen Kurie," ZRG, KA, XXVII (1939), 105ff.; Grundmann, op. cit., 483; and Georg Schreiber, Kurie und Kloster im 12. Jahrhundert (Stuttgart: Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen, 1910), I, 307ff.

[63]See Brunonis, "Vita Leonis IX," who, although he is forced to give credit for the reform to Hildebrand, cannot but admit the role of Henry III. This life forms a preface to Bruno of Segni's "De Symoniacis," MGH, Lib., I, 547. See also A. Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands (3rd ed.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), III, 575.

[64]Hauck, op. cit., III, 580; Adolf Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte (3rd ed.; Freiburg: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr, 1897), III, 380.

[65]See Henry's "Edictum de Iuramentis Clericorum," MGH, Const., I, 96.

[66]Id., 98. See also Henry's exchenge with Leo IX as recorded in Leo's letters, PL, CXLIII, 625, 653-54, 697, 700-701.

[67]See especially the study of Heinze Lowe, Die karolingische Reichsgründung und der Sudosten: Studium zum Werden des Deutschentums und seiner Auseinandersetzung mit Rom (Stuttgart: Froschungen zur Kirchen und Geistesgeschichte, 1937), 130-35, which discusses the formation of the idea of the sacrum imperium as political expression of the Christian unitas. See also Alois Dempf, Sacrum Imperium: Geschichte und Staatsphilosophie des Mittelalters und der politische Renaissance (München/Berlin: Verlag von R. Oldenburg, 1929), 133; Fritz Kern, Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages, trans. S.B. Chrimes (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948), 27-50; Tellenbach, op. cit., 56-61; and Wilhelm Berges, Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters (Leipzig: MGH, Schriften, 1938), 25ff. The best study of the idea of Rome in the medieval period is that of Percy Ernst Schramm, Kaiser, Rom und 'Renovatio' (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1929), I, 87ff.

[68]W. Erben et al., Urkundenlehre (München: Handbuch der mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte, 1907), I, 313.

[69]Berges, op. cit., 27; Schramm, op. cit., I, 225-30.

[70]Erben, op. cit., I, 313; Schramm, op. cit., I, 232-33.

[71]See Hauck, op. cit., III, 673; Anton Michel, "Die folgenschweren Ideen des Kardinals Humbert und ihr Einfluss auf Gregors VII," Studi Gregoriani, I (1947), 65-92; Michel, "Die Anfange des Kardinals Humbert bei Bischof Bruno von Toul (Leo IX)," Studi Gregoriani, III (1951), 299-319; and Michel, Die Sentenzen des Kardinal Humberts, das Erste Rechtsbuch des päpstlichen Reform (Leipzig: MGH, Schriften, 1943), 122ff.

[72]On the concept of "imitatio imperii," see the ground breaking work of J.B. Sagmüller, "Die Idee von des Kirche als 'imperium Romanum,'" Theologische Quartalschrift, LXXX (1989), 69ff.; Schramm, op. cit., I, 274; and Schramm, "Sacerdotium und Regnum im Austauch ihrer Vorrechte: Eine Skizz der Entwicklung zur Bedeutung des 'Dictatus Papae' Gregors VII," Studi Gregoriani, III(1951), 403-57.

[73]The extensive literature concerning Ulrich Stutz' concept of the Eigenkirchen and Eigenkirchenrecht (proprietary churches and proprietary church law) is too large to investigate here. We here cite once and for all the literature upon which we base our remarks. The best general statement concerning Stutz' argument is his article "Eigenkirche, Eigenkloster," Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, XXIII, 367ff. For more complete handling see Stutz, Die Eigenkirche als Element des mittelalterliche-germanischen Kirchenrechtes (Berlin: H.W. Müller, 1895). Criticism of the Stutz' thesis was advanced by Alphonse Dopsch, "Benefizialwesen und Feudalität," Mitteilungen des Osterreichisches Institut für Geschichtsforschung, XLVI (1932), 1-36, where the latest work on the Eigenkirchen in non-German countries was discussed. For further evaluation still, see Heinrich Mitteis, Der Staat des hohen Mittelalters: Grundlinien einer Vergleichenden Verfassungsgeschichte des Lehnszeitalters (3rd. ed.; Weimar: Hermann Bohlhaus, 1948), 219ff. For an evaluation of the Eigenkirchenrecht in the formation of the idea of the Reichskirche, see Phillip Funk, "Pseudo-Isidore gegen Heinrichs III Kirchenhoheit," Historisches Jahrbuch, LVI (1936), 307ff., and Stutz, "Gratian und die Eigenkirche," HZ, KA, I (1911) 3ff. An excellent summary of the literature thus far is to be found in Geoffrey Barraclough, Medieval Germany (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948), I, 63ff.

[74]Gregory VII claimed that he was called to restore the "libertas Christiana." See Caspar, Register, II, 557; I, 34,70. Tellenbach, op. cit., 1-9. The best work on the legal revolution wrought by Gregory VII is that of Paul Fournier, "Un tournant dans l'histoire du droit canonique," Nouvelle revue de l'histoire du droit francaise et étranger, XL (1917), 5ff. Gregory would never admit that he was introducing radical innovations into the papal government. He argued, instead, that he was trying to restore the true role of the Church which had become corrupted through centuries of submission to the state. See his letter to William of Hirsau in Caspar, Register, II, 503-504, and Arrigo Salmi, Stato e chiesa secondo gli scritti politici da Carlomagno al Concordato di Worms (Modena: Bibliotheca dell'Archivio Giuridico "Serafini," 1901), II, 209.

[75]For the relations holding between the Gregorian Reform and dialectic, see Reinke, Die Schuldialektik, 30, 58, 50-51, 29ff. Compare the article by Stephen Kuttner, "Zur Frage der theologischen Vorlagen Gratians," ZRG, KA, XXIII (1934), 243ff. On the schools or rhetoric and grammar in Italy during the Investiture Struggle, see Giuseppi Manacorda, Storia della Scuola in Italia (Milano: Renio Sandron Editore, n.d.), I, 98ff., II, 257. On the relations between Monte Cassino and the Papacy, see Hans Walter Klewitz, "Monte Cassino und Rom," Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken, XXXVIII (1937-38), 36-48.

[76]Schramm, op. cit., I, 274ff.; Schneider, Rom und Romgedanke, 206ff.

[77]See Charles Dereine, "La problème de la vie communale chez les canonistes," Studi Gregoriani, III (1951), 291ff.

[78]Fournier, op. cit., 9; Funk, op. cit., 305-33; and Hans Erich Frine, "Die periodisierung der kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte," ZRG, KA, XXXVI (1950), 1-14.

[79]Fournier, op. cit., 9-10.

[80]Ibid.

[81]The movement toward a curial constitutionalism was first noted by Walter Ullmann, "Cardinal Humbert and the Ecclesia Romana," Studi Gregoriani, IV (1952), 111-27. Compare the view of Michel Andrieu, "L'origine du titre de cardinal dans l'Eglise Romaine," Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati (Citta del Vaticano: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1949), V, 135-44, who argues that the cardinals attained prominence in Church affairs only insofar as the popes associated them with their governmental function. Another view is that of Stephen Kuttner, "Cardinalis," 191.

[82]Michel, Die Sentenzen, 131.

[83]Ibid., 65ff.

[84]The most important of the canons of Pseudo-Isidore used by the Gregorians were those of Pseudo-Anacletus, Pseudo-Symmachus, Pseudo-Sylvester, and Pseudo-Fabian. Taken in their order we might note that, for Humbert, Anacletus symbolized the primacy of the See of Rome, Symmachus and Sylvester for the personal immunity of the popes from any criticism for immorality by any member of the Christian community, and Fabian for the impossibility of deviation from the faith by the pope. In Humbert's Sententiae, Fabian became canon 49 for Humbert (Hinchius, Decretales, 162); canon 22 of Fabian is canon 50 of Humbert (Hinchius, Ibid., 165); canon 21 of Fabian is canon 67 of Humbert (Ibid.); canons 19 and 20 of Fabian is canon 91 of Humbert (Ibid.); canon 17 of Fabian is canon 92 of Humbert (Ibid., 163-64); canon 22 of Fabian is canon 50 of Humbert (Ibid., 165); canons 7 and 8 of Pseudo-Sylvester become canon 138 of Humbert (Ibid., 450); canons 2-4 of Pseudo-Symmachus becomes canon 174 of Humbert (Ibid., 658). See Paul Fournier, "Le premier manuel canonique de la reforme du XIe siecle," Mélanges archéologiques et historiques de l'École Francais de Rome, XIV (1894), 147-223 for the rubric.

Michel is responsible for having called attention to the role of Humbert of Silva Candida in the formulation of the Gregorian revolution. In his Sentenzen, 122ff. Humbert was established as the author of the collection Diversorum Sententiae Patrum. In another monograph, Papstwahl und Königsrecht (Munchen: Max Hueber Verlag, 1936), 40ff., Michel established Humbert as the author of the papal electoral law of 1059. See also Ullmann, "Cardinal Humbert and the Ecclesia Romana," 111.

[85]Title II of Humbert's Sententiae so argues. See especially canons 21-22. See Fournier, "Le premier manuel," 12, and Michel, Die Sentenzen, 13ff.

[86]Especially did the Anonymous of York so argue. See the text in Boehmer, Kirche und Staat in England im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert, 477. Here we read: "Petrus non est apostolus gentium, sed circumcisionis. Et si non est apostolus, nec episcopus. Paulus vero et apostolus et episcopus et doctor gentium."

[87]On this forgery, see Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, I, cxxxiii. The text of this canon may be found in Hinchius, Decretales, 449. See the discussion of Kuttner, "Cardinalis," 194.

[88]"Nemo judicabit primam sedem, quoniam omnes sedes prima sede justitiam desiderant temperari. Neque ab Augusto, neque ab omni clero, neque a regibus, neque a populo judex judicabitur." PL, VIII, 840. The Symmachan forgeries were promulgated during the schism between Pope Symmachus I and one Lorenzo. Using Pope Sylvester as a model, the forger argued that the pope's immunity from all judgment was guaranteed by both council and emperor. See Duchesne, op. cit., I, cxxii-cxxxiii, 260-68.

[89]Hinchius, op. cit., 449, canons 60-61.

[90]Ibid.

[91]Ibid.; Fournier, op. cit., 11.

[92]Based for the most part on Pseudo-Sylvester. See Hinchius, op. cit., 449.

[93]Fournier, op. cit., 19.

[94]The idea is put forth in the "De Ordinando Pontifice:" "In ecclesia populus sacerdoti, sacerdos episcopo potest confiteri, episcopus summo et universali pontifici, ille autem soli Deo, cui eum suo iuditio reservavit." MGH, Lib., I, 13. On the authorship of the "De Ordinando Pontifice" and its ascription to Humbert of Silva-Candida, see Franz Pelster,

"Der Traktat 'De ordinando pontifice' und sein Verfasser Humbert von Moyenmoutier (Humbertus a Silva Candida)," Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft, LXI (1941), 88-115. The same argument is put forth by Humbert in the Sententiae, Title I, canon 3. Fournier, op. cit., 13; Hinchius, op. cit., 136.

[95]Pseudo-Anacletus, canons 33-34, Hinchius, 83-84.

[96]Humbert is quite clear on this point; see Michel, Die Sentenzen, 20, note 2. For further evidence of the struggle between secular and regular clergy over who should administer the reform, see A. Köniğer, Burkhard von Worms und die deutsche Kirche seiner Zeit (München: Kirchenhistorishce Seminar München, 1905), 112ff.

[97]Hinchius, op. cit., 83-84.

[98]On the use of the Donation of Constantine see Michel, Die Sentenzen, 99ff. Canon 33 stated that the secular clergy were independent of all lay interference by virtue of the Donation of Constantine. Ibid., 19. In another work written by Humbert, the Roman Church is likened to the ancient Roman Senate, and the Roman world is likened to the patrimony of Peter. See the "Epistola ad Michaelem," which is published in Cornelius Will, Acta et Scripta quae de Controversiis Ecclesiae Graecae et Latina Saeculo Undecimo Composita Extant (Lipsiae: Sumptibus N.G. Elwerti Bibliopolae Academici, 1861), 73-74.

[99]Ibid. Compare Michel, op. cit., 190.

[100]Fournier, op. cit., 34.

[101]The complete text and variant readings will be found in Michel, Papstwahl und Königsrecht, 35-36. See also the work written by Humbert only three years after the Sententiae, the"Adversus Simoniacos," MGH, Lib., I, 212, and the "De Ordinando Pontifices," MGH, Lib., I, 14.

[102]Fournier, op. cit., 25.

[103]Hinchius, op. cit., 450, canons 7-8.

[104]Ibid., 165-66; 237, note 39.

[105]"Si enim fide deviaverit episcopus, erit corrigendus prius secrete a subditis; quod si incorrigibilis, quod absit, apparuerit, tunc accusandus ad primates suos aut ad sedem

apostolicam. Pro aliis vero actibus suis magis est tolerandus ab ovibus et subditis suis quam accusandus aut publice derogandus, quia cum eis a subditis delinquitur." Hinchius, op. cit., 166, canon 33.

[106]See below, p. 101ff.

[107]Humbertus, "De Ordinando Pontifice," MGH, Lib., I, 13; Michel, Sentenzen, 32; Will, Acta, 70.

[108]In the "De Sancta Romana Ecclesiae" Humbert specifically exempted the pope from all accusations on the basis of immorality. See Fragment A in Schramm, op.cit., II, 129.

[109]See Title V, canon 50: "De ordine accusationis deque accusatorum personis" in Fournier, op. cit., 16-18. Compare the other works of Humbert, "Adversus Simoniacos," MGH, Lib., I, 244, and "De Sancta Romana Ecclesiae," Schramm, op. cit., II, 129.

[110]See Title IX, canon 74 in Fournier, op. cit., 19, and Michel, Die Sentenzen, 35, note 12.

[111]Ullmann,"Cardinal Humbert and the Ecclesia Romana," 123. See Michel, op. cit., 32, note 1, who notes: "Anderseits hält er es doch für möglich dass der Papst (privat) in Häresie fällt. Der Kardinal unterscheidet aber scharf zwischen dem Amtlichen (officium) und dem Privaten."

[112]See particularly the study by E. Mason Hammond, The Augustan Principate in Theory and Practice during the Julio-Claudian Period (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933), 25-50.

[113]See Michel, Die Sentenzen, 32.

[114]Humbertus, "Vita Leonis IX," Watterich, Pontificum Romanorum, I, 128.

[115]Humbertus, "Adversus Simoniacos," MGH, Lib., I, 216-17.

[116]Petrus Damianus, "Disceptatio Synodalis," MGH, Lib., I, 91-93.

[117]See the letter from Leo IX to Damiani, PL, CXLV, 159-60. Compare Humbertus, "Vita Leonis IX," in Watterich, op. cit., I, 127ff.

[118]"Epistola Leonis IX," PL, CXLIII, 765.

[119]"Et sicut cardo immobilis permanens ducit et reducit ostium, sic Petrus et sui successores liberum de omni ecclesia habent iudicium, cum nemo debeat eorum dimovere statum, quia summa sedes a numine judicatur. Unde clerici eius cardinales dicuntur, cardini utique illi, quo caetera moventur, vicinus adhaerentes." PL, CXLIII, 765.

[120]Ullmann, op. cit., 122.

[121]See above, note 81.

[122]"VII episcopi debent assistere cum XXVIII cardinalibus totidem ecclesiis infra muros urbis Romae potestatem obtinent iudicium facendi super omnes episcoporum totius Romani imperii in omnibus conciliis vel synodis quibuscumque aceristi vel praesentes fuerint." "Descriptio Sanctuarii Lateranensis Ecclesiae," Bibliotheca Vaticana, Reginensis MSS, 712, 89v , quoted in Hans Walter Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," ZRG, KA, XXIV (1936), 119.

[123]Fridericus Thaner, ed., Anselmi Collectio Canonum una cum collectione minore (Oeniponte: Librariae Academicae Wagnerianae, 1906), Title VI, canon 12, pp. 272-73. See also Victor W.E. von Glanvell, ed., Die Kannonsammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit (Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schoningh, 1905), 267-68. Note the commentary of Kuttner, op. cit., 129.

[124]Ibid., 194ff.

[125]Ibid.

[126]Michel, "Die Anfange des Kardinal Humberts," 299ff.; Michel, "Humbert und Hildebrand bei Nicholaus II," 133ff.

[127]See Kuttner, op. cit., 183-97 and references noted in note 126.

[128]G.B. Borino, "L'archideaconato di Ildebrando," Studi Gregoriani, III (1951), 463-516.

[129]See the letter of Gregory VII's electors to the abbot of Monte Cassino in Caspar, Register, I, 1-2. See the electoral bull of Urban II in PL, CLI, 283-84, and that of Paschal II, Jaffe-Wattenbach, 5807 (4303). The electoral notices of Gelasius II and Calixtus II are lacking, although the elections are described in March, Liber Pontificalis, 172-73, 193. See the comments of Michel, Papstwahl und Konigsrecht, 223; Kuttner, "Cardinalis," 176; Klewitz, "Entstehung," 149-50;

Andrieu, op. cit., 113ff.; and Karl Jordan, "Die Entstehung des römischen Kurie," ZRG, KA, XXVII (1939), 126ff.

[130]Michel Andrieu, Le "Ordines Romani" du haut moyen âge (Louvain: "Spicilegium Sacrum Louvaniense" Administration, 1948), II, wherein is contained allof the ordines prior to that given in the Liber Censum. The Ordo Romanus contained in the Liber Censum was compiled during the reign of Hadrian IV and is dated c. 1154-59. In this work the pope is presented as the holder of the episcopal chair in the church of St. John Lateran. The pope becomes pope by virtue of being elected to his office of bishop. The seven cardinal-bishops are attached to the Lateran Basilica, and they are thus, supposedly, given higher dignity than the twenty-eight cardinal-priests and eighteen cardinal-deacons. See Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 306, note 4, and Duchesne, Liber Censum, I, 290, note 1; 311-13.

[131]Ibid., 311-21.

[132]Ullmann, op. cit., 122-126.

[133]Humbertus, "Adversus Symoniacos," MGH, Lib., I, 205.

[134]Founier, op. cit., 166. Cf. Michel, Die Sentenzen, 54, 57, 49.

[135]The text is contained in Watterich, Pontificium Romanorum, I, 127-70, and PL, CXLIII, 405-510.

[136]Erdmann, op. cit., 108ff. [137]See PL, CXLVII, 1301.

[138]See H. Tritz, "Die hagiographischen Quellen zur Geschichte Papst Leos IX," Studi Gregoriani, IV (1952), 191-364, esp. 233, and Watterich, op. cit., I, 127-128.

[139]Ibid., 129. [140]Ibid., 132-33.

[141]See below, p. 564ff. [142]Watterich, op. cit., 132.

[143]Ibid., 129. [144]Ibid., 129-30.

[145]Ibid., 130. [146]Ibid., 130, note 15.

[147]Ibid., 131. [148]Ibid., 131-32.

[149]Ibid. [150]Ibid., 128.

[151]Watterich, op. cit., I, 128ff.

[152]"Sapientia divinarum humanarumque artium in eo refulgebat amplissima, maxima artis delectabilis musicae peritia, qua antiquis auctoribus non modo aequiparari poterat, immo in mellifica dulcedine nonullos eorum praecellebat." Ibid., 143-44.

[153]Ibid., 145.

[154]Ibid., 134.

[155]"In illius itaque saecularibus militiae dispositione sic repente sagax apparuit et providus,..." Ibid., 134-35.

[156]Ibid., 135.

[157]Ibid., 135-37.

[158]Ibid., 137-38.

[159]Ibid.

[160]Ibid., 138-39.

[161]Ibid., 145-47.

[162]Ibid., 147-48.

[163]Ibid.

[164]See below, p.

[165]Watterich, op. cit., I, 147-48.

[166]Ibid., 150.

[167]Ibid.

[168]Ibid.

[169]Gilson, La philosophie au moyen âge, 255.

[170]Ibid.

[171]Ibid.

[172]Michel, Papstwahl und Königsrecht, 178ff., and H.-X. Arquilliere, St. Grégoire VII, 291ff.

[173]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 25.

[174]H. von Schubert, "Petrus Damiani als Kirchenpolitiker," Festgabe für K. Muller (Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr, 1922), 102-103.

[175]We have chosen these works from the hundreds which Damiani wrote because they seem best to outline his view of the alliance necessary between the ascetic hierarchy of values

and the Church leader. Damiani did not think in terms of particular offices in the Church community as did Humbert--further proof of his anti-hierocratic bias. However, this anti-hierocratism did not lead him to formulate a system of leadership concepts. Clues to his position on this matter and the ideology which forms it can be found only in the great mass of letters, opuscula, and sermons which the saint has left us. After an examination of the works of Damiani, we have chosen the following as representative: "De Sancta Simplicitate," "De Perfectione Monachorum," "De Vera Felicitate," and "De Divina Omnipotentia" as examples of the basic epistemological position. His political theory is summarized in two works: "Liber Gratissimus" and "Disceptatio Synodalis." Other opuscula, sermons, letters, and longer works will also be referred to secondarily. It is particularly interesting to note the change in tone of Damiani's correspondence c. 1063-64. There is a growing coldness toward the curia and its guiding lights--Hildebrand and Alexander II--and a tendency for Damiani to withdraw from all interest in politico-religious reform. We shall argue that this split between Damiani and the leaders of the reform springs from a growing realization on the part of the former that the latter have betrayed monastic ideals. This change is noted because there has been a tendency to consider the correspondence of Damiani en bloc. One is mistaken if one attempts to align Damiani to the papal reform led by Hildebrand. For example, Schramm, Kaiser, Rom und 'Renovatio,' I, 241, uses Opusculum 31, "Contra Phylargyriam," in order to show Damiani as champion of the "renovatio" theory of Roman supremacy, noting that Damiani refers to the curia as the Roman Senate. Now this letter can only be dated as coming sometime between 1063 and 1068, according to Franz Neukirche, Das Leben Petrus Damiani bis zur Ostersynode 1059 (Göttingen: Robert Peppmüller, 1875), 101. During the same period, however, there are extant a number of tractates from Damiani's pen which vigorously attack the practice of cardinals' assuming imperial insignia. See, for example: "Contra Clericos Aulicos," PL, CXLV, 463-64; "Contra Intemperantes Clericos," Ibid., 392-94; "Epistola II," PL, XLIV, 26-61; and "Epistola IV," Ibid., 316ff. Schramm's attempt to find some link between the "Geist" of Peter Damiani and that of Humbert and Hildebrand is patently impossible. The men moved in different intellectual and ideological spheres, a fact of which Damiani was conscious when he wrote of himself as "the last of the monks" and "last of the hermits." See Damianus, "Epistola I," PL, XLIV, 289, and "Epistola V," Ibid., 352.

176"Itaque non ignorantis, fratres mei, quod gemus loquor, ad quantum sancti fervoris lapsus sit, imo proclivius quotidie labi non desinat noster ordo defectum....Sub religionis enim specie saeculariter vivimus et, violatio disciplinae genio, dum nos per ille cerrarum fluxa dissolvimus, velut a nobilitatis nostrae titulis degenerantes, monachorum nomen

inaniter possidemus,..." Petrus Damianus, "De Perfectione Monachorum," in Paolo Brezzi, ed., De Divina Omnipotentia e altri opuscoli, testo critico con introduzione e note a cura di Paolo Brezzi e traduzione di Bruno Nardi (Firenze: Valecchi Editore, 1943), 205-206.

[177]Ibid., 208.

[178]Ibid.

[179]Ibid., 210. See the comments of Owen J. Blum, St. Peter Damiani, His Teaching on the Spiritual Life (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947), 45ff., who tries to establish classical influences in Damiani's work. Blum's attempt hinges upon the fact that, according to one authority, there was to be found a "souci" of the Leonine cursus in Damiani's writings. Blum's source was Leone Couture, "Le cursus ou la rythme prosaique dans la liturgie et la littérature de l'église latine du IIIe siècle a la renaissance," Révue des questions historiques, N.S., VII (1892), 260ff., a short article of little merit, but important because Blum wishes to exclude the tractate "In Dedicatione Ecclesiae" on the basis of a lack of the cursus to be found in it. See Blum, op. cit., 42-43, 198. This sermon is important for it contains one of Damiani's strongest arguments for a purely Gelasian theory of Church-State relations. See the work in PL, XLIV, 900. Blum's arguments seem hardly justifiable, since the cursus is to be found in Damiani's writings solely in the verses and certain letters. On this point, see Wilhelm Wattenbach, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, herausgegeben von Robert Holtzmann (Berlin: Dr. Emil Ebering Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1940), I, iii, 434-35.

[180]Damianus, "De Perfectione Monachorum," 256.

[181]Ibid.

[182]Ibid., 258.

[183]Ibid.

[184]Neukirche, op. cit., 101.

[185]Michel, Die Sentenzen, 130.

[186]Reinke, Die Schuldialektik, 29.

[187]Michel, "Humbert und Hildebrand," 133ff.

[188]See "Vita Sancti Lucii," PL, CXLVII, 1301-1303.

[189]Damianus, "Epistola II," PL, CXLV, 595.

[190]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 25.

[191]Damianus, "De Perfectione Monachorum," 326.

[192]Ibid. [193]Ibid.

[194]Stutz, "Eigenkirche, Eigenkloster," 374.

[195]Damianus, "De Perfectione Monachorum," 328.

[196]Ibid., 330. [197]Ibid., 330.

[198]Damianus, "De Vera Felicitate," in Brezzi, op. cit., 338.

[199]Ibid.

[200]Damianus, "De Sancta Simplicitate," Brezzi, op. cit., 172.

[201]"Nec enim Deus omnipotens nostra grammatica indiget, ut post se homines trahat, cum in ipso humanae redemptionis exordio, cum magis videretur utique necessarium ad conspergenda novae fidei semina, non miserit philosophos et oratores, sed simplices potius, idiotas ac piscatores." Ibid.

[202]Ibid., 174. [203]Ibid., 188.

[204]Ibid. [205]Ibid.

[206]"Johannes evangelista apud saeculum paene nil didicit, sed, spretis oratorum dialecticorumque versutiis, ad simplicem Iesus stultitiam puerulus commigravit; hic tamen, dum per libri sui principium summae lucis mysterium terribiliter intonat, illico philosophorum caeca subtilitas in tenebrosa studiorum suorum profunditate caligat." Ibid., 196.

[207]Ibid.

[208]Damianus, "Epistola I," PL, CXLIV, 210ff. This letter is most important in any study of Damian, for it shows how he justified the idea of charismatic leadership. He cites a number of historical arguments to support his contention that even the pope may be judged by the holy man. He notes that David submitted to the judgment of Nathan and that Peter was corrected by the other Apostles. See Ibid., 217-18.

That he was speaking of the papal office may be seen in the following statement: "Si is qui judicat omnia, non dedignatur a servis argui; tu servis utique cum conservo in judicium venire fastidis?" Ibid., 218. In a direct reference to the Pseudo-Sylvestrian canons which Humbert had used to render the Papacy free from all criticism by men, Damiani wrote: "Sed ecce dicitur: Ego sum episcopus, ego sum pastor Ecclesiae, non debeo a commissis ovibus accusationum patere molestiis; etenim in causa fidei dignus sum etiam in pravis moribus aequanimiter ferri." Ibid., 217. Then, quoting Scripture, Damiani gave his own view on the matter: "Se peccaverit in te frater tuus, carripe eum inter te et ipsum solum: si te audiert, lucratus es fratrem tuum...." Ibid. This letter was buttressed by another to one Bishop Oldericus in which Damiani castigated Leo IX's warlike activity in conformity with the principle that no matter how excellentwas the personal life of the man or how dignified his position, God judged the individual act upon its own merit: "Dico quod sentio, quoniam nec Petrus ob hoc apostolicum obtinent principatum quia negavit...; cum malia, vel bona non pro meritis considerantur habentium, sed ex propriis debeant qualitatibus judicare." Damianus, "Epistola IV," PL, CXLIV, 316. Again: "Sacerdos itaque, qui in regno coelorum vult esse magnus, sit in populo praevius, ut quod voce se sequentibus dictat, primus ipse vivis operibus impleat." Ibid., 314.

[209]Ibid., 314-16.

[210]Ibid., 315.

[211]Damianus, "Epistola II," PL, CXLIV, 273-75.

[212]Damianus, "Epistola I," PL, CXLV, 441ff.

[213]See Raphaelis Foglietti, Sancti Petri Damiani Autobiographia ex Operibus euis Deprompta (Torino: Tipografia Successore A. Baglione, 1899), 83.

[214]Damianus, "Epistola II," PL, CXLIV, 260.

[215]MGH, Const., I, 539.

[216]Ibid.

[217]Ibid.

[218]Ibid., 540.

[219]Augustin Fliche, Études sur la polemique réligieuse a l'époque de Grégoire VII: Les prégregoriens (Paris: Société

Française d'Impimérie et de Librairie, 1916) 245. For a critique of Fliche's conclusions, see Michel, Papstwahl und Königsrecht, 60-61.

[220]MGH, Const., I, 547.

[221]Ibid., 548.

[222]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 31.

[223]Ibid.

[224]The "De Privilegio Romanae Ecclesiae" is an excellent example of the inability of Damiani to adjust to the new spirit of the canonists manifested in Humbert's Sententiae. Prior to Gratian's Decretum, canon law in Europe was little more than propaganda, consisting for the most part in the attempt to muster texts--any texts--to support certain arguments. In Damiani's writings there are many allusions to law, but Damiani was usually referring to the lex Dei which he found in the Bible and which needed little interpretation. When he refers to the "science" of law he usually allies it to the work of "scribes and Pharisees" and sees in it the same snares as await the student of dialectic. The "De Privilegio Romanae Ecclesiae" is singularly weak as canon law, taking its point of departure from Scripture and proceeding in only the most general way. In fact, the only issue which Damiani feels safe on is that of moral purification, and on this account he is willing to give some disciplinary power to the Papacy. See the work in PL, CXLV, 91.. The "Liber Gommorhianus" was just as ardent in its demand for reform and just as distrustful of the ability of a formal legal structure to accomplish the end desired. He writes: "Omnes authentici canones, aut in venerandis synodalibus consiliis sunt inventi, aut a sanctis Patribus sedis apostolicae pontificibus promulgati: nec cuiquam soli homini licet canones edere, sed illi tantummodo hoc competit privilegium, qui in B. Petri cathedra cernitur praesidere." PL, CXLV, 172. And again: "Jam vero his scenicis deliramentis, de quibus carnales homines praesumebant, ex numero canonum eleminatis, ac perspicua argumentorum ratione convictis, illos canones apponamus, de quorum fide et auctoritate nulla prorsus ambiguitate diffidimus." Ibid., 172-73.

[225]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 33f.

[226]Damianus, "Disceptatio Synodalis," MGH, Lib., I, 9394.

[227]Damianus, "In Dedicatione Ecclesiae," PL, CXLIV, 900.

[228]"Nam non amplius quam duos ordines inter discipulos domini esse cognovimus...." Michel, Sentenzen, 55. Again: "Sacerdotum ordo bipartitus est nec amplius quam duos ordines id est episcoporum et presbyterorum nobis collati sunt." Ibid. Damiani, on the other hand, looked upon the monks as the real ideal leaders of the Christian community. In the "Vita Sancti Rodolphi," for example, he lauds the saint as a bishop who managed to maintain the monkish virtues even after he had ascended the episcopal throne. See the work in PL, CXLIV,1010. The same idea is repeated in Damianus, "Vita Sancti Odilonis," Ibid., 927; "Vita Sancti Mauri," Ibid., 952; and "Liber Gomorrhianus," Ibid., CXLV, 161.

[229]Damianus, "Liber Gratissimus," MGH, Lib., I, 20.

[230]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 31-33.

[231]Damianus, "Disceptatio Synodalis," MGH, Lib., I, 80.

[232]Ibid., 78.

[233]See above, p. 51ff.

[234]Damianus, "Disceptatio Synodalis," 79. See also the comments of Michel, Papstwahl und Königsrecht, 181ff.

[235]See Damianus, "Disceptatio Synodalis,"80. Compare the "Epistola ad Michaelem," Will, Acta et Scripta, 71.

[236]Damianus, "Epistola I," PL, CXLIV, 210.

[237]Damianus, "Disceptatio Synodalis," 80. Compare Damianus, "Epistola VII," PL, CXLIV, 442.

[238]See above, note 227.

[239]Damianus, "Disceptatio Synodalis," 93.

[240]Ibid.

[241]See Tellenbach, op. cit., 105. See also Damianus, "Epistola VII," PL, CXLIV, 433; "Epistola III," Ibid., 294; and "Liber Gratissimus," MGH, Lib., I, 71-72.

[242]Damianus, "Disceptatio Synodalis," 93.

[243]Michel, Papstwahl und Königsrecht, 186, 192.

[244]Damianus, "Disceptatio Synodalis," 89-90.

[245]Haller, Das Papsttums, II, 338-41.

[246]Damianus, "Epistola III," PL, CXLIV, 294ff.

[247]Caspar, Register Gregors VII, I, 202ff.

[248]Damianus, "Opusculum XXX," PL, CXLV, 538.

[249]Damianus, "Opusculum XII," Ibid., 258.

[250]Damianus, "Opusculum XXVIII," Ibid., 527.

[251]Damianus, "De Brevitate Vitae Pontificum Romanorum," PL, CXLV, 471ff.

[252]Damianus, "De Divina Omnipotentia," in Brezzi, op. cit., 50.

[253]Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, III, 682ff.

[254]Damianus, "Liber Gomorrianhus," PL, CXLV, 170.

[255]Ibid., 172.

[256]Ibid., 172-73. Compare Damianus, "Epistola I," PL, CXLIV, 218ff.

[257]See above, p.

[258]See "Vita Sancti Mauri," PL, CXLIV, 952; "Vita Sancti Loricati," Ibid., 1023; "Vita Sancti Rodolphi," Ibid., 1010; "Epistola VIII," Ibid., 161; and "Epistola IV," Ibid., 316.

[259]Although in no part of Damiani's writings was the primacy of the See of Rome ever questioned, there is a distinct difference the view of that primacy between Humbert and Damiani. Humbert always emphasized the judicial primacy of Rome, that is, the administrative primacy; while Damiani emphasized the preaching of the moral law and baptism as the two functions of the priesthood. Primacy was given to Rome insofar as there existed the magisterial supremacy of the priesthood in exercising these two functions. In Humbert we find a eulogy of the pope as a judge and administrator. In Damiani's writings we find a eulogy of the teaching and preaching virtues of the pope. It is the pope as interpeter of Holy Scripture that Damiani

emphasizes. It is for this reason that Damiani is particularly devoted to St. Paul. See his "De Picturis Principum Apostolorum," PL, CXLV, 593, where the traditional iconography is discussed. See also Damiani's "Epistola I," PL, CXLIV, 218ff., where Paul is presented as the leader of those devoted to the contemplative life. Damiani argues that Paul did not ascend a throne, because he came to teach men--not to rule them. See "De Picturis Principum Apostolorum," 592-93.

CHAPTER III

GREGORY VII AS LEADER: PAPAL LEADERSHIP DURING THE GREGORIAN REVOLUTION, 1073-99

Historical fact merges with myth in any investigation of the real nature of Gregory VII and his pontificate. The great church leader of the eleventh century assumes a universality of interpretation at the hands of his contemporaries and successors. His contribution to the foundation of papal power was as important as the contributions of Augustine, Leo I, Gregory I, Cyprian and others of the primitive Church.[1] Later political or theological movements sought inevitably to justify their existence by finding precedent for their activity by allying their names with ideas to be found in Gregory's registers, no less than did a host of thinkers and reformers constantly return to St. Augustine for justification of radical religious ideas. It is significant, however, that during the schism of 1130 only one side claimed to act in the spirit of Gregory VII: the Anacletan party. The Innocentians, supported by St. Bernard of Clairvaux and a large monastic following, did not seek to ally their cause with the figure of the great pope who preceded them. The reasons for this repudiation of the Gregorian ideal by the Innocentians seems to lie in the way in which the pope was

described by both his adherents and his adversaries during the period 1073-1130.[2] Let us consider for a moment the peculiar character of the Gregorian revolution and then note how Gregory himself was seen through the eyes of his contemporaries. It will become obvious that he not only consciously instituted a new concept of the papal office, that is, put the ideas of Humbert of Silva-Candida into practice, but at the same time instituted a whole new concept of the function of the leader in the Christian community.

The young Hildebrand was related closely to the Roman nobility and was the nephew of Gregory VI. He probably came himself to Rome at an early age and studied at the papal school in the Lateran Palace: the schola cantorum Lateranensis. In Rome he seems to have taken minor orders; the fact that he was chaplain to Gregory VI indicates that he was a cleric rather than a monk. When Gregory VI was deposed by Henry III, Hildebrand accompanied him to Cluny where the Pope died.[3] Immediately after Gregory VI's death Hildebrand took monastic vows at Cluny, but he remained at the monastery only for a few months, returning to Rome shortly thereafter and assuming a place in the curia of Leo IX. As archdeacon Hildebrand rose in power within the curia, making that office a real political power in intra curial politics. In conjunction with Chancellor Humbert of Silva Candida, Hildebrand and other "new men" of the curia transformed the papal machinery into the awesome thing that it became after the death of Alexander II.[4]

Peter Damiani's death was followed by the election of

Hildebrand as Pope Gregory VII to succeed Alexander II.[5] The publication of the Dictatus Papae in 1080 indicates Gregory's desire to assume personal command of the Church administrative machinery and declares open war upon the Holy Roman Empire.[6] Publicly the Dictatus affirms that (1) the Roman Church has never erred, can never err; (2) the pope is supreme judge, may be judged by none, and there is no appeal from him; (3) no synod may be called a general one without his order; (4) he may depose, transfer, reinstate bishops; (5) he alone is entitled to the homage of all princes; (6) he alone may depose the emperor. Behind these injunctions lies a whole new ideological world view, a world view which encompasses a complete acceptance of the new learning, a new idea of the nature of law, and a wholly different concept of the structure of society in which the state was definitively subordinated to the priestly power.[7]

Little is known about the intellectual route by which Gregory came to embrace the individual points of his revolution.[8] In his registers we find him constantly appealing for the "libertas" of the Church in the name of "perfecta caritas et christianae concordia unitas."[9] The use of such terms would seem to place Gregory within the same general framework as that of his fellow cardinal, Peter Damiani. There is no doubt that Gregory sought to present his reform as part and parcel of the monkish reform of an earlier generation. To this end he incorporated the monkish propaganda into his own. However, examination of his pontificate

reveals that Gregory's thought (that is, his propaganda) and his actions led to different results in the direction of the reform program than they had been meant to fill under Damiani's program.[10]

The enigma which Gregory VII has presented to historians for so long may be in part explained by the ability of the pope to mask his new reform of the administrative machinery of the Papacy behind the terms of the earlier ideas of men like Damiani. Gregory's propagandists might use Damiani's concept of the state, mutatis mutandis, for ends quite unforeseen by Damiani when he conceived them. In Gregory's registers the sacrum imperium is transformed into the imperium Petri; knightly orders might be called the militia Christi or militia Sancti Petri.[11] The ideal of the unitas Christiana might be eulogized, but it was a unitas "ordered" by the Apostolic See.[12] Traditio might be invoked, but it was a tradition of an anti-imperial primitive Church which Gregory sought to popularize, a pre-Constantinian Church, and, therefore, a Church which admitted no relationships with the Empire.[13] The ecclesia was to be purified, returned to its pristine state, but for Gregory this meant the exclusion of the secular from any voice in Church affairs and the destruction of the Reichskirche.[14] Concordia was to be the ordering principle of the newly defined Gregorian society just as it had been for Damiani, but as Henry IV pointed out at Canossa, it was to be a concord dominated by the pope's own law.[15] Charitas was to be the lubricant of social action, but now,

under Gregory VII, it was to be guaranteed by a consistent system of law.

Open rupture with the Empire was prepared for by the careful preparation of canon law.[16] The attack was to be launched in the name of tradition, purification of the Church, and return to the ideal ecclesia primitiva. Thus the Gregorian revolution would be presented, like most revolutions, as a cleansing of the body social. Canon lawyers purport to find in ancient canon law the injunction that "all prescriptions of law proceed from the authority of the Roman Pontiff."[17] Deusdedit, Anselm and Bonizio of Sutri combine a fine sense of dialectic, an excellent propaganda style, and a through study of canon law sources in the exposition of this idea.[18] Virtues such as those seen in the three named men came to be honored in the Roman Curia in a way which would never have been countenanced under the fundamentalist Peter Damiani.

Rhetoric and the study of logic and letters came to be especially esteemed in a curia geared to the victory of new concepts of social organization. The tradition of Rome as center of the world had never died out completely.[19] During the early tenth century a monk had written:

> O Roma nobilis, orbis et domina
> cunctarum urbium excellentissima,
> roseo martyrum sanguine rubea,
> alibis et virginum liliis candida;
> saluatem dicimus tibi per omnia
> Te benedicimus- salve per saecula![20]

But note that here it is the Rome of the martyrs which is eulogized. Now, riding upon the crest of renovatio theories,

ideas of a resurgence of Rome's ancient governmental greatness, the Gregorians sieze upon ancient Rome as an archetype of the new dominion which the Papacy claims.[21] Gregory sees the Roman cross carried on the eagles of the Roman legions to the far corners of the earth. The Rome of the martyrs, while honored still, gives way to the Rome of the Caesars, and both Romes are incorporated into a new and more glorious "eternal city." During Gregory's reign a monk of Monte Cassino hails the rise of the new center of the world:

> Orbis honor, Roma splendere decorata corona
> Victorum regum, discretio maxima legum
> His simul et multis aliis redimita triumphis
> O victrix salve, cuius super ethere polme
> Pulchre scripuntur, et quam colit undique mundus.
> Que vox, quis sapiens, vel quel facundia verbi
> Quisque tuas laudis poterit replicare poeta? [22]

Gregory, moved by the same intoxicating spirit, writes to the King of Sweden that the "law of the Roman Popes now held sway over more lands than that of the Roman Emperors," that the Pope's insignia were now displayed throughout the world, and that once were the Emperor had commanded, Christ commanded (through the pope) now. Thus the idea of the translatio imperii took form, and Gregory argued himself that when Constantine retired from the west, he left the control of the Empire to the popes.[23] The popes alone held power in Church and State and they alone should rule.

As a seeming corollary to the rise of Rome's prestige as a symbol was the rise of its nobility as allies of the popes. Aside from the peculiar Roman character of the Papal Curia (even Peter Damiani had referred to it as the "senate

of the Church,"[24] the Papacy now came to depend ever increasingly upon the wealth and military power of the Roman nobility. New families emerged in Rome, rich Jewish bankers and merchants were given noble status and thus allied to the Papacy. The Frangipane and Pierleoni, the principle actors in the drama of 1130-38, emerge at this time, supplying both arms and money to the prosecution of the papal cause at home and abroad.[25]

Just as the revival of classical motifs were joined to the papal cause, so too were those cultural centers which had led in the twelfth century renaissance. The great cultural centers of Cluny and Monte Cassino were strongly allied to the papal program.[26] Men drawn from these monasteries, themselves now the champions of a new kind of humanistic monasticism, remained in the forefront of the Gregorian intellectual elite.[27] Both Cluny and Monte Cassino supplied administrators, theologians, dialecticians, and lawyers to the Roman Curia, and by the time Paschal II ascended the throne the terms "curia" was allied in the popular mind with the great abbatial courts of Cluny in France and Monte Cassino in Italy.[28]

Florence and Milan, themselves in a turmoil of social and intellectual revolution, supplied new leaders to Gregory's movement no less than did the great abbeys named.[29] A new kind of leader had come to Rome. He was not a wild eyed ascetic, although he had the ability to couch his arguments in ascetic terms. He was a logician, a rhetorician, and an administrator. The political aims which the Gregorian Papacy embraced necessitated the recruitment of a kind of

leader who was, unlike the monk, both interested in the conversion of the world and able to use the sciences which could sway the public to the papal view. Although this new leader- the pope as humanist-administrator- was not formally recognized as the most desirable leader of the Christian community until c. 1118, ascetics and imperialist writers sensed that a change in leadership concepts had taken place. Working out of the Roman Curia, a new kind of Church administrator appeared in the provinces (the legati a latere), and the men chosen to fill this new office were not men devoted to the ideal of withdrawal from the world but the conversion of it. In his creation of two great institutions, the papal bureaucracy and canon law, Gregory VII assumes his important place in history, and in the creation of these institutions he forced the Church to recognize that a "new man" had entered the lists in the struggle of Pope against Emperor.

One might argue that the difficulty of presenting a true or at least consistent picture of Gregory VII stems from his confusion of the two ideals which he, as personality and as pope, embraces. On the one hand it cannot be denied that he ardently desired a complete moral reformation of the whole Church. In this respect he worked within the monkish-ascetic hierarchy of values. On the other hand it was his genius which recognized that no reform could be lasting which did not take up the role of the priestly hierarchy of values and build around it a new concept of Church organization, one that would be lasting, consistent, and free from external interference. Thus, the theory, the justification for his

revolution, is always presented in terms of the ascetic hierarchy of values and appeals to the monkish followers in his train. By his actions, however, we see emerge a financier and a warrior, an administrator and an organizer, who, rejecting the ascetic ideal of withdrawal from the world to a life of contemplation, emerges to do battle with it, to organize it, to subdue it, and finally to leave it under the control of a self-perpetuating hierocracy which will often confuse its own ends with the ends of the Church as a whole.

Gregory's accomplishment was blended with his own personality. Himself the creator or organizer of a purely Amtscharismatic system, Gregory was able to establish such a system only because his own leadership was charismatic. He could blind even the most ardent mystic to the priestly revolution which he was leading by the apparent otherworldy inspiration under which he worked. Such an anti-intellectual as Manegold of Lautenbach, closer ideologically to Damiani than to Gregory, was one of the Pope's strongest supporters and saw him as the cleanser of Christianity and restorer of the monastic ideal.[30] The imperialist critics of Gregory saw behind the cowl, however, and tried to point out that while Gregory himself might profess to be a monk, in his ideals he was anything but that. A whole stream of anti-papal literature spews forth in the late eleventh century in which it argued that Gregory is a false monk, a false cowl, and a perpetrator of radical new ideas designed to destroy the old Christian unitas. Imperialists did not, however, hit upon a propaganda line until c. 1090 when Peter Crassus, possibly

the most brilliant of the anti-Gregorians, avowed that the struggle between Pope and Emperor was really a struggle between different concepts of law.[31] Crassus' own work on Roman law had been a real contribution to that science. In his work he had constantly reiterated that the realm of the law was the realm of the king: "Omnes anima sublimioribus potestatibus subdita est, non est enim potestas nisi a Deo,' cognosces non Ildebrando monacho, sed Henrico regi pertinere."[32] At the same time Crassus accused Gregory of being sent from the "synagogue of Satan," a false monk and a materialist.[33] But Crassus' attacks were made of the same stuff as the canon lawyers' attacks against the emperor. His arguments from Roman law could hardly hope to sway the pietists at that time still firmly ranged behind Gregory's standard. Crassus merely appealed to another auctoritas and a secular auctoritas for all.

Wido of Ferrara tried the same tack,[34] arguing that Gregory trafficked in Church offices and was nothing but a warrior in monk's clothing: "a puero terrenae militiae studuit, rebus bellicus semper operam impendit, multimodis homocidiis sese immiscuit, sacrilegio se polluit, periuriis obligavit..."[35] But such arguments had little real chance of swaying Gregory's since they were as convinced that he was a saint as the imperialists were convinced he was a devil.

The anti-pope Clement III probably came closest to realizing an effective course to pursue in the propaganda war against the Gregorians. He discussed the nature of the priestly offices, pointing out that papal interference in

local affairs was no longer valid now that the priesthood was, generally speaking, extremely continent.[36] The truth of this charge was growing more evident daily. But it remained for a monk of Hersfield to seize upon the most effective propaganda line possible for the anti-Gregorians. In the brilliant Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae Conservanda, Walram von Naumburg not only found the knife with which he could undercut the Gregorian concept of the papal office, but he also gave the imperialists an effective counterthrust to the idea of the libertas ecclesiae. This was the concept of the unitas Christiana. It was theologically pure, being based upon the thought of SS Augustine and Cyprian. It had a great appeal for the monastic, being based upon the idea that the leader is leader because he is morally pure. And it was the most brilliantly constructed piece of logical argumentation to come out of the Investiture conflict. Furthermore, it presented the basis whereon imperial theorists and the advocates of the rising pietism might find a common ground of understanding. That understanding would bear fruit not only in the deposition of the curial ideal of Gregorian leadership but in a new synthesis of political thought of Honorius of Autun, Geroh of Reichersberg, Otto of Freising, and St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Significantly, all of these names belong to the generation and the movement which destroyed the Gregorian leadership ideal in the schism of 1130. For that reason we shall devote some time to a discussion of the leadership ideals of Walram of Naumburg.

The Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae Conservanda is undoubted-

ly a propaganda work.[39] The reasons for its promulgation of course have nothing to do with either the truth or falsity of the charges it brought against the Gregorians or with the logic of its arguments. However, it is important that we realize that this tractate apparently did not spring from a mind engaged in pure contemplation of philosophic ideals. In our terms, therefore, it is most important, for as a propaganda piece it can be expected, if the author is at all competent, to play upon themes which had a great immediacy for the day. Propagandistic writings are, thus envisaged, better indications of popular ideology than philosophical tracts. Since this work has all the indications of being directed at pietists and monks in the Gregorian camp, we shall wish to note particularly the concept of social organization of the writer, his view of the nature of Church organization,[40] and his leadership ideals.

As the title suggests, the main theme of the work is the Christian unitas. By the use of this term, Walram apparently wished to juxtapose the spiritual nature of the corpus mysticum, which was to him the essential aspect of Christianity, to the objectified Leviathan he conceived the papal bureaucracy to be.[41]

Now, before we proceed, it would be well to discuss something of the method used by Walram in the exposition of his theme. The entire work hinges upon the definition of such terms as charitas, humilitas, paupertas, ignorantia, sapientia, scientia, and unitas in such a way that their

emotional connotations can be exploited to the utmost as propaganda material. That is to say, these terms are the skeletons upon which Walram hangs his discourse, but they are used only as references to bodies of knowledge and things which have a high emotional content in the religious community. For example, the first three terms are presented as ideal virtues and are linked with the life of Christ as revealed in scripture. They are thus given an emotional content that they would not have if merely used abstractly. Similarly, in his attempt to appeal to the monks who will read his work, Walram makes distinctions between sapientia and scientia and seeks to ally the former to monkish wisdom while giving the latter the peculiar character of being the creation of "scribes and pharisees." The word unitas itself is left as a kind of mystical idea, never fully defined, but constantly played upon. Its value is largely evocative. The method used by Walram was well chosen, for had he attempted to set up merely another objectified concept of law, as had Peter Crassus, he could not have appealed to the pietistic elements of the community to which his tract is apparently directed. Thus if, in the exposition of the leadership ideals of this writer, we seem to be caught in a mystical whirl of terms and count terms, the situation is in part the fault of Walram von Naumburg. For his plan seems to have been to juxtapose in some kind of dialectical sense terms which stood on the one hand for the Gregorians, and on the other for anti-Gregorian, yet pro-monkish, ideals. It was Walram's purpose to use terms which were common to the great mystics and

ascetics who had drunk at the springs of Augustinian ideas[42] in such a way as to make the monkish and imperial causes one.

Behind the mere spinning of terms Walram had another purpose. He desired to discuss in detail, from his own point of view of course, the nature of Christian society, the nature of the relations between Church and State, the nature of the Church as a part of society in general, and the nature of the ideal leader of the religious community. He took his point of departure from a discussion of the cohesive quality of Christian love as a social force. The two key terms used for the exposition of his argument are charitas and unitas. He assumes, with St. Augustine, that men are essentially good and that they manifest that goodness through charitas.[43] Charitas is not only the manifestation of faith, it is the way to faith. In a society of Christians charitas will be manifested in unitas, by which diverse elements of society are bound together for the benefit of the whole: "per caritatem concordans membrorum unitate collegit in coelum in ipso redemptore, qui est caput ecclesiae."[44] The unitas thus created is a kind of corpus mysticum which needs no official or external bonds to hold it together: "Sic enim ipse orat ad patrem pro fidelibus suis, quos praedistinavit concordes fore in vinculo caritatis et pacis: 'Rogo ut omnes unum sint, sicut tu pater in me et ego in te, ut ipsi in nobis unum sint, et dilectio qua dilexisti me, in ipsis sit et ego in eis.'"[45] The idea, from the first, is given the authority of St. Augustine, an authority which serves to carry the entire

work: "Unde sanctus Augustinus in ipsius evangeli expositione: 'In uno, inquit, estote, unum estote, unus estote.' Et: 'Vae illis, qui oderunt unitatem ecclesiae, presumentis in hominibus partes facere.'"[46]

In beginning his discussion with a eulogy of the mystical unitas of society and its unifying agent, charitas, Walram immediately created an atmosphere in which any rupture of society for any purpose was looked upon as a sin. Neither Church nor State is justified in breaking the unitas because neither has a realm in which it may come into conflict with the other.[47] If a conflict emerges, it is because one or the other has confused its proper role. Harmonious relations between the powers of society are signified by the existence of pax. Pax is seen as the inheritance of the Church and the result of real unitas: "Christus pax est et hereditas ecclesiae pax est...."[48]

Now the peculiar quality of the Church which makes it the custodian of pax is its "internal" nature. The Church is a community of saints forming the heavenly city, the celestial Jerusalem:

> Christus enim est pax nostra, et ipsa est pax nostra quoque patria, ad quam suspiramus, et ad quam tendimus, si tamen pacifere sumus, quoniam caelestis Hierusalem, quae est mater nostra, visio pacis interpretatur, cuius terminos posuit Dominus pacem, sicut per psalmistam dicitu r: cuius participatio eius in id ipsum, ut scilicet ecclesia Dei, que et civitas Dri, unum corpus sit cum Christo, quid ipsum est, quod aeternaliter est, de quo Moysi dictum est: 'Ego sum qui sum.'"[49]

The leaders of the spiritual community and its members do not have need of "external signs" to distinguish them; they

are distinguished by their holiness, by their manifestation of *charitas*.[50] Similarly, the member to the "inner Church" is possessed of a certain knowledge which is purely internal and with which he is able to ascertain good and evil.[51] The good man can find his *pax* within him and his salvation through *charitas*; he therefore has little need of the "external Church" which has been erected by the Gregorians.[52]

This does not mean that Walram ignores the whole corpus of Gregorian writings which had demonstrated Rome's claim to magisterial supremacy in the Church. He recognizes that Rome kept the honors of the apostolic primacy, but he will not admit that Rome also was made heir to the princely *imperium* of the Roman emperors.[53] In other words, Walram does not accept the concept of the *translatio imperii* which was an integral part of Gregorian theory. He sees two powers in society, Church and State, but he sees them living together in concord in much the same manner envisaged by Peter Damiani in the *Disceptatio Synodalis*.[54] But the prince must have freedom if he is to fulfill his duty of protecting the community from its external enemies.[55]

Thus we have the picture. The Christian community has two authorities, State and Church. The two are bound together in a mystical *unitas* which, if it is real, will result in *charitas* and *pax*. The Church has a purely spiritual function; but the real membership in the Church is an internal membership. The realm of the State is the realm of force, created to protect the Christian community from without. Both powers

are directly subject to God, but both prince and priest are responsible for the maintenance of the peace in the community. If one party breaks the peace, the other is acting rightly if it tries to restore the concord which distinguishes the Christian community. Walram was willing to admit that St. Ambrose had acted rightly in the correcting of Theodosius, but he pointed out that Ambrose withheld the sacraments from Theodosius because Theodosius, as a man, had sinned against God, and it was as a man that he was corrected.[56] The action of Ambrose in no way signifies the superiority of the priestly power over the princely. On the authority of Augustine, Walram holds that the princely power is as divine in its origin as the priestly and notes that according to the Apostles it is not the function of the priest to dispose or set in order the princely office.[57]

Once the business of definition is finished the author of the Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae discusses the proper leadership of the Church community and attempts to show how the Gregorians deviate from the ideal. The model for the ideal leader is to be found in the monk. The entire second book of the Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae is devoted to a discussion of leadership ideals, first in terms of what the religious leader should not be (i.e. a Gregorian) and then in terms of what he should be (i.e. a monk-ascetic). By setting up his arguments in this form, Walram apparently hoped to estrange the monkish support of the Gregorian Reform from the Papacy. Whether he accomplished that aim or not is impossible to say, but he did succeed in outlining the major attributes of

Gregorian leadership ideals and demonstrated that they were essentially priestly rather than ascetic.

The second book begins with an empirical look at the state of Christian society of the time (c. 1090). It is apparent that society is not in a state of pax, so Walram undertakes to discover the reasons for this rupture of the unitas. Hildebrand has set "episcopus adversus episcopum, clerus adversus clerum, populus adversus populum immo filius adversus patrem et pater adversus filium" in his quest for power.[58] This can be the only explanation for Walram, for prior to Hildebrand the Church and the State lived together in peace. The description of the rupture of the peace by Hildebrand is allied to the growing criticism of the papal use of the crusade psychology in arousing the populace against the king.[59]

Hildebrand is seen as a student of war who in his desire for power has erected a great court with which to exploit the people of God:

> Sed Hildebrant papa sic divisit etiam sacerdotia, quemadmodum ecclesiam Dei atque rem publicam imperii, quoniam inde segreavit sibi... Exinde divisa est ecclesia et divisa sunt ecclesiae sacerdotia, atque scandalorum orta sunt genera; exinde crevit grave et diuturnum bellum, et non solum civile bellum. . .; exinde etiam corruptae sunt divinae pariter et humanae leges, sine quibus non subsistet vel Dei ecclesiae vel imperii res publica... Haec nunc abundare et superabundare propter doctrinam Hildebrandi papae, qua divisit corpus vel ecclesiae vel rei publicae, nunquid hoc est apostolicum esse?[60]

In his analysis of Hildebrand's crimes Walram presents us with a summary of the vices which distinguish the bad

leader; he presents us with the obverse of what he considers to be the ideal leader of the Christian community. The major crime of the bad leader is pride (superbia) and the fruit of his activity is the destruction of charitas generally and the destruction of monkish values specifically.[61] He promises destruction in the afterlife for those who follow Hildebrand's in the destruction of charitas. This destruction of charitas is represented by Hildebrand's leading of the rebellion against traditio, and its carrier, the sacrum imperium.[62]

Since Hildebrand's crime consists in the bane of the monkish life, pride, Walram examines the manifestations of this pride in detail. With obvious reference to the administrative system created by Gregory and developed by Urban II, Walram describes the attempts by Gregory to erect a Babylon, an earthly city, upon the foundations of the Church: "erexit sibi statuam contra Deum caeli, ut adorent eum omnes, qui non pertinent ad civitatem Dei, quales etiam sunt cultiores perversorum dogmatum, etc..."[63] The canon lawyers in Rome have erected a Tower of Babel (id est confusio) by which they hope to confound the simple folk who make up the mass of the Church.[64] Rome is, Walram declares, in the hands of a group of "scribes and pharisees," who dispense false justice in a language of their own making: dialectic.[65] These lawyers and dialecticians have created a body of false knowledge by which the unitas has been torn asunder. This attack upon the epistemological basis of the Gregorian Reform was a masterstroke by Walram, for by so arguing he was able to enlist the adherents to the Augustinian "metaphysics of inner experience" in the imperial

cause. At the same time, he destroyed the careful structure of objective law by which the Gregorians had hoped to protect themselves from charismatic leader as well as Emperor. Walram delivered a final thrust by developing the theme of "Hildebrand, false monk."

Whether Gregory VII had or had not been a monk before becoming pope has annoyed historians since Martens published his arguments on the question at the end of the last century.[66] One finds a number of sources which state that Gregory had been a monk, but there are a greater number which state that Gregory was a "false monk." We hold that, since the evidence pro and con on the question is derived from libelli de lite, the question of whether or not Gregory was a monk is not pertinent. Dom Borino, in the latest and most exhaustive study of the sources, concludes that Hildebrand not only took monkish vows, but in all probability took them at Cluny.[67] If Gregory was a monk, then we must account for the "false monk" tradition in the Streitschriften of the period. Certainly men like Wenric of Trier and Benon of Alba were not so naive as to base whole arguments upon a misstatement of fact which could have been easily disproved or was common knowledge.

The resolution of the whole question, it seems to me, turns around the real meaning of the term "false monk." Nowhere, in all of the sources of the period, is it said that Gregory had not taken monkish vows; it is only affirmed that he is a "false monk."[68] Now, in the terms of the time, it is

one thing to say that a man was not a monk (that is, that he had not taken monkish vows), but it is quite another thing to state that he was a "false monk." The first statement is a statement of fact; the second is a statement of value. The anti-Gregorians are consistent in their use of the second type of statement. They wish to say that he is an apostate from the vows he had taken as a monk.[69] In fact, their whole propaganda attempt fails (considering the values of the time) if Gregory had not at one time actually taken monastic vows.[70] The anti-Gregorians wish to show that he has broken away from the ascetic hierarchy of values which distinguish the monk - that he has foresaken the ideal of withdrawal from the world for the idea of domination of the world. In one sense, we may conclude that if Gregory had not been a monk, the anti-Gregorian argument would have collapsed. Hence, the question of whether Gregory was or was not a monk is not to the propagandist a question of historical fact. He is interested in the amount the emotional content which he can give to Gregory's alleged apostasy from the ascetic hierarchy of values. We must assume, therefore, that the ascetic hierarchy of values still had a high prestige in the time in which Walram wrote and that this value system still stood distinct from the sacerdotal value system. For only if this were true could Walram hope to estrange his monkish audience from the Gregorian program.

We can understand the reasons for the long discussion of the values of society in general which Walgam undertook in the first half of the Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae.

Society's values, to Walram, are monkish values. The terms charitas, humilitas, pax, and paupertas can be used effectively as propaganda material only to an audience which has made those terms the basis of its life. The priestly hierarchy and the laity, viewed from the aspect of their official role in society, do not act upon such values. The monk does or falls.

Now a monk is known by his ability to withdraw from society and his ascetic practices.[71] The fact that Gregory VII calls himself "servus servorum Dei" means to Walram that he is the servant of the ideals of the monk, or at any rate he professes to be.[72] Yet how can Gregory and his followers be true monks when they have precipitated a schism between regnum and sacerdotium: "Quale mysterium iniquitatis nunc operatur per quosdam, qui dicuntur monachi, confundentes ecclesiam pariter et rem publicam perverso dogmato suo, qui adversantur et extollunt se adversus regiam potestatem..."[73] Gregory is shown as having led in the degeneration of Benedictine more in his rebellion against the secular power:

> Sed monachi, de quorum schismatibus atque scripturis tractamus, longe degeneraverunt ab illa, quam professi sunt, beati Benedicti paternitate, qui docent regiae potestate, immo divinae ordinationi resistendum esse, et exaltant se contra pontificatum sedis apostolicae, qui etiam si justos et regulares monachose esse profitentur...[74]

The Gregorians are likened to the third order of monks listed by Benedict and destined for hell.[75]

Gregory's personal apostasy has, according to Walram, led to a general decline of monkish virtues. In this state-

ment our author wished to appeal to the new reform elements then forming. Monastic life is seen to be in decline both in practice and in theory. Monks have been brought from the monastery to take part in the erection of the great hierocracy which is Gregory's.[76] More important in Walram's mind, however, are the innovations which Gregory has introduced into the monasteries in the way of destroying the old, traditional epistemology. Here we are presented with Walram's attack upon dialectic in which the concept of the "metaphysics of inner experience," sapientia, is juxtaposed to Gregorian knowledge, scientia.

The Gregorians are presented as "scribes and pharisees," who dispense false justice and preach a false science:

> Qui ne pueros quidem vel adolescentes permittunt in monasteriis habere studium salutaris scientiae, ut scilicet rude ingenium nutriatur siliquis daemoniorum, quae sunt consuetudines humanarum traditionum;...'Vae vobis, scribae et pharisaei, hypocritae, qui tulistis clavem scientiae...' Igitur ignoratio divinarum scripturarum ignoratio est Christi, qui dicitur virtus Dei et sapientiae Dei.[77]

The institution of dialectic has thus destroyed the ideals of monasticism no less than it has destroyed the pax of the unitas Christiana. Gregory's death in exile was a fitting end for the man who had destroyed the peace of the Christian community.[78]

Thus we see the reason for the "false monk" concept. Gregory's crimes are, in Walram's mind, made much more heinous by the fact that he has rebelled against vows once taken. The whole of the Gregorian rebellion is cast as un-monkish,

based upon the conquest of the world and having secular ends.[79] We shall see that the theme thus developed by Walram began to have real meaning for the monks when, in 1112, Paschal II's pietistic policies were destroyed by the Curia. Meanwhile, we must take account of the leadership concept which Walram created.

If Gregory is what a good leader is not and is at the same time, to Walram's way of thinking, a "false monk," then the ideal leader of the Christian society is the monk, the true monk. This occupation of this position was, in a sense, to be expected. For from the imperial standpoint the monk, by his ideal of withdrawal, represented the ideal type to lead that part of the whole of society which is devoted to "otherworldly" ends. Rome was the recognized head of the Church as the center of apostolic power; but since Walram had defined the Church as an "internal" Church, it followed that the ideal leader was the highest approximation of the "internal man." This is the good monk.

Walram argues that Gregory's famous epistle to Hermann of Metz does not manifest the prime virtue of the Christian, that is, <u>charitas</u>.[80] He shows that Gregory's real aim is not salvation but dominion "super reges et super regna."[81] Now, if the monk is the real leader of Christianity his virtues are the real virtues of the Christian community; and these virtues seek dominion over the faults of the soul, internal faults. Election to leadership in the religious community is not to be had, therefore, by any external office that a

man may hold. His leadership is leadership by example:

> Unum itaque signum est electionis: soliditas caritatis. Unde ne vel miraculis quidem preproborum seducamur, quae non finit ex caritate, sed per elationem. 'In hoc, inquit Dominus, cognoscent omnes, quia mei est discipuli, si dilectionem habueritis ad invicem.' Igitur ubi non est caritas, unde unitur ecclesia, ibi non est iusitia, et ubi non est iustitia, ibi nec virtus aliqua, quoniam omnes virtutem species continentur uno iustitiae nomine, cum et iustitia sit lex divina et vinculum societas humana. [82]

The elect of the "internal" Church are blessed with a special kind of wisdom; this is the wisdom derived from the sources of Christian revelation. It is the Augustianian sapientia, which exists in the highest degree in the monk. This sapientia is identified with the "foolishness of the Cross" of which St. Paul speaks: "Iuxta quod iterum dicit Apostolum: 'Non sitis alta sapientes, sed humilibus consentientes;' humiles quippe sunt unanimes et pacifici, qui non faciunt scismata, sed superbi faciunt ea, quales diciuntur pharisaei, qui per falsam iustitiam sunt a caeteris divisi."[83] Paul was quoted for the purpose of attacking the canon lawyer and the dialectician in the Gregorian court. That the Curia did not realize the force of such an attack will be seen in our study of Rangier of Lucca's life of Anselm of Lucca, in which the very revolution in epistemology that Walram labels as anti-monkish is lauded as a virtue.

But Walram's argument of sapientia vs. scientia had another use; it served to link his position to the reform psychology of the time. It represented an attempt to return to the unpolluted sources of Christian thought. He could say: "cum absque Patre non profetur, cum absque Christo non

dicitur, cum sine Spiritu sancto non assumatur,...diabolus est."[84] And again: Haec sunt verba beati Cypriani de cultoribus humanae traditionis, quorum consuetudines diversae quidem sunt in diversis locis, se d quicquid diversum est, hoc utique verum non est; est enim Deus verax, omnis utem homo mendax."[85] He insinuated that wisdom of a higher sort was possible to the monk, but not in monasteries, founded by Gregory, in which: "Plus quam evangelium Christi et mandatum Dei valent... consuetudines eorum, quae sunt mandata hominum."[86]

Real wisdom (religious wisdom) has, according to Walram, been presented in three principle sources: the Bible, the writings of St. Augustine, and the Rule of St. Benedict. These three sources represent Walram's reference group. In that order, one has direct revelation, theological explanation of that revelation, and the practical rule for the attainment of the salvation promised in the revelation. Not by subtle philosophical distinctions, but by devotion to the Benedictine Rule, a man may find his own salvation. To the extent that a man follows this rule, to that extent he is the leader of the community.[87] He is recognized by his fruits, not his office. He will manifest pax, humilitas, and, above all, charitas.[88] He will lead by the example of the purity of his life, not because he has been elected to an office. This, according to Walram, is what distinguishes Clement III from the Gregorians.[89] One is reminded of Damiani's letter to Alexander II in which he stated that the real virtues of the Church were those of the ecclesia primitiva, namely, patience,

humility, and charity.

In the final section of the work, the monastic leadership ideal is given symbolic form by a discussion of the cowl as the symbol of Christian unity, but not before one long section has developed the idea that "clothes do not make the monk." Both Christian and classical sources (Quintilian) are cited to prove the point.[90] Thus, Walram can stress the essential quality of the monk's profession, the fact that he receives his honors as a result of the place he has attained in the moral hierarchy. He is not what he is by mere conferment of office. The office of the monk, as the office of the true Christian, is internal, and the cowl does not make a man a monk anymore than legal election makes the Bishop of Rome the <u>real</u> leader of the Christian community.

In the true Church external office must be a reflection of internal worth, and the individual's worth is determined by the extent to which he seeks to create an atmosphere of concord, peace, and moral honesty. That is why the cowl of the monk, although it is also only an outward symbol of the internal office, has such symbolic value. It is a symbol of the withdrawal from worldly affairs, a cell in miniature: "Cuculla est quaedam virtus sacramenti...cuculla...est minor cella, dicitur vestis cucullata propter cucullum, qui est capitis operimentum.[91] But in that symbol of withdrawal from the world is also a symbol of the highest wisdom that man can attain and, similarly, the key to the <u>unitas ecclesiae</u>.

> Cuculla est tunica tolaris et cucullata atque manicata, ubi quasi per quemdam pedagogum docentur superius comprehensa sanctae crucis

> mysteria, ut in latitudine si caritas bene operandi, in longitudine perseveratis firmiter inhaerandi, in altitudine contemplatio caelestis vitae, inscrutabilia in profundo Dei iudicia, unde ista in homines venit gratia.[92]

This eulogy of the monk which ends the Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae ties the whole thing together and offers the solution to the schism between regnum and sacerdotium. For this work (1) presents a criticism of the legalist concept of office which the Gregorians champion, (2) seeks to restore the ideal of charismatic leadership in the religious community, (3) seeks to point out that the Gregorians, in establishing a hierocracy built upon canon law and dialectic, have betrayed the monastic ideals which motivated the reform movement in its earliest days, and (4) seeks to destroy the basis of the hierocracy's existence by advocating a return to the "pure" monkish virtues of charitas, humilitas, and paupertas.

The anti-Gregorians learned a good deal from Walram von Naumburg. They exploited the themes he had developed with increasing subtlety. Just prior to the election of Paschal II, in 1098, the work of Benon of Alba was resurrected in the Gesta Romanae Ecclesiae, and in the year 1101 Wido of Osnabruck and Hugh of Flavigny hammered away at the Augustinianism which the imperialists had made their own.

The Gesta Romanae Ecclesiae was especially well done as a propaganda vehicle. Particularly, it directed its attacks against the Gregorian concept of Amtscharismatic leadership. After having castigated Gregory and his successors as destroyers of the unitas, Benon launched into a discussion

of the nature of leadership in the religious community.[93] Hildebrand and Anselm of Lucca are accused of fraud in attempting to remove the See of Rome from moral judgement.[94] He pointed out the errors "quia Hildebrandus cum discipulis suis scripto renovavit, merito a sede Romana divina sententia tanti erroris renovatorem exclusit. Hildebrandus, Turbanus, Deusdedit: 'Romanus pontifex absque dubio sanctus est, si canonice electus fuit.'"[95] Benon concluded that merit, in a moral sense, was as much a part of the election to religious leadership as legal process, and cited the angels whom God ejected from Heaven for their evil, although they had certainly been given a holy office.[96] The office of Rome was nothing if it did not follow all of the teachings of Christ; and if it did not, it could and must be judged.[97]

Wido of Osnabruck, in his tractate Libro de Controversia inter Hildebrandum et Henricum Imperatorem, pictured Gregory VII as the destroyer of charitas, the prime monkish virtue and the basis of Christian unity.[98] He followed this by advocating a return to monkish virtues for the Papacy and a pursual of paupertas as an ideal.[99]

The impact of the imperial arguments upon the Curial following must have been felt, if we are to judge from the works issued by the curia at the time of the election of Paschal II. The imperial use of such Augustinian ideas as the "inner Church" and the "metaphysics of inner experience" was most effective. The "inner Church" ideal was juxtaposed to the hierocracy erected by the Gregorians. The "metaphysics of inner experience" was the logical criticism of

the epistemology of the Gregorian Reform, the epistemology which had given birth to a new concept of law and logic. The mysticism of Augustinian ideas resulted inevitably in an appeal to a type of individualism which opposed the centralization of the Roman party in the Church. Finally, the moralistic concept of office (the ascetic hierarchy of value) stood in direct opposition to the legalism of the Roman See. The Gregorians could not admit that the Pope was answerable for his moral acts without inviting imperial interference in Roman affairs. Thus they were forced to maintain, even in the face of the rising pietism, that the pope was answerable to no one, could be judged by none. Being caught between the Scylla of imperial propaganda and the Charybdis of a growing pietism, the Papacy could only restate its desire for moral purity in the Church while arguing, at the same time, that moral purity was not a condition of the occupancy of the See of Rome. Everyone must answer for his moral acts to Rome, but Rome was answerable only to God. The quandary with which papal propagandists were presented was, in a sense, unsolvable. This may account for the essential uncreativeness of the Papal party during the period 1100-30. Only after the schism of 1130, when the Cistercians had gained control of the Papacy, was the curia willing to grant that the basis of all leadership in the Christian community was morality, and they included in that generalization the office of the Papacy itself. Meanwhile, during Paschal's reign, the curia, dominated by the old Gregorian concepts, answered the imperial challenge as best it could.

Significance of Gregorian Reform Ideals for the Post-Gregorian Papacy and the Concept of Church Leadership
-Summary-

We have seen that the Gregorian Reform movement represented a change in program of the Reform as a whole in that it attempted to define and restore the rights of each order of society. This was the basis of the struggle against the sacrum imperium and the eulogization of the concept of the libertas ecclesiae. The freedom of the Church was to be the watchword for the leadership of the papacy which after victory would assume the role of the fount of justice (justice motivated by the concept of charitas) for the whole of the Christian community. The significance of this program was twofold. It aimed to rehabilitate the morality of the masses which the all powerful papacy, unhampered by imperial pretensions upon its power, would organize and lead to the kingdom of heaven. Thus, metaphysically the pope assumed a priestly, eschatological view of world development, offering the hope of salvation at the end of the time process. In their social message, the Gregorians offered an antidote to what they considered the self-interest and parasitism which the Eigenkirche and a corrupt clergy represented. On the other hand, the Gregorian party sought to strengthen the Church body politic by drawing upon fresh and telling sources of ideological strength, which they found represented in the revived legal, cultural, and philosophical traditions of the late eleventh century.

Gregory, while appropriating what was salutary in the mystical thought of his day, had been careful to avoid the extreme of demanding a monastic discipline for the entire body of the Christian community. His "ordering" of society was embraced by his successors as a program in which each order of the Church and society as a whole was to be judged by standards peculiar to it. The fact that Gregory VII could steer the middle course between the two elements of his reform movement is a testimony to his ability as a politician. Gregory's appeal to the restoration of the ecclesia primitiva effectively bound together the diverse elements of his party. His leadership was a perfect combination of charisma and office, legal authority and spiritual inspiration. However, with the neutralization of the Emperor after the Concordat of Worms and the reform of the clerics by the Cistercians, the appeal to the ecclesia primitiva had to be supported by deeds as well as words. The monks demanded the establishment of the rule of charitas instead of the rule of lex. Gregory's successors found it difficult to abandon an ideology which had stood them in such good stead for so long; this is especially true of the members of the curia, who after 1112 effectively ruled in the pope's name. Thus we shall argue that the new monkish reform of the early twelfth century found itself confronted by a leadership which was a hierocracy, and which, insofar as its leadership ideals were concerned with law and hierarchy, appealed to legality and office rather than to charitas and example.

These "radical Gregorians" who so ruled from 1112-1124 were strict legalists. They represented the younger element in the reform of Henry, who in installing a pious pope had created a Frankenstein; for this younger group, as it developed under the strain of Henry V's attack against the papacy of Paschal II, became committed to a legalist tradition and firm advocacy of Amtscharisma as a leadership idea. Forced by a concourse of events (and not infrequently by their own ambition), the "radical Gregorians" sought to dominate the ecclesiastical hierarchy through the law alone. Whereas Gregory had incorporated his personal power behind the struggle of the libertas ecclesiae and the ideal of restoring the primitive Church, the "radical Gregorians" sought to dominate the Church in the name of the law of Rome and the power of the curia. This the mystical element in the Church could not countenance, for it represented a negation of the Augustinian view of society in practice and a rejection (through its adherence to the new learning) of the Augustinian metaphysic in theory. Consequently, the monk had been forced out of a stake in the reform by the rejection of his ideals. Calixtus II was the first member of the secular clergy to wear the papal crown since the days of Henry III. As we shall show, the members of the College of Cardinals who had been monastics were all of the new breed of cultured and refined gentlemen, men like Giles of Tusculo, Peter of Pisa, and Peter Pierleoni. They were men who had come from the cultural centers of Pisa, Pavia, and Padua and from monasteries in the process of cultural revivals, such as Monte

Cassino and Cluny. The young notarii et scrinarii of the Lateran, who had been trained in these two centers, were almost certain of a cardinal's hat. They were the new leaders. But in their development under Paschal II we shall note a curious phenomenon, i.e. the development of the idea in the curia that it too had, by virtue of its participation in the source of Divine authority (Roman See), a claim to inviolability. The curia, after the humiliation of Sutri of 1111, rejected Paschal II as an effective leader, and that pope more than any other had embodied monkish ideals to the extreme.

The curia had, by a logical extension of Humbert's ideas and as a practical advantage of Gregory's policy, developed a rigid constitutionalism. They held that, vis-a-vis the pope, the curia alone could act as judge of his actions (but only in matters of faith), and if necessary they could depose him. The argument followed from the assumption that the papacy was an office of both pope and curia. Even more curious is the fact that the curia argued that no one in the Universal Church might judge them. The differences between pope and curia were, so to speak, a family matter, a purely Roman matter. Thus envisaged, no one outside of the Roman clergy might pass upon the validity of curial or papal acts. As a result of such arguments the office of the papacy was removed from control of and direct contact with the general body of believers.

The men of Paschal's time rejected rule by inspiration

for rule by law, and at the same time rejected rule by charisma for rule by authority. The pressing of this claim was the characteristic of the period 1100-1125. The struggle on the part of the curia to maintain the universal character of the Church vis-a-vis the general membership while maintaining a rigid constitutionalism vis-a-vis the pope accounts for some of the events of Paschal's reign, both in Rome and in the provinces, which have until now not received satisfactory exposition. In our analysis of Paschal's rule we shall show how these events occurred and show how at the same time a movement was growing in the Church to recapture the papacy from the curia. What Gregory had accomplished was the creation of a novel manifestation of papal power. This was his ideal of a politically creative papal leadership which was popularized through his activities as well as through the myth which sprang up after his death. Gregory, like Augustus, had the ability to present a revolution as the restoration of fallen traditional political forms. This allowed him to create an ideology upon which the Church could sustain itself long after he had ceased to be. But there can be little doubt that the basis of Gregory's power, while depending upon the appeal of the moral reform as a point of departure, could only be made permanent through the propagation of a body of law which was recognized as quasi-divine and the creation of a bureaucracy to implement the new law. The pope's claim was thus similar to the Roman emperor's in yet another way; he was the source of law, and his pronouncements had the force of law. Like Augustus, Gregory argued

that it was his role to unfetter law from the dominance of self-interest and to make it the expression of divine will working for the benefit of the whole of society. This was effected by emphasizing the concept of appeal, which had the double end of giving the pope a lever into local affairs and making him appear as the pater of the Christian familia.

However, the men who effected his revolution, the curia, kept a share of the new power for themselves and this same system of appeals and the rule by law revealed its weaknesses after the men of Gregory's generation had passed on. In the hands of an impersonal bureaucracy this legal system sometimes tended to be used in the interests of the magistrates rather than in the interests of justice. The result of this negligence was a reaction, severe and instant, on the part of the monastics who thus saw their ideals betrayed. But when reform was attempted (as in 1107-1111) they found themselves blocked by a papal legalism and a rigidly hierocratic bureaucracy in which attempts at moral reform from without were stifled. When Bernard of Clairvaux wrote that the world needed not more law but more trust, he was voicing a typical monkish reaction to the impersonal rule of the Curia as it had developed under Paschal II, Gelasius II, and Calixtus II. Thus envisaged, the schism of 1130 was the outward manifestation of a desire on the part of certain elements of the Church to return to the ideals of the early reform, to the ideals of Damiani, Henry III, to reject the quest for worldly power, to cleanse the papacy, and by freeing the

papacy from the curia, to once more restore the voice of the general Church membership in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER III

[1]See especially the remarks of Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches, trans. Olive Wyon (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1950), I, 233-35. Cfr. the view of Gerd Tellenbach, Church, State and Christian Society, trans. R.F. Bennet (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948), 147-61; Adolf Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte (3rd ed.; Freiburg: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr, 1897), III, 308; and H.X. Arquilliere, St. Grégoire VII: essai sur sa conception du pouvoir pontifical (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1934), 280-1.

[2]See below, p. 175.

[3]The curriculum vitae of Gregory VII has been exhaustively analyzed by G.B. Borino, "Quando e dove si fece monaco Ildebrando," Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati (Citta del Vaticano: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1946), pp. 218-62. See also G.B. Borino, "Ildebrando non si fece monaco a Roma," Studi Gregoriani, IV (1952), 441-56.

[4]G.B. Borino, "L'arcidiaconato di Ildebrando," Studi Gregoriani, III (1953), 463-516. Cfr. the view of Anton Michel, "Humbert und Hildebrand bei Nicholas II (1059-61)," Festschrift Georg Schreiber (Freiburg: Karl Albert Munchen, 1953), pp. 143-155.

[5]Gregory's election is announced by the curia in a letter to Monte Cassino. Here is the new pope described: "virum religiosum, geminae scientiae, prudentia pollentem, equitatis et iustitiae prestantissimum amatorem, in adversis fortem, in prosperis temperatum et iuxta apostoli dictum bonis moribus ornatum, pudicum, modestum, sobrium, castum, hospitalem, domum suam bene regentem, in gremio huius matris ecclesiae a pueritia satis nobiliter educatum et doctum atque pro vitae merito in archideaconatus honorem usque hodie sublimatum Hildebrandum etc...." Erich Caspar, Das Register Gregors VII (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1920), I, 2.

[6]Ibid., I, 203-7. Cfr. the remarks of Karl Hoffman, Der 'Dictatus Papae' Gregors VII: Eine rechtsgeschichtliche Erklärung (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schoningh, 1933), pp. 89-131, and Augustin Fliche, La réforme grégorienne et la reconquête chrétienne (1057-1123), Vol. VIII of Histoire de l'Église, ed. Augustin Fliche and Victor Martin (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1950-), pp. 63-108.

[7]'Rightness' requires the supremacy of the true ruler, of the spiritual authority, in order that in principle all interference with the true ruler may be excluded. In principle, however, such a possibility is only excluded if the State is theoretically

subordinate to the Church, as an organ to be appointed by her for the control of secular affairs, for the organization of secular values and conditions, in relation to the absolute spiritual purpose of life, which is supported by the hierarchy." Troeltsch, Social Teachings of the Christian Churches, I, 229. R.F. Bennet notes in his translation of Tellenbach's monograph: "On the negative side, Gregory's task could only be the destruction of the hitherto dominant regime in Church and State; and this involved, as its primary object, the attempt to peprive princely dominion of the Church of the divine and sacramental character in which it had so long appeared." Tellenbach, Church, State, and Christian Society, p. xiii. Cfr. Wilhelm Berges, Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalter (Leipsig: Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1938), II, 23-27.

[8]The following sources are to be found in the Gregorian registers: Pseudo-Isidore (especially Pseudo-Anacletus), Popes Gelasius I, Gregory I, Innocent I, Julius I, Leo I, and Anastasius II. St. Augustine is quoted only once, and the work quoted is that of the De Doctrina Christiana. St. Ambrose and Pseudo-Ambrose are quoted ten times. All of the sources of the Gregorian registers are given in Caspar, Register, II, 649-50.

[9]The idea of the "libertas ecclesiae" and its definition was made the central theme of the work of Tellenbach, op. cit., pp. 1-37, 126-61. For Gregory's exposition of the idea, see Caspar, Register, I, 48; 70, 341; II, 575. Cfr. the comments of Fliche, Histoire, VIII, 59-64.

[10]Georg Schreiber, "Gregor VII, Cluny, Citeaux, Premontre zu Eigenkirche, Parochie und Seelsorge," ZRG, KA, XXXIV. (1947), 148ff.; Georg Schreiber, Kurie und Kloster im 12. Jahrhundert: Studien zur Privilegierung, Verfassung und besonders zum Eigenkirchenwesen der vorfranziskanischen Orden vornehmlich auf Grund der Papsturkunden von Paschal II bis auf Lucius III (1099-1181) (Stuttgart: Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen, 1910), I, 307; Albert Brackmann, "Die Ursachen der geistigen und politischen Wandlung Europas im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert," Historische Zeitschrift, CXLIX (1933), 229-39; Herbert Grundmann, Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zussammenhangen zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegnung im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik (Berlin: Historische Studien, Heft 267, 1935), 483; Arquillière, St. Grégoire VII, pp. 27-29; Erich Caspar, "Bernard von Clairvaux," Meister der Politik: Eine weltgeschichtliche Reihe von Bildnissen, herausgegeben von Erich Marcks und Karl von Muller (Berlin: Deutsche Verlaganstalt, 1923), pp. 192-93; Carl Erdmann, Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedanken (Stuttgart: Forschungen zur Kirchen und Geistesgeschichte, 1935), p.322ff.

[11]J.B. Sagmüller, "Die Idee der Kirche als imperium Romanum," Theologische Quartalschrift, LXXX (1898), 69ff.; P.E. Schramm, "Sacerdotium und Regnum im Austausch ihrer Vorrechte: Eine Skizze der Entwicklung zur Bedeutung des 'Dictatus Papae' Gregors VII," Studi Gregoriani, III (1948), 436-45; Rafaello Morghen, "Ideali religiosi e azione politica di Gregorio VII," Studi Gregoriani, III (1948), 169ff.

[12]Arnold Reinke, "Die Schuldialektik in Investiturstreit: Eine geistesgeschichtliche Studie," Geistige Grundlagen Römischer Kirchenpolitik, ed. Erich Caspar (Stuttgart: Forschungen zur Kirchen und Geistesgeschichte, 1937), pp.30-31.

[13]Paul Fournier, "Un tournant de l'histoire du droit, 1060-1140," Nouvelle révue de l'histoire de droit française et étranger, XL.(1917), 17ff.; Reinke, op. cit., 50-51.

[14]Caspar, Register, I, 199; Tellenbach, op. cit., 147ff.

[15]See the letter of Henry IV written on 28 January 1077 in Caspar, Register, I, 315.

[16]Fournier, op. cit., 5-9; Arquilliere, op. cit., 202ff.; Fliche, Histoire, VIII, 180ff.

[17]Anselmus, Liber contra Wibertum, MGH, lib., I, 519.

[18]Fournier, "Un tournant," 12.

[19]P.E. Schramm, Kaiser, Rom und 'Renovatio': Studien und Texte zur Geschichte des römischen Erneurungsgedankens vom Ende des Karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit (Leipzig: G.B. Teubner, 1929), I, 33.

[20]Ibid., I, 33-34.

[21]Ibid., I, 238-50.

[22]Ibid., I, 247.

[23]Ibid., I, 250.

[24]Ibid., I, 225.

[25]Demetrius Zema, "Economic Reorganization of the Roman See during the Gregorian Reform," Studi Gregoriani, I (1947), 136ff.

[26]Richard Elze, "Die päpstliche Kapelle im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert," ZRG, KA, XXXVI (1950), 145ff.; Karl Jordan, "Die päpstliche Verwaltung im Zeitalter Gregors VII," Studi Gregoriani, III (1948), 131; Hans Klewitz, "Monte Cassino und Rom," Quellen und Forschungen, XXXVIII (1937-1938), 39ff.

[27]Hans Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," ZRG, KA, XXIV (1936), 206.

[28]See below, p. 136.

[29]See below, p. 131.

[30]Manegoldus, "Ad Geberhardum Liber," MGH, Lib., I, 315,331.

[31]On Peter Crassus, see Carl Mirbt, Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1894), 18ff.

[32]Petrus Crassus, "Defensio Heinrici Regis," MGH, Lib., I, 450.

[33]Ibid., 434. Further: "Nam ecclesiasticae normae iura et ecclesiasticam desiderant auctoritatem, cum in huius exordio erroris, antequam monachus ille pecuniae commertio certare didicisset, non materialibus armis, sed legibus persequendus erat in iuditio, in quo sine tot militum iactura victorem sequeretur gloria cum re devicta, rerum vero poena, quam meruisset cum in lege scriptum sit: 'quod legitime factum est, nullum culpam meretur.'" Ibid., 438.

[34]"Nam quicumque ad ecclesiasticas dignitas his nefandis commerciis pervenissent, corrupto fidei firmamento semet ipsos adulteriis, sacrilegiis, periuriis ceterisque flagitiis subdiderunt..."Wido Ferrarensis, "De Schismate Hildebrandi," MGH, Lib., 535.

[35]Ibid., 554.

[36]Clementis III, "Decretum," MGH, Lib., I, 626.

[37]The best general work on this subject is that of Carl Mirbt, Die Stellung Augustins in der Publistik des Gregorianischen (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1888), 111ff. Mirbt maintains that the Liber de Unitate is the most profound exploitation of Augustinian themes to be found in the Investiture Struggle. For a similar treatment, see Bernhard Gaffrey, Der Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda im Lichte mittelalterliche Zeitanschauung (Berlin: Historische Studien, 1921), 20-28. This work is really only an extension of Mirbt's treatment of the Liber. Reinke discusses the Liber in terms of the dialectical techniques used. See his Die Schuldialektik, 49ff. Cfr. Alois Dempf, Sacrum Imperium: Geschichte und Staatsphilosophie des Mittelalters und der politischen Renaissance (München/Berlin: Verlag von R. Oldenburg, 1929), 199ff., and Fliche, Histoire, VIII, 241

[38]Mirbt, Stellung, 80.

[39]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 242.

[40]Dempf, Sacrum Imperium, 191-2.

[41]"Damit ist die Corpus-mysticum-Lehre hier neben der transzendenten sakramentalen Einheit auch auf die sittliche Aktivität der Glieder gestellt." Ibid., 191.

[42]See Reinke, Die Schuldialektik, 49ff.

[43] Walram von Naumburg, "Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae Conservanda," MGH, Lib., II, 253-4. Hereafter this work will be referred to as "Liber."

[44]Ibid., 184.

[45]Ibid., 184-5.

[46]Ibid.

[47]"Duae sunt, quibus principaliter mundus hic regitur, auctoritas sacrata pontificum et regalis potestas. Christus enim, memor fragilitatis humanae, quod suorum saluti congrueret dispensatione magnifica temperavit, sic actionibus propriis dignitatibusque distinctis officia potestatis utruiusque discrevit, suos volens medicinali humilitate salvari, non humana superbia intercipi, ut et christiani imperatores pro aeterna vita pontificibus indegerent et pontifices pro temporalium cursu rerum imperialibus dispositionibus uterentur, quatinus spiritualis actio a temporalibus distaret incursibus et Deo militans minime se negotiis saecularibus implicaret, et vicissim nonille rebus divinis praesidere videretur, qui esset negotiis saecularibus implicatus...." Ibid., 225.

[48]Ibid., 192.

[49]Ibid., 202. Cf. pp. 203-4, 210-11, and 282ff.

[50]Ibid., 225.

[51]"Ergo qui sunt pacifici hi dicuntur a Domino filii Dei, et qui caritatem habent, hi spiritum Dei habent...quia exterioribus signis sancta ecclesia non indiget, quique credes in nomine Jesu Christi fraternam habuerit caritatem, Spiritu sancto in se manenti testimonium perhibet." Ibid., 274.

[52]"Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae," 213.

[53]"vetus Roma optineret primatum apostolici honoris et nova retineret principatum regiae maiestatis, ut sic mater et filia concordarent in unitatem christianae fidei et religionis." Ibid., 185.

[54]See above, p.

[55]"Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae," 187.

[56]Walram admits that the kings of the Old Testament and of recent history who were deposed for acts of immorality were rightly deposed. See Ibid., 229. See also the comments of the author on the Ambrose-Theodosian affair in Ibid., 195. where Walram quotes Ambrose:"Quae Deo, Deo, quae Caesari, Caesari. Ad imperatorem, inquit, palatia pertinent, ad sacerdotem ecclesiae."

[57]Ibid., 212.

[58]Ibid., 193.

[59]Mirbt, Die Publizistik, 456-62.

[60]"Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae,"214.

[61]Ibid., 212, 265.

[62]Ibid., 189.

[63]Ibid., 273.

[64]Ibid., 274.

[65]See below, p.

[66]Wilhelm Martens, War Gregor VII Mönch? (Danzig: 1891), 52pp.

[67]The historiography of the problem is thoroughly listed and examined in G.B. Borino, "Quando e dove si fece monaco Ildebrando?" 241ff. Borino seems to have proven conclusively that Gregory VII had been a monk before becoming pope and that he probably had taken his vows at Cluny. Ibid., 260-61. See the critique of Borino's article by I. Schuster, "Ildebrando non si fece monaco a Roma,"Studi Gregoriani, IV (1952), 441-56. There is of course only one contemporary source which states that Gregory VII had been a monk at Cluny; this was the"Liber ad Amicum" of Bonizio of Sutri. See the discussion of Bonizio's evidence in the articles cited above. Cf. the remarks of Benon of Alba,"Gesta Romanae Ecclesiae," MGH, Lib., II, 337, and Peter Crassus, "Defensio Heinrici Regis IV," MGH, Lib., I, 434-447.

[68]The present writer has discussed this point with Dom G.B. Borino, the Gregorian scholar, and he admits that he has never seen the assertion made that Gregory VII had not taken monkish vows. However, Dom Borino fails to admit that there is a difference between this assertion and that which states that Gregory VII was a "false monk." It was this confusion of a statement of value for a statement of fact which led Dom Borino into his exhaustive study to prove whether or not Gregory VII had indeed been a monk or not.

[69]See the typical expressions in one of Henry IV!s epistles in MGH, Const., I, 110 and MGH, SS, XI, 615, 626, 659.

[70]Crassus calls Hildebrand a monk: "Ildebrandus monachus tanta sanctorum patrum auctoritate contempta..." Crassus, "Defensio Heinrici Regis," MGH, Lib., I, 447. Wenric of Trier states: "adolescentiam vestram, assumpto santitatis proposito, sub pietatis habitu, inter mundi contemptores, non sine magnis perfectionis indiciis, militiae christianae dedicatam...iuventum vestrum..." Wenricus, "Epistola," MGH, Lib., I, 285. It is because Hildebrand took monkly vows that his crime represents the greatest of sins. Ibid., 286-7.

[71]"Ergo monachus interpretatur singularis sive solitarius... Monachos vero...ieiuniis et orationibus contentos esse et in illis locis perseverare, in quibus saeculo videntur renuntiasse, nequaquam autem ecclesiasticis vel saecularibus rebus communicare nec importunitatem inferre,..." Walram,"Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae," 266.

[72]Ibid., 212.

[73]Ibid., 274.

[74]Ibid., 270-71.

[75]Ibid., 276.

[76]"Ecce enim quod pro exercito et industria naturalis ingenii apud paganos olim iniustum et turpe videbatur, hoc nunc apud monachos pro iustitia et sanctitate tentetur et colitur, sicunt sunt discriptae apud eos consuetudines et laxae vestes." Ibid., 275. Again: "Qui enim deberant se continere intra solitudines monasteriorum, egressi sunt ultra terminos et constitutiones patrum, usurpantes sibi contra divinarum ordinatione disponere, immo destruere regnum et sacerdotium...." Ibid., 266.

[77]Ibid., 275.

[78]Ibid., 220.

[79]Ibid., 214. Compare Ibid., 212, where Gregory is described

as a leader who wishes to lead the "militia Dei" into a war with the"militia rei publicae." See also Gaffrey, op. cit., 37ff. for a description of Walram's attempt to cast Gregory in the role of the "pastor iniquus" and Henry IV in the role of the "rex iustus."

[80]Ibid., 186.

[81]Ibid., 211.

[82]Ibid., 225.

[83]Ibid., 265.

[84]Ibid., 271.

[85]Ibid.

[86]Ibid.

[87]Ibid., 269-71.

[88]Ibid., 275-6.

[89]Ibid., 211.

[90]Ibid., 275.

[91]Ibid., 277.

[92]Ibid., 278.

[93]Benon, "Contra Epistolam Hildebrandi," MGH, Lib., II, 399.

[95]Ibid., 399-400.

[96]Ibid.

[97]Ibid., 418-19, 420.

[98]Wido, "Libro de Controversia inter Hildebrandum et Henricum Imperatorem," MGH, Lib., II, 470.

[99]Ibid., 466.

CHAPTER IV

PAPAL LEADERSHIP IDEALS DURING THE REIGNS OF URBAN II AND PASCHAL II, 1088-1118

The pontificates of Urban II and Paschal II represent two distinct stages in the study of our subject. Urban's reign saw the realization of Gregory VII's dream. His Papacy was administratively strong, legally justifiable, and had the support of a large, mass ascetic movement.[1] Urban was the real leader of the Church as well as the official leader. The charismatic and Amtscharismatic positions were united in him. The same cannot be said of Paschal II. Of a monkish turn of mind, Paschal saw the problems of the Church in a completely different light than had Urban.[2] Whereas Urban worked from the standpoint of what was legal and possible, Paschal seems to have conceived of his role as the implementation of the moral and the desirable.[3] One depended heavily upon his lawyers and the other upon his own conscience.[4]

The two different points of reference produced two different concepts of the papal office, and Paschal's concept of his own office was considered revolutionary enough to precipitate an open rebellion in the Curia against the Pope himself. The result of the rebellion was the creation of a hierocracy in which papal power was assumed by the Curia and a select group of the higher French and Italian clergy. This action was instrumental in the separation of the See of Rome from the mass ascetic movement then in process in the

Church, because the rebellion of the Curia and its seizure of power were justified only if the Curia was willing to admit that the monastic values of *charitas*, *humilitas*, and *paupertas* were not sufficient virtues for the ruler of the Church community. Thus, Paschal's reign, although it followed close upon the height of papal absolute power in the eleventh century, marks the first stages in the failure of a creative minority which had come to be institutionalized in the Papal Curia.

One need only consult the development of canon law, political theory, and theology to see the failure of the creative minority reflected ideologically. Under Urban the papal party was dominated, intellectually as well as politically, by the Roman Curia; but that same body, in the period 1100-1124, was singularly uncreative. In canon law, the typical expression of the Gregorian Reform, no new concepts or methods were introduced after Urban's death,[5] until the time of Gratian (c. 1140), except by Ivo of Chartres, himself formally rejected by the Curia along with Paschal. Political thought was dominated by the Chartrians on the one hand and the imperial partisans on the other. The Curia itself, once the creative center of political theory, was sterile.[6] One need only compare the work of such curialists as Bruno of Segni,[7] Rangier of Lucca,[8] Gerard of Angouleme,[9] Guy of Vienne,[10] and Geoffrey of Vendome[11] with the work of men outside the Curia like Ivo of Chartres, Walram von Naumburg, the Anonymous of York, Hugh of Fleury, and Sigebert of Gembloux to realize

the inadequacy of the curial response to the intellectual challenge of the time.[12] Even if one is not willing to admit that the latter men as a group are more "creative, he cannot fail to recognize that their devotion to Augustinian ideals gave them a more powerful propaganda weapon than the curialists were able to command.[13]

For if the period of Urban and Paschal is characterized by any one trait it is the tendency on the part of the mass membership of the Church to shift from a preoccupation with "external" problems of organization of the anti-imperial offensive to "internal" problems of religious salvation. This shift is signified in the rebirth of pietistic ideals, incorporated into movements which eulogized poverty, practiced asceticism, and embraced a thoroughgoing belief in chiliastic prophecy.[14] The whole of the movement was justified intellectually by the epistemological rebirth of Augustinian thought and was given formal expression in the founding of new religious orders such as the Cistercians, the Premonstratensians, and the Canons Regular.[15] The resurgence of the ideal of "divine ignorance" made it necessary for the papal leadership minority to translate its aims into a language which was much more universal than the technical jargon employed by canon lawyers. For centers of strength were forming on the local levels, centers of strength which holy men, charismatic leaders, commanded. These new leaders were possessed of ideals which, because of their Augustinian character, placed little stock in "legality" and dialectical argumentation.

Insofar as the imperial writers appealed to this element, they communicated much more effectively their arguments for the restitution of the sacrum imperium than could the Gregorian remnants in the Curia.

Theology, of course, was a different matter. The revolution in canon law which the Gregorians had precipitated had raised new problems in theology. The problem of lay investiture hinged, in the final analysis, upon the nature of the sacrament of consecration. Simony raised the problem of the nature of ordination.[16] The arguments involved in the resolution of these problems necessitated the gathering of evidence from Patristic sources, weighing them, and arranging them logically to present one's case in the best light. Canon law tracts themselves were something like dialectical arguments, a fact recognized by Gratian when he entitled his work Concordia Discordantium Canonum.[17] It is a commonplace to compare Gratian's Decretum with Abelard's Sic et Non, but it must be done, For only thus can we explain the paucity of canonical activity in the Curia during the height of St. Bernard of Clairvaux's influence over the papacy.[18] The same force which effectively destroyed dialectic, reducing it to the status of handmaiden to rhetoric and grammar, reacted as violently to the sophistries of canon law.[19] The inability of the Curia to recognize that, epistemologically, the wind had shifted with the coming of the new pietism away from dialectic and towards the "metaphysics of the inner experience" accounts for the propaganda failure of the creative minority in the Papacy from 1100 to 1124.

A part of the failure was the result of the completeness of Urban II's triumph. It is difficult to follow a completely successful man in office; and Paschal II, if we are to believe his biographer, was as reluctant to follow Urban as Tiberius was to follow Augustus.[20] Had that reluctance been the only factor in Paschal's difficulty, rule might have come easier to him. But he inherited more than the task of filling Urban's pontifical shoes. He had inherited an ideal of the papal office which was outlined even in the most specific points. He inherited a Curia which was devoted to that ideal and which would not stand for any deviation from it. Furthermore, and this was Paschal's real difficulty, his Curia lacked the ability to recognize the real nature of the problems of pontifical rule which faced the new Pope.

Although the early Gregorians had been faced with both an internal and an external threat, both threats were of the same type. Both were organizational, consisting in the problems of organizing the Church under the See of Rome and orientation of that organization outward against the Empire. With at least ostensible accomplishment of part of the publicized aims of the Gregorian Reform (the clergy were now much more chaste than ever before), new problems presented themselves to the papal leadership. The problem was this: How was one to justify continued centralization of Church power in a Church in which "reform" in itself was coming to be separated from centralization. There can be little doubt that the two functions had become separated under Urban II.

As Mr. Z.N. Brooke has noted, while reform is the chief object there will be little opposition to the king who carries out moral reform in his own realm. But under Urban II the establishment of the papal authority became the chief end; while reform was still pursued, it was pursued only as a part of the work proper to the head of the Church.[21] It was no longer the dominating aspect of the papal program. Specific evidence of the changed point of view came in the conflict between Ivo of Chartres and Urban II over the definition of lay investiture.

The Bishop of Chartres was unhesitating in arguing that lay investiture was a purely political problem[22] and saw no reason why a pious cleric, if he were properly ordained, could not carry out his function of service to his parish in an Eigenkirche.[23] This view, put forth in what seems to have been an honest attempt by Ivo to arrive at the truth of the matter, met with a sharp rebuke from Urban, a rebuke so sharp that Ivo attempted to abdicate his See.[24] He was dissuaded but remained silent for the rest of Urban's reign. This incident was not the only one of its kind during Urban's pontificate. Combined with growing protests of bishops who resented the extension of papal power into areas in which reform was not needed, it serves to highlight the institutional changes which Urban's pontificate brought about.[25]

With Urban the sacerdotal hierocracy became the major force in the Church. We have noted that the Cluniac Reform sought to transpose monkish values into general societal values. Gregory VII may have begun his pontificate with the

same end in mind, but, as Raffaelo Morghen has noted, by the time of Canossa the ideal of the flight from the world had been replaced by the idea of conquest of the world in his mind.[26] Now we find Urban, surrounded by his canon lawyers, erecting his own concept of the papal office and, like the sacerdotalist that he was, recognizing that there were two lives in the Christian community, one of contemplation and one of activity.

> Duae enim ab aecclesiae sanctae primordiis vitae ejus filiis sunt institutae, una, qua infirmorum debilitas retinetur: altera, qua, fortiorum virtus beata perficitur. Una remanens in Segor parvula, altera in montis altiora conscendens. Una lacrymis et eleemosynis quotidiana peccata redimens; altera quotidiana instantia merita aeterna conquirens. Alteram tenentes inferiorem, terrenis bonis utuntur, alteram sequentes superiorem, bonam terram despicient ac relinquunt.[27]

Furthermore, Urban saw his own office as bound to the former, active in the world, with the task of administering and judging it: "Oportet nos qui licet indigni, Petri residemus in loca prava corrigere, recta firmare, et in omni ecclesiae arbitrium judicis ejus judicum nostrum prodeat, oculi nostri videant aequitatem."[28] Here was the presentation of the Humbertine concept of the papal office, judging, not on its own merit, but upon the merit of the office. Similarly, Urban's lawyers, Deusdedit, Bonizio of Sutri, and Bernhold of Constance, in a stream of brilliant canon law tracts repeated the theme that the Bishop of Rome "might judge all but could be judged by none."[29]

The institutional expression of Urban's pontificate was the great administrative bureaucracy which he raised to a state of machine like efficiency. As strong as it was

ubiquitous, it was intensely jealous of its own power. This was the Papal Curia and the great bureaucracy which represented it in its relations with the Church as a whole. Special agencies were set up by Urban for the handling of the increased number of papal privileges and exemptions granted by Urban.[30] Some of the privileges granted created ill will between bishops and abbots and between bishops and metropolitans. The Curia participated in a very real sense in the growing papal power, settling disputes in the courts of Rome and acting as legates in the provinces.[31] New tax systems were evolved for extracting the maximum from the lands controlled by the Papacy,[32] and census systems were set up for the computations of revenue sources like the pallim tax.[33]

Gregorovius has commented that Urban II played Augustus to Gregory VII's Julius Caesar.[34] This statement is true in more than one way, for Urban, like Augustus, created the very system which destroyed the initiative of his ruling minority. If, as Rostovtseff argues, the revolution of 69 A.D. was the reaction of the provincials in the army against the corruption of Rome, then the events of 1130 bear a striking resemblance to the pattern of the post-Augustan years of ancient Rome.[35] For one can see, in the years immediately following Urban's death, the extension of the bureaucracy which he had created and the growing resentment of that extension in the pietists of the provinces. Urban had realized the creation of a type of leader and a type of administrative activity which, because of its success, achieved the status of dogma among the members of the Curia;

but it was singularly unsuited to lead the forces of the new pietism.

Urban's leadership ideal was unsuited to lead the forces of pietism (exemplified above all in Bernard of Clairvaux) because it was essentially Amtscharismatic. Of course, this was the fulfillment of the Gregorian seed, but there was a difference. Whereas Gregory could justify his recourse to Amtscharisma because he stood the chance of being destroyed by the Emperor Henry IV, Urban II did so for the extension of his hierocracy. In the extension of that power there was created a new concept of leadership, the leader as administrator or, as Mannheim calls it, "the manager type."[36] There was nothing wrong with this, propagandistically, as long as the "manager type" could be fitted into the general ideal of charismatic leadership which was traditional to the Church. But where Gregory VII had been able to maintain the balance between dependence upon legalistic concepts of office and personal charismatic ability, Urban II seemingly abandoned the attempt and foresook the latter for the former. While he was able to mass behind him the adherents to the First Crusade, the prestige thus gained was not directly used for the implementation of papal power.[37] One of the reasons it could not be done was the existence, for some years, of the criticism of the use of the crusade for the extension of papal power against Christian princes and bishops.[38]

As a result, the leadership ideal which emerges from the reign of Urban II is the manager type, the man trained in "getting things done." The professional administrator

is not a type found only in modern society; he exists in every institution which reaches the stage of integration of its own power. The manager type is not, however, possessed of combative virtues. He must have virtues of leadership, initiative, and management; but above all he must have organizing ability.[39] Since the dynamic, the reward, of leadership as management is not the acquisition of personal power (since all power becomes vested in the institution), it (leadership) tends to become impersonal. The rationale of the labor of the administrator tends to become the enterprise as such--the enterprise which becomes a fetish.[40] If this is in fact what happened during the reign of Urban II we can expect to find, if the opportunity presents itself, that certain characteristic phenomena will occur after Urban's death. Mannheim has insisted that managerial leadership tends to become dispersed. It is then no longer in the hands of one person, but in the hands of the administrators of the institution, who wield their power in the name of the institution itself. Toynbee has called the same phenomenon the "idolization of an ephemeral idea."[41] No matter what terms we employ to describe it, it results in a split in the leadership in which the office itself is vested with apparent power but in which real power is wielded by a group behind the scenes. We shall see this phenomenon appear in the pontificate of Paschal II.

Since our study is primarily one of ideas, we must justify the prolonged discussion of what seem essentially political or social events which follows. Paschal II's

reign is, for us, the pivotal point in the history of leadership ideals from 1059 to 1130. Paschal's own story represents one of those times in history in which the individual personality make-up effected the course of events for the whole institution. Had he not been elected pope, there would probably not have been a "humiliation of Sutri," a curial rebellion against the Pope, and the formation of a group of "radical Gregorians" who took the papal power into their own hands for the attainment of what pietists of the time considered purely worldly ends. If the Pope of that time had been a "real Gregorian," as that term had come to be interpreted, he would not have acceded to Henry's pressure. That was a priori reasoning by the Roman Curia.[42] But Paschal was not a "Gregorian," in curial terms, and that is the reason that, upon his return from Sutri, he was met with the combined forces of the Curia and the higher clergy massed against him. We shall discuss the development of that rebellion in full below. Now we wish only to note that it was the shock created by the "humiliation of Sutri" which prompted so much discussion of what constituted the ideal papal leader. It provoked discussion of what virtues he should possess and how he should comport himself in a crisis. It crystallized thinking on what constituted the "Gregorian" pope, and such thinking weighed Paschal in its scales and found him wanting. The rejection of the monk-pope, Paschal, and the erection of a pure "Gregorian" ideal of papal leadership had as a corollary the exaltation of anti-pietistic

virtues as papal virtues to the curial mind. Gregory VII took on an aspect which was completely different from that known in the eleventh century through Bonizio of Sutri and Manegold of Lautenbach.[43] To the Curia of the early twelfth century the Gregorian pope was a warrior and an administrator. This may, in some measure, explain why any reference to Gregory VII is lacking in the writings of most prolific thinker of the period, St. Bernard of Clairvaux.[44] It may also explain why the schism of 1130 ushered in a new papal leadership ideal which found its highest expression in the De Consideratione of St. Bernard.

The growth of pietism on the popular level in the Church presented a serious challenge to the leadership in Rome. For, above all, the growth of Augustinianism brought with it a revival of "the metaphysics of inner experience." This meant that to a large body of the Church membership dialectic was no longer a valid means of argumentation because of epistemological objections to it. It also meant that a different concept of "law" began to grow which threatened the very existence of the objectified law of the Roman canon lawyers. For just as surely as Cistercian epistemology is based upon the "metaphysics of inner experience," the dominating concept in ethics is charitas. This was unfortunate for a Papacy which had devoted a half century to the formulation of a law which they held was divine but which was justified pragmatically only as a sustaining force for the papal administration. The law of charitas is internal, unwritten; it springs from the heart and carries with it the

force of divine will.[45] Urban II himself had recognized the lex privata, the "law of the heart," in one of his bulls, but he had tacitly assumed that the Papacy was the final exponent of that law.[46] The canon lawyers of Gregory VII had also so assumed, and Ivo of Chartres had followed.[47] Since the Pope was considered the final source of law on Earth, the assumption was natural.[48] The Gregorians, in attributing such a position to the popes, bequeathed to the Papacy the position formerly held by the mystic, the saint. The pope, they argued in substance, was by the mere fact of legal election given the ability to interpret the divine law as it applied to the Church in this world.

Now no conflict need develop in the Church as long as the pope agrees in his interpretation of divine law with the view of the mystic. In like manner, if the mystic disagrees, no conflict may result until the mystic can command a large enough following to give his interpretation of divine law some social force. But, and this is important, the mystic does have his own source of knowledge which exists completely apart from the organized hierocracy of pope, bishop, and priest. He claims to have direct communion with God and claims to be edified by that union with a higher kind of wisdom.[49] But since this wisdom, in all mystics, is ineffable, it is not subject to the same kinds of attack by canon lawyers as was, say, Roman law or the concept of the sacrum imperium. Yet the mystic sometimes draws a social message from the mystical experience. Such was the case of St.

Francis of Assisi, Joachim of Flora, and St. Catherine of Siena.

It is also true of the twelfth century pietists. St. Bernard of Clairvaux and Norbert of Magdeburg, to take the most important leaders of the movement, acted from an unshakeable belief in certain philosophical and social tenets. That these tenets were essentially different from those of the curia will be shown in our analysis of the leadership struggle of 1130-38. For the time being, however, we should like to note the essential differences between the pietists and the curia upon which the propagandists could play.

First of all, the new pietism was monastic; it believed in withdrawal from the world instead of conquest of the world. It also believed, however, that in order to be able to effect such withdrawal a certain moral purity of society as a whole and of the Church in particular was necessary. Their method of judging what constituted purity differed radically from that of the Curia.

Their ideals were monkish and charismatic. The highest virtues were charitas, humilitas, and povertas, and generally their formulation of their social philosophy did not go much beyond the passionate belief in those ideals. Hugh of St. Victor is an exception, but Bernard of Clairvaux, in his social thought as well as his mystical thought, acted from general beliefs and when specific situations arose, he did not pause to speculate.[50] Like Dr. Johnson, for St. Bernard, "right was right and wrong was wrong, and there was an end

on't." The mystical experience furnished the saint, in his own mind, with an overwhelming certainty in being able to make the distinction.[51] But this was dangerous to the papal machine, because it had no consistency when applied to particulars. There was no objective body of knowledge, such as canon law, to which one could refer for one's actions. One was left to the caprice of St. Bernard's mind. This is not to imply that Bernard's calling did not weigh heavily upon his ascetic shoulders. He had the prophet's burden, and he felt it profoundly.[52] But, at the same time, the mystic acts from a purely subjective view of the social situation, and to a Curia which was becoming more and more objectified, in substance as well as thought, this presented certain problems. Furthermore, the Curia was becoming open to charges of graft, bribery, and corruption.[53] Combined with the pervasiveness of the papal machine and its tendency to stifle individualism, such faults could only result in a clash when the new orders could command sufficient strength to challenge the Papacy.

Paschal II (1099-1118): The Schism in the Curia and the Definition of the Gregorian Leadership Ideal

The length of Paschal II's reign and the complex personality of that Pope make it difficult to outline, in any simple form, the attitudes toward leadership in the curia of that time. Paschal was not a strong-willed individual, like Urban II, Gregory VII, or Calixtus II. He was, instead, a monk in the strictest meaning of the word, a monk who had carried monastic values with him to the papal chair with which to rule a hierarchy becoming increasingly allied to the interests of the sacerdote. The Liber Pontificalis tells us that Paschal did not wish to be elected pope and that he was carried, weeping, into the Lateran Palace.[54] The new Pope's personality seems to have resembled that of the unfortunate Desiderius of Monte Cassino, whose reign as Victor III matched that of Paschal's pathetic pontificate in all but length of time.[55] Paschal's interest in the otherworldly probably accounts for the smooth functioning of papal policy in the early days of the reign, while pressure from without was negligible, and for the extreme vacillations in the later years, when group after group attempted to present a program of Church rule to the Pope. The eighteen years of Paschal's rule witnessed great variation in papal policy, variation which grew out of the ability of certain interests to influence the Pope in matters of policy.[56]

We may take the period 1099-1106 as a period in which the Papacy was not forced into great activity. The smooth

functioning of the papal machinery during the period 1099-1106 must be attributed to two factors outside the Pope himself.[57] These factors were the lack of a concentrated offensive from the German Emperor, the result of the rebellion of Henry V against his father, and the continued efficiency of the powerful curial machine which Urban had fashioned, a machine which inertia carried through Paschal's reign even after its creator had ceased to exist.[58] Of course there were matters to be settled with England and France, but these affairs had none of that crucial character which one associates with the struggle against the Empire. Investiture in England and France was a political problem, irksome to the individual kings, but at no time threatening their very existence, as in Germany.[59] Although the Curia seems to have directed the Papacy during the period 1099-1106, Paschal concurred in their decisions. It is significant, however, that the Papacy, during this period, is neither so rigid in its demands nor so violent in its pursuance of those demands as it had been under Paschal's predecessors. We may take this as a tribute to the personality of the new Pope.

With the opening of a new offensive by Henry V in 1106-7, Paschal undertook a policy, vis a vis the secular power, which constituted a rupture with the Gregorian tradition to which his Curia was devoted. Dominated by the monkish ideals of paupertas, charitas, and humilitas, Paschal seemed to take those ideals literally and made them the base of new papal policy.[60] The turn of political events in the Curia from 1106-1111 is not to be regarded as unexpected, since Paschal had

expressed ideas which pointed in that direction much earlier.[61] But Paschal's policy led,-quite logically to the signing of the Concordat of Sutri in 1111. That Concordat was considered not only an affront to the Curia but grounds for branding the Pope a heretic as well.

The years 1111-1112 are the most important of Paschal's reign. It is at this time that the papal office and the Pope himself are submitted to a new examination and definition. The signing of the Concordat of Sutri had resulted in a "loss of nerve" in the Curia and higher clergy in which not only was Henry V castigated for his "barbarian" actions, but Paschal II himself was turned upon by the very men who had elected him pope. A threat of schism was delivered to the Pope, and schism it would have been had not Paschal signed the "confession of faith" in the Lateran Council of 1112. But the confession was itself a curious document, binding the Pope, not to general principles, but to concrete administrative procedures, to a concept of office which can only be described as idealized Gregorianism. Prior to 1111, Paschal was surrounded by various groups with various programs, each group assuming a different leadership ideal for the implementation of its particular program. The groups were the Chartrians, the imperialists, the Curialists, and the French Gregorian radicals. The new pietistic orders were just forming; and while they had their own brand of leadership, they were, in this period, in no position to try to impose it upon the Papacy.

On the right we group the Curialists and the French Gregorian radicals, men devoted to the concept of office formulated by Humbert of Silva Candida; their leadership ideals are outlined in the work of Bruno of Segni, Placidus of Nonantola, Rangier of Lucca, and in the events of 1111-1112. The left is represented by any writer who, while definitely pro-imperial and anti-papal, still works within the framework of mystical or evangelical thought, especially in so far as his ideas are based upon the thought of St. Augustine. Such thinkers as Walram von Naumburg, Hugh of Fleury, the Anonymous of York, Benon, Wenric of Trier, and Wido of Ferrara fit into this category. The Chartrians are moderates, taking part of their ideas from sacrum imperium theories and part from the Gregorian corpus. Their program is rejected by the Curia in 1111-12, the time of decision for all of the groups. The French radicals, similarly begin their agitation with the signing of the Concordat of Sutri in 1111. They form an outside source of strength for the Curia but represent elements in the Church which men like St. Bernard detest.

Paschal was attracted to the Chartrians. The Pope's own personal devotion to pacific virtues probably accounts for his dependence upon the social theory of Ivo of Chartres. Even though his own Curia was made up of a large number of canon lawyers and political theorists, the Pope consulted Ivo often and made his social theory the basis of papal policy vis a vis the State during the years 1106-1111. Both

the embracing of what we have termed contemplative values by the Pope and his devotion to the ideas of Ivo of Chartres were looked upon by the Curia as a desertion of Gregorian ideals.

The earliest years of Paschal's reign witnessed some unfortunate decisions on the part of Paschal, unfortunate in that they provided imperial propagandists with further opportunity to exploit the "pope as warrior" theme. In 1104 Paschal was convinced by Bohemund that he should preach a crusade against Byzantium. Bohemund had informed the Pope that Byzantium was the real enemy of the Latins in the East. Runciman has noted that this was a turning point in the history of the Crusades: "Norman policy, which aimed to break the power of the Eastern Empire, became the official crusading policy."[62] While a crusade might or might not be recognized as valid against the Greeks, there is no doubt that the use of the secular arm against certain recalcitrant churches of the West provided good propaganda fare for the imperialists. In an opus entitled Leodicensum Epistola Adversus Paschalem,[63] Sigebert of Gembloux exploited two themes: the use of the crusade as an instrument for the extension of papal secular power and the figure of the "pope as warrior."

Sigebert professes to be appalled at the use of armed force by the Church against Christians: "Contra barbarorum et inimicorum Dei assultus concedunt canones etiam clericis arma ad defensionem urbis et aecclesiae...Pacem Jesus, pacem apostoli, viri praedicant; peccantes arguunt, obsecrant,

increpant, in omni pacienter et doctrina."[64] Gregory I is called upon to witness the desecration of what Sigebert termed the "ancient tradition" of papal government.[65]

Sigebert questioned the validity of Paschal's excommunication of himself and Henry's men, arguing that they had not deviated from the faith nor were they immoral. "Nos non adulteramus, sed fidem catholicam per Dei gratiam tenemus, fidei catholicae opera in Deo exequimur. Regulam canonicam ex patrum traditione habemus et reveremur; secundum illam vivimus, diiudicamur, satisfacimus, absolvimur."[66] Here again Sigebert appealed to pure morality and held the law of the Church up for examination in the light of Augustinian pietism. He quotes Augustine to admonish the Pope: "Reges et imperatores ex legibur promulgatis nihil ab hereticis in hoc mundo possideri voluerunt.' Igitur, cum non simus heretici et hoc sit ius regem et imperatorum, quare domnus Pascasius solo contentus spirituali gladio immittit Robertum armigerium suum ad devastandos fundos et villas aecclesiarum."[67] Indeed, it is Hildebrand who has brought things to such a pass (auctor est huius novelli scismatis, et primus levavit sacerdotalem lanceam contra diadema regni).[68] Then Sigebert gave his own idea of leadership: "Esset apostolicum imitari apostolum, esset propheticum imitari prophetam. Sed paccatis nostris merentibus apostolicus, qui etiam modo orare deberet pro rege quamvis peccatore, ut tranquillam et quietam vitam agamus, agit bellando, ne tranquillam et quietam vitam agamus."[69] Here was an appeal to morality. The Pope had

revealed by his actions his interest in secular power; he was, therefore, an unworthy Pope. "Si enim David non meruit aedificare Templum Dei, quia vir sanguinum erat, summus pontifex, si vel stilla sanguinis vestem eius tetigerit, quomodo in sancta sanctorum introibit cum sanguine Christi, quem offerat pro sua et populi ignorantia."[70]

What the effects of such criticism upon the Pope were we cannot say. It is important to note, however, that immediately after the death of Henry IV, his son, Henry V, gave all indications of being ready to begin an antipapal offensive in Italy.[71] Such pressure gave the Pope an opportunity to begin negotiations for a settlement with the Kings of France and England. In pursuance of these negotiations Paschal displayed a striking originality. In the first place, he seemed willing to achieve the libertas ecclesiae even at the cost of complete dissolution of all of the Church's temporal power.[72] This policy was based upon Paschal's disagreement with the Gregorians over the nature of the episcopate. Unlike his predecessors, Paschal did not conceive of the episcopate as a unity comprised of both spiritual and temporal goods. Like Ivo of Chartres, he was willing to surrender the latter for complete liberty in the former. Paschal believed that in so holding he was living up to the highest ideals of the Gregorian Reform.[73] Curial dissatisfaction with this policy may be seen as early as 1106 but did not break out into a full revolt until 1112.

During the period 1100-06 there are five writers who

present concepts of papal leadership to the public. Three are imperial (or devoted to the interests of the secular power) and two are papal. The Anonymous of York, Hugh of Fleury, and Sigebert of Gembloux represent the imperial position and stem respectively from England and/or Normandy, France, and Germany. They thus present us with a cross section of the thought on the matter, at least geographically speaking. Bruno of Segni and Rangier of Lucca represent the Curial position, both being cardinals and highly influential in the Curia. Since the political position of all the writers named is well known, we shall content ourselves with an examination of the concepts of the papal office which they maintain and examine the values upon which their leadership ideals are to be sustained. The Chartrian school of thought represents a compromise between the imperial and the Curial position, but since it was definitively rejected by the Curia in 1112, we shall discuss it in our analysis of the crisis of that year.

The works of Bruno of Segni and Rangier of Lucca represent an attempt to defend the Gregorian leadership ideal and to counteract propaganda gains made by the imperialists such as Walram von Naumburg, Benon, and Wido of Ferrara. Bruno of Segni's Vita Leonis IX and Rangier of Lucca's Vita Anselmi Episcopi Lucensis both stem from an attempt to counteract what the authors consider to be malignant rumors concerning the worth of their heroes to the claim of leadership.

The Vita Leonis IX of Bruno of Segni forms one half of

Bruno's De Symoniacis, a tractate written either at the very end of Urban's reign or at the beginning of the reign of Paschal II.[74] The life forms the first eight books of the total sixteen which compose the entire tractate. The purpose of the work is exactly the same as another life of Leo, the so-called Ponoclet life,[75] written at about the same time as Bruno's: namely, to justify the facts of Leo's career. Bruno states that the facts of Leo's life have been so obscured that the truth has been buried.[76] The anonymous author of the Ponoclet life is more specific. He states that there has been untoward criticism of Leo's martial activities. Part of these "grumblings" had been heard in Rome, so it is part of the Ponoclet's author's task to justify not only Leo's defeat at the hands of the Normans but his undertaking of the campaign into Apulia in the first place.[77]

Bruno begins his work with a description of the state of the Church before Leo came upon the scene. It is a sorry situation with which we are presented: "Mundus totus in maligno positus erat; defecerat santitas, iustitia perierat et veritas sepulta erat; regnavit iniquitas, avaritia dominabatur; Simon Magus Ecclesiam possidebat, episcopi et sacerdotes voluptatis et fornicationi dediti erant..."[78] It is this situation which demanded a particular kind of leader. Interestingly enough it is not the saint who is needed but a man with martial talent: "Et talis quidem magister necessarius erat, qui tali tempore et tales

discipulos habiturus erat."[79]

The virtues of the ideal leader are not clearly defined. This confusion seems to be a result of Bruno's admiration for the Pope's warlike virtues and his desire to satiate the demand for a eulogy of traditional ascetic virtues. For example, Leo is seen as "vir mitissimus, pietate et misericordia plenus."[80] Further on, he is described as "nobilis genere, forma speciosus; sed speciosior sanctitate, litteris instructus, doctrina potens, moribus ornatus et qualcunque huic ordini necessaria sunt, semul in eo convenerant."[81] In another part he is noted for his "benignitas" and "humilitas."[82] Thus, according to Bruno, Leo manifests the traditional virtues, the ascetic virtues, the very virtues which Peter Damiani had declared that he lacked.[83] How then does Bruno account for the Pope's leadership of an expedition into Beneventum against the Normans?

In the handling of the Beneventum campaign, Bruno reveals his unwillingness to compromise with criticism of the papal territorial expansion. For the Beneventum campaign, although undertaken as a territorial expansion against a Christian state (the Normans), is presented as a crusade. The author of the Ponoclet life follows the same line. The fact that both Bruno and the author of the Ponoclet life see no inconsistency in referring to the Beneventan campaign as a crusade reveals the fact that the Curia was completely unsympathetic to pietist demands to cease using the secular arm against Christian peoples. There was a long tradition of

criticism of such usage.[84] But Bruno did not understand its nature, and we shall see, under Paschal II and Calixtus II, continued use of the crusade psychology to enlist secular troops in the extension of the power of the Curia.

The troops who serve under the Popes are referred to by Bruno as "milites Christi," a term which had been used prior to the Gregorian period to refer only to monks.[85] The author of the Ponoclet life was more subtle. He argued that Leo did not go to Beneventum with troops: "Non veniat cum exercitu ad preliandum, sed cum arma Christi et triumphum victoriae Dei.[86] Bruno never succeeds in making quite clear why the war was a crusade, although the author of the Ponoclet life says that a delegation had come to the Pope asking to be liberated from Norman tyranny.[87] The war thus was fought for the preservation of "justice."[88]

If the failure of later crusading expeditions was explained by the Papacy as God's punishment of the sins of men,[89] neither Bruno nor the author of the Ponoclet life were subtle enough to conceive of that excuse. The Ponoclet author explains the defeat by the betrayal of one "Count Madelfrit,"[90] while Bruno is completely vague on the point. But there is no doubt as to the "martyrdom" which those troops suffered in Leo's service. This is an important point, for it means that martyrdom and sainthood are now possible for any mercenary soldier who is killed in the cause of extending of papal territory. It represents a complete departure from the ideals of the monk, who feels that sainthood is to be found only in

the service of Christianity per se, that is, in ascetic practice on the individual level and the practice of charitas on a societal level.

The "army of saints" was defeated, according to Bruno, to demonstrate how all "who are born of God" can conquer the world.[91] Leo's visions reveal that his troops are among the chosen of God: "Collecet eos Dominus cum principibus populi sui."[92] The author of the Ponoclet life is much more florid: "et per martyrium animas Domino deddiderunt," he says of the slain papal troops.[93] These troops have received the crown of martyrdom because they died "for the love of God and in obedience to St. Peter."[94] Leo's reward for his campaign is beheld in a vision which the Pope had three days before his death. The vision shows him the highest reaches of Heaven and tells him: "Ecce locus tuus et sedes tua inter nos praeparata est."[95] Bruno comments in the same vein: "omnes qui pro iustitia moriuntur inter martyres collocantur," and finally:

> Gaudeo vero vehementer, quia vidi ibi inter martyres Christi fratres et amicos meos, qui me in Apuliam secuti pro defensione justicia mortui sunt. Erant autem bene ornati; palmas in manibus habentes, ut per hoc eos victores esse intelligant qui eos victos fuisse putabant.[97]

Thus the warrior pope achieves his reward, in the service of "justiitia" to be sure, but a peculiarly papal justice. Furthermore, it is undeniable that the virtues manifested by Leo in leading his troops are "good" virtues. The defeat of the troops is not God's visitation upon the Pope. It is an efficient cause in Leo's apotheosis. Leo's martyrdom serves,

in the narrative of both Bruno of Segni and the author of the Ponoclet life, to highlight the combative virtues needed by an effective pope in his battle against the secular power.

Both lives discuss the reform activity of Leo; indeed, the life of Leo is used by Bruno of Segni to introduce his own denunciation of the simony which still exists in the Church of his own time. Reform activity is a virtue and a necessary part of the good pope's work, but neither reform activity nor extension of the papal territorial power is the reason for the power held by the individual occupant of the See of Peter. In this point both lives present the same argument: the Papacy does not derive its power from the morality of the occupant of the office. For a man to command the vast resources of the Church he should be morally pure, but he must be legally elected. In the development of this theme the Pope's relation with the Curia is demonstrated.

It is interesting to note how conceptions of papal power formulated by members of the Roman Curia always include some eulogy of the "qualified councillor." Humbert and Anselm of Lucca had provided for power for the College of Cardinals. Deusdedit had done the same. In the extant lives of Leo IX and in the Vita Anselmi of Rangier of Lucca the power of the Roman Curia in Church affairs is developed with similar emphasis. In these vitae, however, the curia is given a personality through a representation of some important figure who guides and directs the pope. This figure is the custodian law. In Bruno's life, Hildebrand fulfils this function.

In Rangier's biography of Anselm, the great canon lawyer so acts for Gregory VII. In the Ponoclet life, the Curia is always consulted before any major act is undertaken by Leo IX. Whether such thematic development was conscious or not is unimportant. The fact that the clergy and people of Rome are given such a large share in papal power in all of the three works indicates a certain view which is peculiarly curial. It is a tendency which will suffer at the hands of St. Bernard after the schism of 1130.

The election to the See of Peter by the clergy and people of Rome is what confers leadership power upon any aspirant to the papacy. The Ponoclet author shows Leo asking to be elected by the Romans before he can undertake the work of reform which the situation in Rome demands. Leo says he will be pope only "si vobis placet," and the Romans (universus populus Romanus) respond: "Nos omnes desiderabimus magnum habere pastorem...(et) elegerunt illum...in sede apostolicam."[98] Leo's mission is to liberate the Romans from their oppressors.[99] The role of Henry III is seen to be the protection of the liberty of the Roman people. He is shown as addressing the people of Rome in these terms: "Eligite vobis unum, quem vultis, et eligam secundum vestram voluntatem."[100] Thus the "Romanity" of the ultimate Church leadership is stressed and the custodian of leadership power is seen to be the people of Rome.

For Bruno (as he argued in 1112 as well) the power of the Curia is more explicit; it consists in the protection of

the law of Rome (the Roman tradition, as he calls it) and the admonition of the pope who deviates from that law. Bruno's concept of leadership is thus strictly legal, even though Leo's virtue is above reproach, a young monk in his train refuses to follow him until he has been elected "secundum Romanam consuetudinem." This young monk is Hildebrand, "nobilis indolis adolescens, clari ingenii, sanctaeque religionis" who "sub beati Benedicti Regula militaret."[101]

Hildebrand's role is to restrain Leo from accepting the power of the Papacy from the hands of the king. Leo, having little knowledge of canon law, prepares to depart for Rome to undertake the work of reform needed there, and he asks Hildebrand to accompany him. Hildebrand refuses: "Nontacio,' inquit. Respondit episcopus (Leo): 'Quare non?' At ille: 'Quia non secundum canonicum institutionem, sed per secularem et regiam potestatem Romanam Ecclesiam accipere vadis.'"[102] Leo submitted (like a "good" pope) to the advice of Hildebrand, and went to Rome to be elected by the people of Rome: "Ego, 'inquit,' Romam vado; ibique si clerus et populus sua sponte me sibi in pontificem elegerit, faciam quod rogatis: 'aliter electionem nullam suscipiam.'"[103] Hence, the leadership of the Church is conferred upon Leo in Rome. Until that is done, none of his works, no matter how necessary or good they may be, are valid.

The ultimate leadership of the Church is, in this view, legal leadership. No other is valid. For Bruno of Segni the division between the "inner Church" and the great

hierarchy of Rome had no meaning. The doctrine "extra ecclesiam nulla salus" meant that the Roman Church alone conferred salvation. The priestly concept of office had triumphed; the way to God was the peculiar province of the priest.[104] The "corpus Christi" was the Church of Rome; any division made between the external Church and the internal Church was a purely intellectual division and subject to a charge of heresy. While the argument was probably doctrinally sound (and the only possible one for a Curialist), the mystic might seriously challenge such a view. With his belief that a place in the heavenly hierarchy was won by moral worth, the declaration by the sacerdote that he (the sacerdote) had a monopoly on salvation might not be too well received, especially if the sacerdotal hierocracy became open to charges of corruption.

That the Curia refused to recognize the distinction between the temporal character of the Church and the Augustinian "community of believers" is to be seen in the Vita Anselmi of Rangier of Lucca, a work composed at about the same time as the Vita Leonis.[105] This is an exceedingly long and laborious poetic rendition of the life of Anselm of Lucca copied after an earlier life of one Bardo.[106] It is a general history of the Gregorian Reform and gives little genuine insight into Anselm's life. It is significant for our study, however, in that it represents the Curial attempt to justify the sacerdotal idea of the conquest of the world, the Curial belief in the necessity of control of the temporalia, and

the type of leader which control of the temporalia necessitates: the canon lawyer. In the development of the three themes, Rangier of Lucca effectively rejects the Augustinian "spiritualistic" view of the Church, makes external goods of the Church an essential part of the Church, and defines his leadership ideal in terms of the defense of those external goods.

The fact that the Papacy claims to be the heir to the Roman Empire (a claim supported by the idea of the translatio imperii) is the determining factor in the leadership ideal envisioned by Rangier of Lucca. Since the Papacy is the representative of Christ on earth, it is the source of all power, both spiritual and temporal (Ad Christum veniam, regem super omnia regna et dominatorem tocius imperii).[107] This power makes a certain type of leader necessary to the Church. Prior to the Reform this power had not been recognized in its full capacity, but with the coming of the Reform Popes the power of Rome was reacquired.[108]

Now for Rangier of Lucca the power of Rome is not only magisterial, it is juridical as well. The libertas ecclesia hinges upon the ability of the popes to maintain their control over the rights granted by Constantine to Sylvester I. This is the theory of the translatio imperii. Hildebrand is seen as the man who first realized the nature of the Constantinian donation; he is presented as saying:

> Rex nobis non est, homo fallitur ille,
> Qui putat hanc urbem subdere servicio.
> Roma per antiquum non servit, sed dominatur:
> Roma sibi famulos novit habere duces.

Hystoriae narrant et regnum gesta locuntur,
Quae sibi Romanus subdideret populus.[109]

Then Gregory quotes the words of Constantine in which the Emperor defined the powers of the See of Rome:

Sic habiit, sic instituit, qua viveret, urbem,
Silvestroque decus et diadema dedit.
Qui monitus causus discernere pontificales
Horruit addictos litibus esse deos.
"Vos, inquit (Constantine), vestras per vos decidite lites,
Nam non est hominis ponere iura diis.
Vos autem Deus ipse deos testante propheta
Astruit et sobolem non negat esse suam.
Me vero sicut relicos ubicumque potentis
Exequare Deo gloria nulla potest." [110]

Thus the power of judication and the power of the Empire ("decus et diadem") are given to the Pope.

This power of the popes exists apart from the purely spiritual power of the See of Rome. The See of Peter is "Fons fidei Christus, fons vitae spiritualis, et pastoralis arbiter officii,"[111] but it also is the source of all kingly power. This contention is illustrated by a long passage describing the power of the Old Testament prophets over the kings of Israel. The prophet Samuel is shown to be, not only kingmaker, but lawgiver as well: "Sic a principio Saul a Samuhele creatur et regni leges ipsa propheta dedit."[112] This same power is given to the See of Rome, although Rangier, as a good Gregorian, points out that it does not hinge upon the personal merit of individual popes: "Non quia de Petro procedat procedat gratia tanta, sed quod Petrus agit, nonnisi Christur agit."[113] The type of man best suited to administer this power over both the spiritual and the temporal is represented by Gregory VII and Anselm of Lucca, according to Rangier.

Gregory is presented as the real power behind the pontificate of Alexander II ("Hildebrandus erat vox euis")[114] and is likened, in his struggle against the imperial tyrant (seen as a Nero), to the martyrs of the ecclesia primitiva.[115] Hildebrand is aided in his struggle by the peculiar talents of Anselm of Lucca.

Now it is interesting that Rangier recognized of the departure from ascetic ideals which Anselm's activity entailed, but he justifies that departure in the light of the times. Anselm is presented as being, above all, a pious man:

> Omnis in Anselmo sibi sentit ab etere missum,
> Quo soleant pasci corda quieta, cibum.
> Pascuntur verbis, pascuntur religione,
> Pascuntur lacrimas illius atque fame.[116]

His education is shown to have prepared him for his work in the reform; he is seen to be proficient in theology, law, and rhetoric.[117] Because he is so trained, Gregory wishes to enroll him in his Curia. He gives him the task of correcting canon law.[118] It is the knowledge of law which is needed to defend the Church's claim to the imperial power which Constantine had given to it, for law is peculiarly necessary to the Church which wishes to maintain its hold on the temporalia.

Rangier recognized that such a claim was dangerous. For this reason he included in his Vita a long discussion of the differences between the active and contemplative lives and a discussion of the relative merits of Augustinian sapientia and dialectical scientia. Such a discussion could have been brought about only by continued criticism of the

harsh character, the compulsive character of Roman law as criticized by the Augustinian ideal of *charitas*. As we shall see, the Anonymous of York especially had developed this theme and had continued the tradition of Walram von Naumburg. It is conceivable that criticism like that of these two authors prompted Rangier's long discussion of the matter.

It is not until line 1175 that Rangier broaches the subject. Grammarians, rhetoricians, and dialecticians have thrown all into a state of confusion (Grammaticus, rhetor, dialecticus omnia turbant).[119] Rangier recognizes that the *sapientia* of St. Benedict "qui nos informat atque reedificat" is the most desirable kind of knowledge.[120] "Scrire Deum satis est, quo nulla scientia maior;..."[121]

And:

> Ihesus habet lucem, sine quo medicat et errat,
> Qui se cumque putat scrire vel esse aliquot.
> .....
> Multa loqui mentis conturbat simplicitatem,
> Et passim rapimur mulliplicante sono.[122]

Since he has acknowledged the superiority of *sapientia* over *scientia* Rangier finds it necessary to justify Anselm's leaving his charge in Lucca to go to Rome in the service of Gregory. This argument is presented as an evaluation of the active and contemplative lives. Standard allegorical or Biblical figures are used to present both sides of the argument. St. Paul, Rachel, and Mary represent the comtemplative life, while Peter, Lea, and Martha represent the active life. The people of Lucca are shown asking Anselm: "O quid fecisti, pastor bone, deseruisti plebem commissan caelitus et patriam?"[123] Then follows a eulogy of the active life in which the figure

of St. Marin of Tours is evoked to give authority to the need for the holy man to enter into the struggle of the Church against the powers of evil.[124] Anselm argues that all types are needed to defend the faith:

> Conveniunt Christo virgo, thorus et viduata,
> Conveniunt fortes, conveniunt fragiles.
> Convenit armorum racio pro pace tenenda,
> Convenit et dormitor ruris in arte sua
> Convenit orator supremus et ultimus ordo,
> Per quem subsistunt atque valent alii.
> Nec minus apta Deo concedimus ocia vestra
> Et Rachel (contemplative life) lumen novimus et speciem.
> Set neque tu lippam debes contempnere Lyam (active life)....[125]

Then Gregory is shown instructing his Curia. They will live holy lives so as to better carry out their missions.[126] All of this is given to show that the rumors circulated about Gregory and his men being "false monks" are untrue.[127] Again Rangier repeats that the Gregorians did not undertake the conquest of the world for their own ambition ("Ambiciosus homo non placet ecclesiae"),[128] and once more we are given a full development of the David-Nathan motif justifying the Church's claim to power over the temporal.[129]

The long digressions and lack of system in Rangier's life may stem somewhat from the fact that it was a derived work. Repetition abounds, and the necessity of developing complicated arguments in a poetic form sometime bogs the author down in endless repetition. Since we are only concerned with the leadership ideal which Anselm represents in Rangier's eyes, we will summarize our evidence in that matter without further reference to his general political theory. This political theory is in the orthodox Gregorian strain in

any case.

The leader as canon lawyer can only be justified in the light of two claims made by Rome: that the See of Rome is superior both juridically and magisterially to all other sees of Christendom and that the papal power is superior to the imperial power. If these claims did not have to be supported, then the Curia would have little reason for calling Anselm from the contemplative life of the cell into the world. The fact that conflicting claims over power exist also makes it necessary that Anselm be able to use the tools of dialectic and law. For only by the use of these sciences will the Papacy come into its own. While Rangier was not willing to admit that "divine ignorance," the wisdom of the ascetic, was invalid, at the same time he has to admit that the only thing which makes his ideal leaders, the Gregorians, superior to preceding popes is their ability in these fields. Given Rangier's assumptions, the logical conclusion is that the contemplative life is fine but is ineffectual in dealing with the problems of the Church of his day. This is as much as admitting that the Gregorian ends are not the same as the ends of the monk and ascetic. Similarly, while a highly moral life is necessary to the leader of the Christian community, it is not his distinguishing mark. Rangier's leader is not a charismatic leader; he does not lead by example, and he does not achieve his office by spiritual exercise. He achieves his status in the hierarchy by the use of certain skills, and he is appointed by legal office holders, men who

have been elected to the See of Rome.

Whether Bruno and Rangier meant their works to be taken as rejections of the charismatic leadership ideal is impossible to say. There can be little doubt, however, that both firmly stood behind the conclusions concerning the papal office which had first been stated in the work of Humbert of Silva Candida. Under no circumstances could either man admit that the ultimate basis of papal leadership was moral worth; This would be to deny the whole of the Gregorian Reform. But as the Curia came to be concerned with purely administrative problems, anti-Gregorian writers came to argue that the See of Rome had deviated from ascetic ideals by repudiating the claim to lead the Christian community on merit. One of the most vociferous of the anti-Curial writers and one of the most original propagandists of the time took up the theme begun by Walram of Naumburg; this was the anonymous author of the Tractates of York.

The Tractates of the Anonymous of York consist of thirty one libelli de lite issued by a Norman or English cleric concerning various issues which were raised in Church government and theology during the years c. 1080 to 1104.[130] The bulk of the work was composed after 1096, and thirteen of the tractates were composed between the years 1101 and 1102.[131] We may thus consider the work approximately contemporary with the works by Bruno and Rangier and consider all the Tractates as a whole, since they are remarkably consistent.

It must be admitted that in the tractate entitled De

Consecratione Pontificis et Regis, the Anonymous of York embraced a strict theory of caesaropapism. This political theory stemmed from the Anonymous' concept of the Christian community. He argued that the Church was not an artificial construct, an institution, but a spiritual Gestalt, made up of invisible relationships which held between the members: "Ecclesia quippe Dei quid aliud est, quam congregatio fidelium christianorum in una fide, spe et charitate, in domo Dei cohabitantium."[132] This was good Augustinianism, but it also smacked of Tertullian. The Anonymous, however, drew some startling conclusions from it. He argued that since the Church was only a group of laymen, the king, as head of the laity, was the head of the Church. Furthermore, the king reflected the superior part of the two natures of Christ: Christ the King and Christ the Priest.[133] But since there was only one authority in the world, the king was that authority. The priest might participate in that authority, but he wielded temporal power only in an interregnum and then only long enough to bestow it on the next king. The king was thus the real imago Dei on earth and the head of the Church.[134]

This view of the king's position was developed in only one of the thirty-one extant documents. Needless to say, it might have raised the ire of the most pious of pietists, but it stemmed from the Anonymous' genuine belief in the idea that the priest should concern himself only with the administration of the sacraments. This is not to say that the Anonymous underplayed the importance of the "holy man" in

the community. On the contrary, it is exactly because the king rules the Church that the ascetic and mystic may go about their tasks without interference from the priestly hierarchy. We must not mistake caesaropapism of the Anonymous for a rejection of the leadership ideals which he wishes to ascribe to the real religious leader. This leader is, for him, the holy man. In his desire to keep the priest in his primary function of administering the sacraments, the Anonymous represents a tendency which was not new and which was finding support every day in pietistic circles. This view held that the Church was a purely spiritual entity and that the real leaders of the Church were the saints, men of proven moral worth, not legally ordained priests. This being said, we may continue in our analysis of the other tractates with which we are concerned.

The principal argument, the one most consistent argument in the whole of the Tractates of York, is the idea that merit (moral worth) is the only basis of leadership of the Christian community. One's place in the hierarchy of being is determined by moral worth, according to the Anonymous, and he argues that the same considerations should also prevail in the delegation of authority to the ecclesiastical hierarchy (although, for our writer, the Church is such a spiritual entity that it hardly matters who has official authority).

In the tractate entitled De Una Ecclesia the nature of the Church is defined. All of the members of the Church are bound together in harmony and equality in the ideal. This

equality stems from the gift of the Holy Spirit, which is diffused equally throughout the Church: "Auctoritate sanctorum patrum didicimus, quod sancta ecclesia toto orbe diffusa una sit ecclesia, una sponsi columba, unum Christi corpus, quia adheret Domino unus spiritus."[135] The very nature of the diffusion of the Holy Spirit prohibits the establishment of a formal hierocracy in which certain elements might seek to dominate others: "At vero una ecclesia, una columba non potest sui ipsius domina esse vel inferius et unus spiritus non potest sibi prelatus esse vel subditus. Qua propter illa pars, quae superior vult fieri et alterius dominari, vel illa, quae inferior habitur et ancillatur, non erit ecclesia...si omnes partes insimul una sunt ecclesia, nulla tamen earum per se integritatem huius totius obtinent aut nomen."[136] If, he argues, all sacraments have equal efficacy, then the churches which administer those sacraments must be equal themselves.[137] The Humbertine argument (that certain loci have more authority than others) is denied upon these grounds. If one church or one diocese is superior to another, it is a purely moral superiority, and such superiority is not manifested in power itself.[138] Superiority may stem only from the fact that the members of one church are morally more pure than those of some other church. But the apostolic power was given equally to all of Christ's disciples in the great Heavenly City which came into being in Jerusalem: "Constitues (omnes apostoli) principes super omnem terram. Si ergo super omnem, et super Romanam. Et non solum Petrus et Paulus, sed

etiam omnes apostoli Romanae aecclesiae principes facti sunt, qui sunt Hierosolimitana aecclesiae ac per hoc illa princeps eius esse dinoscitur."[139]

If spiritual power has been given equally to all, then the opportunity of salvation is given equally to all. The will to attain salvation is an individual matter, and the holiness of a man's life is an indication that he has availed himself of that opportunity by his own will. For this reason the only thing which gives status in the religious community is the "magnitude of sanctity" which each member attains.[140] That this status is a purely internal thing, not to be confused with the formal hierarchy, is seen in the distinction made by the Anonymous between the churches of Rome and Jerusalem. Jerusalem is holier than Rome because "De Sion exivit lex et verbum Domini."[141] Furthermore, Jerusalem and not Rome was the center of Christ's activities: "De quorum semine Christus natus et salus et redemptio totius mundi orta est. Ipse fuit solium et thronus David et regnum, super quod Christus sedit in aeternum..."[142] And: "In ea sanctum condidit evangelium et salutarem doctrinam et legem Spiritus sancti et primitias sanctae fidei et exempla iusticiae, quie convenit omnibus imitare...Ipse factus est principale membrum, id est caput eiusdem aecclesie."[143] Rome, on the other hand, is "caput erroris, civitatem sanguinem, luxui et libidini deditam, purpuratam meretricem, demonibus prostitutum et omniformium viciorum plenissimam."[144] Thus Jerusalem "prima conversationem habuit in caelis," and is

the real head of the corpus Christi, the Church.

If Christ is the head of the Church and the Holy Spirit is equally diffused in the body of the Church, no one place can claim superior authority.[145] Within the Christian community the highest authority is that of the apostle who best represented the contemplative life, St. Paul: "His igitur verbis ostenditur, quod Petrus non est apostolus gentium, sed circumcisionis. Et si non est apostolus, nec episcopus. Paulus vero et apostolus et episcopus et doctor est gentium."[146] This means to say that Peter, who represents the active life, is concerned with the spreading of Christianity outside the Christian community. The auctoritas with which he has been vested has little use in a community of the faithful; the values associated with Paul, internal values, are the ones to be practiced within the community. Precisely what constitutes those values brings us to our discussion of leadership in the view of the Anonymous of York.

The leadership ideals of the Anonymous of York may be discussed under three headings: the hierarchy of merit, the concept of law which he professes, and his view of the Papacy. The first is the basis of the other two, so we shall discuss it in some detail.

The idea of the hierarchy of merit grows, like all of the Anonymous' ideas, out of his concept of the equality of all members of the corpus Christi. The sole source of superiority in the Christian community is holiness of life: "Superiores autem partes huius corporis superiora sunt

membra Christi, id est sancti, qui majoris sunt meriti et sanctitatis."[147] This idea is entirely consistent with the Anonymous' position, stressed in other tracts, that neither locus nor official recognition of superior status can grant that status in any real sense. But how are we to recognize the holy? Here the Anonymous joins the increasing number of imperial propagandists who claim to be "returning to the sources" of Christianity. He claims to go beyond the formal legal structure raised by the Gregorians back to Biblical and Augustinian springs. He finds his standard in the concept of the "imitatio Christi." In Christ's life on earth and in his utterances found in the Bible we have the only standard necessary for judging the holiness of a man's life. Insofar as man manifests the traditional (monkish) virtues of charitas, humilitas, and paupertas he will attain to saint-hood.[148] These saints set the example for the rest of society and therefore lead the Church on earth; the priest exists only to administer the sacraments. The formal hierarchy has no other function, no ruling function. In the tractate De Consecratione Pontificis et Regis, the Anonymous states that it is the king's function to rule the people and to sacrifice (immolare) to God, but the king's sacrifice is invisible and consists in the imitatio of Christ's life,[149] while the priest's sacrifice is visible. Thus, even the king's position is based upon his emulation of the life of Christ insofar as he must manifest traditional Christian virtue in order to be worthy of rule.

The law which governs the Christian community is the law of *charitas*; this is a purely moral law and has nothing to do with the written canon law of Rome. In one tractate, entitled *De Canonibus et Decreta*, the Anonymous briefly touched upon a criticism of the Gregorian legal reform. He objected especially to the Gregorian idea of judication of the pope. He admits that "sacred canons" hold that the Pope shall be judged by no one, but he also holds that these canons must be examined in the light of the law of *charitas*. If this is done, it will be seen that the ope should be judged, especially on moral grounds. Not all canons have equal weight,[150] and man is justified in breaking some of them if he acts not out of a sense of pride but toward the fulfillment of the ideal of *charitas*.[151]

Thus, the pope must be judged for his immoral acts: "Nam si summus pontifex homicida fuerit factus vel adulter vel fornicator vel aliquid huiusmodi, ut de sanctiomoniae gradu et honore virtutis corruat et non intelligens comparetur iumentis insipientibus et similis factus sit illis, nonne sicut iumentum insipiens corrigendus est et, qualem se fecit, sine sanctimonia et honore, talis et iudicandis?"[152] Obviously, in the view of the Anonymous, the popes of the Gregorian epoch had manifested their unworthiness in their rebellion against the princes; they had manifested the most heinous of sins, pride. To the end of making judication of the pope possible, the Anonymous gave his own interpretation of the papal office. The papal office itself does not excuse

the pope from judgement, for "according to the pope's character as a pope, he is above men; but according to his character as a man, he is one among men, and according to his character as a sinner, he is below men."[153] The "saints" of the community are above the pope if the pope sins, and it is they who shall judge him:

> Nam enim summus pontifex sic iudicatur, non homo, set peccator utroque inferior. Set a quibus debet judicari? A sanctis hominibus, in quibus manet Christus et inhabitat spiritus sanctus, et qui Domino adherentes unus cum eo sunt spiritus. Iste etenim licet inferiores sint ordine, superiores tamen sunt et vitae merito et consortio Christi et virtute inhabitantis in se Spiritus sancti et unitate Domini... Potest etiam et debet a se ipso iudicare summus pontifex, si necessitas et ratio extitit.[154]

By the same token, the Anonymous held a similar position relative to the office of the priest in general. In a tractive entitled De Depositione Sacerdotis, he had opposed the Gregorian view that the priest's office did not hinge upon his morality. The Anonymous could write (as St. Bernard would write later): "In quantum enim peccator est, malus est; in quantum vero sacerdos, bonus est."[155] Finally, the Anonymous appealed to the spirit of charitas to heal the split made between regnum and sacerdotium. He seems to have felt that the desire on the part of the sacerdotal hierarchy to dominate the world was a manifestation of force which was unbefitting the priest. He wrote:

> Debet confirmare fratres suas non infirmare. Debet honorare non vituparare. Debet peccantes instruere in spiritu lenitatis, non destruere in spiritu austeritatis. Debet unumquonque admonere secundum qualitatem morem ipsorum,

non secundum suum voluntatem vel proprii animi qualitatem.[156]

Similar themes are developed by Hugh of Fleury in his Tractatus de Regia Potestate et Sacerdotali Dignitate, although Hugh is not so rabidly antipapal nor so passionately pro-princely as the Anonymous of York.[157] One sees some of the sanity and dispassionate analysis which one is accustomed to find in Ivo of Chartres in this thinker.[158] Hugh of Fleury, while loyal to the princely power, attempted at the same time to arrive at a real understanding of what had caused the schism between regnum and sacerdotium. In the course of his investigation he arrived at a concept of leadership which he defined as non-Gregorian.

It is Hugh's contention that "scribes and pharisees," using sophistries of logic and law, have destroyed the pax and broken the unitas Christiana.[159] Gregory VII is seen to be the cause of all this difficulty, because he was elected without the king's consent. He is therefore the "destroyer of the peace" who has thrown the people and the clergy into confusion.[160] Hugh feels that this confusion can be solved with a redefinition of the roles of the bishop and the king. He defines these roles in terms of the ideal unitas.

God is the source of all power and all authority. Both the priestly and the kingly power exist in the service of the one authority:

Quas duas potestas in sua sola persona ipse Dominus Jesus Christus sacrosancto mysterio gestare decrevit, qui Rex simul est et sacerdos: Rex, quia nos regit; sacerdos vero,

> quia nos sui corporis immolatione a peccatorum nostrorum sordibus emundavit et Patri suo reconciliavit.[161]

In this definition, we are already given an insight into the roles of both king and priest and the values which govern those roles. The king exists to govern; his is the realm of law. The priest exists to serve God at the altar and to reconcile man to his God. Thus one envisions the two representatives of the divine power placed somewhere between God and the general run of men, but the king's task is directed upwards, toward the heavens. One exists to admonish man and the other to intervene for him before God.

In fact, Hugh develops this idea with a symbol which he finds in the differences between God the Father and God the Son.[162] It is the Father who represents force (lex) and the Son who incarnates love (charitas): "Reges igitur ministerium est populum sibi subjectum ab errore corrigere et ab aequitalis atque justitiae semitam revocare."[163] Often a cruel king will be visited upon the people. In such an exigency the people have no right of rebellion because (since the king represents the aspect of force in God's justice) this visitation is God's will.[164] The people can only pray to be delivered from their own guilt through God's mercy.[165] The legitimate king, however, will lead his people through the exercise of justice and aequitas and will defend the Church against all transgression.[166]

Now since the role of the priest is to mediate between God and man, the law (as force) is not his province.[167] He is

the representative of charitas; and as that representative he must be not only competent in his office (at the sacrifice) but also pure morally, for an impure priest is unworthy to appear before God as the defender and mediator of the people:

> Quibus etiam moribus debeat pollere, et quibus virtutibus effulgere, apostolus Paulus declarat in epistola sua dicens: "Oportet, inquit, episcopum irreprehensibilem esse, sobrium, pudium, hospitalem, prudentem, non neophytum, non vinolentum, non percussorem, non litigiosum, sed modestum."...ipse debet exemplum bonorum, non solum sibi subjecto populo, sed etiam discolis hominibus, id est gentibus, vitae melioris ostendere...[168]

However, if the bishop was impure ("non est enim homo qui non peccet") the issue was to be settled "non in curia saeculari, sed in synodo generali."[169] The king's only control over the bishop is to preside over the election, and he has this power only because he, being present, can be sure that a good bishop is chosen.[170]

This emphasis upon the morality of the priest and bishop brings us to a discussion of the papal office itself. Hugh admits readily that the Bishop of Rome has the magisterial authority; that is, the Bishop of Rome has the ability to ordain. He is thus the head of the sacerdotal hierarchy.[171] Hugh is willing to admit that Constantine had given the pope the care of the imperial insignia, but he does not feel that the judicial authority went with it.[172] It is the king's task to settle disputes between bishops and to supervise elections.[173] The task of the pope is the same as that of any bishop, the spiritual care of souls, "non regnum

saeculi hujus, sicut ipse passionis suae tempore Pilato testatus est dicens: 'Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo.'"[174]

It is only at the end of the De Regia that Hugh discusses the authority by which he undertakes to criticize the See of Rome. Interestingly enough, it is the same authority which Peter Damiani cited when he criticized the policy of Alexander II and Archdeacon Hildebrand. Hugh notes that Peter willingly submitted to the criticism given him by Paul, and he derives from that example a generalization concerning the type of man who should criticize the Papacy. The saint, the holy, is delegated the task. Those men who incarnate the virtues of Paul, the contemplative virtues, may undertake the criticism of Peter, the representative of the sacerdotal hierarchy in the Church, for they are enlightened by the Holy Spirit: "quem Dominus Jesus Christus magister optimus ore suo docuerat et Spiritus sanctus illuminaverat." Thus the final authority in the Church is the saint. Charismatic leadership is once more affirmed, and to the mystic-ascetic is given the power to lead and criticise the formal hierocracy of priests. Again, the values involved are purely moral; they cannot be given or conferred by any authority on earth, but stem from the soul and are grasped in contemplation.

The criticism of the Gregorian leadership ideal by the year 1106 had solidified into certain general patterns. The most striking feature of the pattern is its similarity to the monkish leadership ideal, although in almost every case

the criticism of the Gregorians had come from sources in the service of either the German Emperor or the Kings of England or France. If any dissatisfaction was felt among the champions of the new pietism, it was not manifested as a purely pietistic criticism of the Papacy. Monks such as Walram von Naumburg and Hugh of Fleury cannot be considered "renegade" monks simply because they wrote for the imperial side. There can be little doubt, especially in the case of Hugh, that many of these monks were pro-imperial for the reasons they professed. These reasons were essentially Augustinian in character, being grounded in the belief that the Church's function should be purely spiritual and that the Gregorian Reform represented an attempt to impose the values of the sacerdote upon the monks - that it was, in fact, the work of "false monks."

Such a line of argumentation had, ironically, resulted in the formulation of an anti-Gregorian tradition which in almost all details foreshadowed the anti-Gregorianism of the Cistercians and their associates ten years later. The same excesses of papal power and Curial ostentation were criticised by the pietists after St. Bernard's opening salvo in 1119 upon the very same grounds as those put forward by such writers as Walram von Naumburg, Benon of Alba, Wido of Ferrara, the Anonymous of York, and Hugh of Fleury. That the Curia had recognized the nature of the imperial offensive is shown in the lives of Leo IX which we have described and in the Vita Anselmi, in which the new values and virtues which distinguish

the Gregorian ideal type are presented under the aspect of the old virtues and values. Papal wars are made into crusades and dialectic and law are transformed into virtues "necessary to the times." But the imperial writers continued to point out the basic inconsistencies in the Gregorian leadership ideal.

These inconsistencies were conceived to be: 1) the confusion of the Church of the spirit (the inner Church of St. Augustine) with the sacerdotal, or formal, or ecclesiastical hierocracy which extended from the Pope and the Curia through the bishops to the priest; 2) the belief that while all men were edified by God according to their moral purity, the See of Rome, by virtue of its position alone, was heir to a special kind of power which was not based upon any merit of a moral type whatsoever; and 3) the confusion of the wisdom of the heart (the wisdom of the mystic-ascetic) with the "science" of dialecticians and lawyers. The imperialists hold that the Pope may be <u>formal</u> head of Christianity because he is <u>formal</u> head of the hierocracy. But they maintain consistently that <u>real</u> leadership in the community is based solely upon moral purity and the knowledge derived in states of mystic contemplation. St. Paul and the virtues he represents are the guides to the Christian life and the means of judging the true leader of the religious community. In the world of the early twelfth century in which the forces of pietism were rising, such criticism must have fallen upon attentive ears. One needed only the kind of crisis which would bring

the idea of leadership into the forefront of discussion to ally the imperial concept with that of the pietists, already tending to put more stock in the mystic than in the formally ordained priest. The crisis was provided by the events of 1111-12 in which the whole of the Curia turned upon the Pope Paschal, and subjected him to an ordeal in which the main charge brought against him was that he had "deviated" from the Gregorian leadership ideal. To accuse a pious monk such as Paschal of such a crime must have led to a new evaluation of what constituted desirable and undesirable leadership virtues. We hold that the result of that re-evaluation was in part the schism of 1130.

In 1106 Paschal, on the advice of Ivo of Chartres,[175] began negotiations with the Kings of France and England. In the same year we find the cardinal subscriptio on the papal "bullae maiores" have disappeared. The cardinal subscriptio on papal bulls had become tantamount to Curial approval of papal acts since the beginning of Paschal's pontificate.[176] In 1106 the subscriptio disappears and does not re-appear until the Lateran Council of 1112, the council in which Paschal signed a "confession of faith" in Gregorian ideals and promised never to deviate from those ideals again.[177] The events of that council grew out of papal policy from 1106-11; the Pope's dependence upon Chartrian theory; and Henry V's abduction of the Pope, in which Paschal was forced to sign the Concordat of Sutri.

In 1111, Henry V entered Italy with an army of 30,000

men. Negotiations between the Pope and the Emperor were conducted at Sutri by the representatives of both parties. At these negotiations the papal representative, Petrus Leo, put forth the proposition which not only threw Henry off balance but brought about a rebellion of the Curia against Paschal. For Pierleone offered, in the name of the Pope, to renounce for all the bishops in all places all goods, all revenues and all regalia that they held from the Emperors.[178] Henry accepted the terms, but in February 1111, when he arrived in Rome to be crowned, he demanded that the agreement be postponed subject to the ratification of his own bishops. The Pope refused to continue with the ceremony of coronation. Henry abducted the Pope, forced him to crown him and extracted an agreement (11 April 1111) in which Paschal granted to the Emperor the right of investiture.[179] The Pope was held captive for two months before Henry left for Germany. In the Curia, however, the reaction to Paschal's failure was quick and deep.

We shall not discuss the relations between Paschal and Henry V. They have been discussed ad nauseam by partisans of every camp.[180] We are less concerned with the political events themselves than with the effect which those events had upon the stimulation of discussion of leadership ideals. For Paschal's apparent defeat was looked upon by the Curia as a leadership failure. While clerics north of the Alps lamented the Pope's abduction and castigated Henry as a barbarian, in Rome and in the Curial stronghold, Monte Cassino,

things took a different course.[181] Here the Pope was subjected to the harshest criticism in the light of what had become the "Gregorian leadership ideal." Fliche has called this action the "redressement gregorienne";[182] it partakes more of the nature of an open rebellion.

In Monte Cassino, Peter the Deacon quoted Psalm 113 to express the mood which prevailed in and about Rome.[183] While men such as Hildebert of Lavardin bewailed the loss of the "dux exercitus christiani" and "principium gratia...exemplar honesti, speculum gratie, fidei forma nostrorum Orpheus seculorum,"[184] the author of the "Rythmus de Captivitate Paschalis Papae" berated the "sacrilegi Teutonici, homine diabolici."[185] In June of 1111, the Curia still did not know whether or not Paschal had made the agreement with Henry of his own free will. Bruno of Segni, in a letter written to Peter of Porto, Cardinal-bishop, demonstrated how he regarded the leadership ideals which he had outlined in his Vita Leonis, written at the beginning of Paschal's reign.

This letter to Peter of Porto is one of four written by the Bishop-Abbot of Monte Cassino to various members of the Curia and the Pope himself. The letter to Peter of Porto is remarkable because of the way it states Bruno's concept of the relationship holding between Pope and Curia. Bruno was scandalized by the Pope's weakness in yielding to physical force. Lay investiture was a heresy in Bruno's Gregorian-influenced mind, and he added that whoever supported such a heresy exposed himself to a charge of heresy. This included

the Pope himself (Omnis autem qui heresim defendit hereticus est).[186] Bruno saw the whole of Gregory VII's work being destroyed by a weak pope.[187] Two other members of the College of Cardinals, John, Cardinal-bishop of Tusculo, and Leo, Cardinal-bishop of Ostia, issued a similar statement.[188] Paschal was forced to justify his actions, in a letter to the latter two, by saying that he had acted "pro fratribus atque filiis, pro excideio Urbis et universae provinciae."[189] Bruno of Segni was not to be discouraged; he acted from the certainty of a cardinal who knew his rights. This certainty led to a letter to the Pope himself. In this letter Bruno returned to the sources of curial constitutionalism. A distinction was made between the obedience which the faithful owed to the Pope and the obedience which the faithful owed to God. Whether, in making that distinction, Bruno had Humbert's concept of the right of the Curia to judge the Pope in mind, we cannot say. That he knew Humbert's works had been shown in his Vita Leonis. That Humbert's Sentences were well known in the Curia of Bruno's time is shown in the number of canon law tracts of the period which were modeled upon the Sentences.[190] It is, nonetheless, interesting to note that while canon law tracts of the period continued to argue that the Holy See could be judged by no one, Bruno of Segni, under the impact of the Concordat of Sutri, could write:

> Inimici mei dicunt tibi, quia te non diligo, et quia de te mala loquor: sed mentiuntur. Ego enim sic diligo, sicut patrem et dominum diligere debeo, et nullum alium te vivente volo habere pontificem, sicut ergo cum mul-

> tis aliis tibi promisi. Audio tamen Salvatorem meum michi dicentem: "Qui amat patrem aut matrem plus quam me, non est me dignus." Unde et apostolus dicit: "Si quis non diligit dominum Jesum, sit anathema maranatha." Debeo igitur diligere te, sed plus debeo diligere illum, qui et te fecit, et me.[191]

Here was the form of the mystic appeal to God, over and beyond constituted authority. But there was a difference between Bruno's admonition of the Pope and the mystic's or prophet's reform activity. Bruno, in his own mind, was within the limits of Curial rights, for he argued that the Pope was approaching heresy in so far as he insisted upon defending the agreement which had granted to the Emperor the right of lay investiture.

But lay investiture was not the real issue behind the curial revolt. Paschal's real crime was his willingness to emasculate papal power by surrender of the temporalia. Surrender of the temporalia, besides destroying the basis of curial existence, was an affront to the Gregorian ideal. This was Paschal's real crime, and this was the reason for the curial revolt. In the same letter to Paschal, Bruno gave as the reason for his revolt his adherence to the law. The curial revolt was, he felt, legally justifiable:

> Habemus canones, habemus sanctorum patrum constitutiones a temporibus apostolorum usque ad te: via regia incedendum est, neque ab ea in aliquam partem declinandum. Apostoli omnes illos damnat, et a fidelium communione segregant, quicumque per saeculorum potestatem ecclesiam obtinerent; laici enim, quamvis religiosi sint, nullam tamen disponendi ecclesiam habent facultatem. Haec namque constitutio apostolorum sancta est; cui quicumque contradicit, catholicus non est: omnis autem

> qui haeresim defendit, haereticus est; nemo autem hanc non esse haeresim dicere potest, quam sancta et apostolica ecclesia in multis conciliis haeresim nominavit, et simul cum suis auctoribus dampnavit et excommunicavit.[192]

The authority cited were the "sacred canons," but there was a more specific meaning than Bruno had wished to give. In a third epistle, concerning "the Heresy called Lay Investiture," Bruno expounded his views for the edification of the Italian higher clergy. Here he cited his devotion to Gregorian ideals: "Et ego quidem quod dixi hoc dico et in Gregorii et Urbani sententia firmissime maneo, et spero..., quia in hoc voluntate usque in finem permanebo."[193] A letter to "to the Cardinals and Bishops of the Holy Roman Church" completed the cycle.[194]

Now it is important to note that the Curia maintained that lay investiture was a heresy even though the Pope had signed a document which the curia could not prove, or did not for certain know, was forced.[195] To all appearances the Pope had issued a decree stating that lay investiture was not a heresy; and he had the right to do this even if it contradicted past papal decrees, for as it had been stated by Bernhold:

> Est autem privilegium Romani pontificis juxta assertionem sancti Sylvestri, Gelasii et reliquorum patrum, ut ipse de omnibus aecclesiis iudicare valeat, nec alicuius judicio subjaciet, et ut ipsorum canonum sive decretorum severitatem pro temporis necessitate valeat, immo debeat mitigare.[196]

Furthermore, the most outstanding canonist of the time, discussing an action to which we shall refer later, supported

the right of the Pope to grant lay investiture if he so chose. Ivo of Chartres, in his famous letter to Jusserand, Archbishop of Lyons, argued that investiture was a political question, not an immutable religious doctrine, and could be changed at the Pope's pleasure.[197] The Curia, however, were convinced of their right to judge the Pope's action. That their concept of their rights was grounded as much in an emotional attachment to the traditional figure of the "Gregorian leader" as in concepts of canon law can be seen in a work issued in the last quarter of the year 1111. This work is the Liber de Honore Ecclesiae, written by the Benedictine prior Placidus of Nonantola.

The word "honor" which we note in the title could be taken to have a double meaning. For in the Curial view Paschal's action had not only done away with the "offices" of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, but had destroyed the "dignity" of the Papacy itself.[198] This double meaning may be seen as a clue to the reasons why Placidus dwelt as much on a redefinition of the papal leader as he did upon a redefinition of the Gregorian concept of the regalia of the Church.

The leadership ideal which Placidus put forth is simple to apprehend. It is seen in the number of exemplary leaders held up to Paschal in an attempt to shame him for his cowardice, for each of the figures drawn is distinguished by his ability to remain firm in the face of physical torture and pain. One might take this for a re-affirmation of the martyr ideal (which it claimed to be) were it not so apparent-

ly another example of the use of the martyr theme for bolstering papal courage against the emperor. Consider the group of ideal leaders which Placidus would have serve as a reference group for the Pope: There is John the Baptist: "veritatem in tantum amator ut iniustum facinus interdicendo regi, mori pro veritate nequaquam timeret."[199] There is Maccabeus: "pro patribus legibus mori non recusarunt."[200] There is St. Stephan Protomartyr, eulogized for his courage as Paschal had eulogized him for his humility.[201] Popes Martin I and Innocent I complete the list except for two names; these are Gregory VII and Urban II. Of these two popes, Placidus writes:

> Moderno etiam tempore venerandae memoriae Gregorius VII papa pro honore sanctae aecclesiae dimicans multas et varias tempestas sustinuit, sed flecti non potuit, quia fundatus erat super firmam petrus. Urbanus etiam eius successor II illius sequens exemplum.[202]

Thus the Gregorian archetype was drawn as the scale by which Paschal was exhorted to measure himself. Thus, too, was Chartrian theory of the nature of the episcopate rejected. Placidus believed that any deviation from the Gregorian concept of the episcopate constituted heresy and would lead ultimately to the destruction of the Church.[203] Of course, such an idea was based upon the twin assumptions that the hierarchy could not exist without worldly goods and that the Church could not exist without the hierarchy.

Placidus' view of the nature of the episcopate was completely Gregorian, but it denied the concept of the inner Church and it denied the very basis of the poverty movements

of the time. To young men such as Bernard of Clairvaux (who in the same year entered the monastery of the Cistercians in Citeaux) and to Norbert of Magdeburg (who was at that very time spreading his chiliastic messages all over Germany)[204] such interest in the Machtpolitik ideals of a Gregory VII and Urban II must have seemed strange. This is not to mention the fundamental importance which the Curia placed upon maintaining the hierocracy in all its splendor. St. Bernard, as he wrote later, looked upon the episcopate as a snare for any man who wished real salvation or wished to follow the real religious life.[205] The Curia, in its hysterical effort to save the hierocracy, was, in fact, creating ideas which could only lead to a disillusionment among the masses of the Church. For the Curia argued, on the one hand, that the Pope was all powerful, and yet they corrected him. They argued that the Pope could change the law, but they would not allow him to change it if it meant that the Curia and the higher clergy would suffer. They claimed to imitate the martyrs, yet rode abroad in state and eulogized a warrior pope. They claimed to protect those who sought inner salvation, and yet denied that the external Church was different from the internal Church. Finally, they eulogized Augustinian "sapientia" but used dialectical "scientia" for their own purposes. We find this last trait developed to a high degree in the Liber de Honore Ecclesiae.

Reinke has placed Placidus of Nonantola among the most distinguished masters of dialectical argumentation known to

the Investiture Period.[206] Placidus' dialectic is signalled by his use of the argument "ex ratione." The prior, of course, defines the term "ex ratione" as that knowledge which is brought by divine grace.[207] So defined, Placidus' use of arguments "ex ratione" do not constitute a radical departure for the time, but they are employed in key situations to buttress arguments for which auctoritas fails. Furthermore, the fact that the argument "ex ratione" was used to buttress arguments designed to curb the pious Paschal gives it the character of an anti-pietist weapon, partaking of the same nature as that practiced in Paris at the same time. Abelard would shortly compose the famous preface to the Sic et Non, and the sentencers were busily proving that no argument approached auctoritas as a theological weapon.[208] Yet Placidus appealed to "rationes" sixty times in his treatise, while other arguments were based upon the Bible (133 times), the Fathers (25), and the registers of Gregory VII and Urban II (27). Needless to note, in the most critical points the two authorities "rationes" and Gregory VII-Urban II were used to the greatest degree. Thus was dialectic openly used by the lawyers of the Curia to curb Paschal's power.

Now, however, the Curia received aid from without. If any indecision remained as to their rights in attacking Paschal, those doubts were removed by the action taken in southeastern France by Jusserand, Archbishop of Lyons, and Guy, Bishop of Vienne. The former intended to convene a council at Anse for the purpose of censuring the Pope.[209] Only

the refusal of Ivo of Chartres to sanction such a move hindered Jusserand and Guy. Ivo's reasons for refusing to go to Anse were two. In the first place, he did not think that the question of lay investiture was a matter of faith. He conceived of the papal position on lay investiture to be an administrative ruling on a political issue - a political issue which might have religious overtones, to be sure, but a political issue nonetheless.[210] If the Popes of the early reform had pronounced against it, this was because they had seen that it had been necessary to the religious life of that day. If Paschal now wished to change this "administrative ruling," he had that right. Secondly, Ivo held that no one might judge the Pope in any matter. In so holding, Ivo was being consistent with his own belief in the whole of the Gregorian legal corpus.[211] In the Disputatio vel Defensio Paschalis Papae, the work of a French Chartrian, issued in earliest months of 1112,[212] Ivo's reasoning was expanded, but he held to his central theme: No one might judge the See of Rome:

> Habet enim Romani pontifices suum speciale privilegium prava corrigere, recta firmare, imperfectu perficere, et illicita prohibere. Habet Romana ecclesia privilegium, quod prima sedes non iudicatur a quoquam. Sedem apostolicam ...iudicare non audemus, nam ab ipsa nos omnes et a vicario suo iudicamur, ipse autem a nemine iudicatur.[213]

There may have been other reasons for the failure of the Council of Anse. Fliche cites two letters, which he dates near the end of 1111, in which Paschal promised to renounce the Concordat of Sutri.[214] Fliche is mistaken however,

along with Hefele and Mansi in attributing these letters to the end of 1111.[215] Jaffe-Wattenbach date these letters as June 19, 1112, three months after the Lateran Council of 1112 in which Paschal had signed his "confession of faith" in Gregorian ideals.[216] It is curious to see how often this mistake has been made and to find it in a work as recent as the Fliche-Martin Histoire de l'Eglise. As far as we know, Paschal was still loyal, as late as October 1111, to Henry V, even though he was being subjected to heavy pressures in his own Curia.[217] Only Ivo of Chartres' loyalty to the Pope saved the Church from a schism in 1111; but the French were in a bitter mood, as witnessed by Jusserand's letter to Ivo of Chartres in which the Pope as well as Ivo were branded as cowards.[218] Only the thought that a council was to be convened in the Lateran to discuss the issue kept the French from schism.

Many of the French clergy were loyal to the Pope. But such clerics as Ivo of Chartres and Hildebert of Lavardin remained loyal; Geoffrey of Vendome, Gerard of Angouleme, Robert of Paris, and Pontius of Cluny[220] were all solidly behind the Curia. Furthermore, the Italian higher clergy was firmly anti-Paschal, for his offer had threatened to do away with their temporalia. Paschal's offer applied for the most part to temporalia held within the Empire, so the Italian clergy had much more to lose than did the French. To the Curial force one must add the Pierleoni in Rome and Monte Cassino in Southern Italy. This bloc, consisting of the the French

higher clergy, the Italian higher clergy, the Curia, Monte Cassino, Cluny, and the Roman nobility, is essentially the same as that which supports Anacletus II in the schism of 1130. All were centers of Gregorian thought, all were allied to the Curial hierocracy, all had a stake in the maintenance of the Gregorian empire. To the end of saving that empire, the Curia was willing to "take the Pope prisoner," so that while officially power was still in the hands of the Pope, the Curia ruled the Church from 1112-1124.[221]

Of course, the Curia could not dispense with Paschal (Bruno had written: "nullum alium te vivente volo habere pontificem"); they could not afford an open break with the Pope while the Emperor still menaced them. Paschal therefore still had a measure of actual power. Furthermore, as a man noted for his piety and the purity of his personal life, he had a great following among the lesser clergy and the masses. Finally, he could still command some of the prestige of his office, the same office which had been occupied by Gregory VII and Urban II.[222] These three resources were open to the Pope, and these alone kept Paschal from having to comply with the Curial desire to excommunicate the Emperor and declare lay investiture a heresy. All means were exerted by the higher clergy, however, to make the Pope assume the Curial position. One example is to be found in the Lateran Council of March 1112.

The Lateran Council of 1112 was dominated by the more than one hundred bishops and archbishops who assembled there

to hear the Pope's "explanation" of the events of February-March 1111. Fliche feels that this council witnessed the "dissipation of the last doubts" which the clergy entertained of the Pope.[223] Such a conclusion does not seem merited by the facts available of that council. Consider, for example, the nature of Paschal's "confession of faith" in the Gregorian cause. This document, composed by Gerard of Angouleme, is nothing more than a promise by Paschal to abide by Gregorian ideals in his administration. And yet immediately after the Concordat of Sutri the Pope had written to Otto of Bamberg stating that he had signed the concordat out of a desire to adhere to ideas formulated by Gregory VII for the maintenance of the libertas ecclesiae. The Pope, in a number of letters which preceded the Sutri concords, had maintained that he had always been governed by the ideals of Gregory VII. But the curia interpreted the term "Gregorian ideals" in a manner completely different from that of Paschal. Whereas the Pope apparently looked upon Gregorianism as a set of ends, to be achieved by the means available, the curia looked upon Gregorianism as a set of means as well. If this were not so, the curia would not have composed Paschal's "confession" in the manner in which they did. For in this "confession" the Pope had to swear not only to abide by the ideals of the ecclesia primitiva, the Fathers, and the four oecumenical councils, but by the precepts put forth by Gregory VII and Urban II as well. If there were not a difference between the ideals of the ecclesia primitiva

and Gregorian ideals (and the Gregorians held that there was not), then there would be no reason to force the Pope to sign a document in which he swore to defend the latter as well as the former. Of course, there was a difference; and the difference, if not one of ends, was definitely one of means. Paschal was not only being sworn to defend the end of re-instituting the ideals of the ecclesia primitiva, he was being sworn to maintain all of the Gregorian legislation (the law and administrative concepts) which claimed to lead to those ends. Paschal signed the following statement:

> Amplector omnem divinam scripturam, scilicet Veteris et Novi Testamenti, Legem a Moyse scriptam et a sanctis prophetis; amplector IIII evanglia, VII canonicas epistolas gloriosi doctoris Pauli apostoli, sanctorum Apostolorum canones, IIII universalia concilia, Nicenum, Ephesenum, Constaninopolitanum, Calcedonense, et Antiocenum concilium et decreta sanctorum patrum Romanorum pontificum, et precipue decreta sanctorum patrum nostri pape Gregorii et beate memorie pape Urbani. Qui ipsi laudaverunt laudo; qui ipsi tenuerunt teneo; que confirmaverunt confirmo; que dampnaverunt dampno; que reppulerunt repello et que interixerunt interdico; que prohibuerunt prohibeo. In his semper perseverabo.[224]

There is no reason why we should not regard the clause quoted above as anything other than what it seems on the surface. If this statement was a declaration of war on Henry V, it was no less a contract between pope and Curia in which the former bought the adherence of the latter by swearing to an administrative program as well as a program of certain idealistic ends. It is a document unique in the development of the Papacy and a major document in the de-

velopment of the concept of curial constitutionalism. In a period in which the Papacy had achieved a measure of independence theretofore unequaled, the Pope, the successor of Urban II and Gregory VII, was forced to sign a settlement binding him to a policy which (if understood correctly) promised not to surrender one whit of the temporalia to the secular power. Yet, is it unique? Had not Humbert of Silva Candida provided for the judgement of the Pope in his Sentences, or at least hinted at such a possibility? Had not the man who formulated the basic precepts of Roman canon law also, in the De Sancta Romana Ecclesia and the letters of Leo IX, given a large place to the Curia in his distribution of the whole of papal power? Had not the canon lawyers left Humbert's ideas concerning the judgement of the Pope intact? Had not the College of Cardinals itself claimed, on more than one occasion, direct participation in the papal power? Was it not generally understood that the power of the See of Rome resided ultimately in the clergy and people of Rome, of which the curia was the representative? It seems, in fact, that the action taken by the Curia in 1111-12 was nothing more than the expression of a natural desire on the part of that body to protect the enormous power to which they considered themselves as much heir as was the Pope. The rebellion of 1111-12 was the open avowal of the Curia's belief in its rights. The papal power had become a purely Roman power.

The Lateran Council of March 1112 signals the open

avowal of a new concept of the papal office, one which had been tacitly recognized up to that time but which had never been capable of enforcement. Urban II seems to have recognized the swing in this direction. He had granted rights to the clergy of Rome which the anti-pope Clement III had granted to his adherents in an attempt to woo certain prelates to his cause.[225] The struggle between the Pope and the Curia for participation in the papal power had been in process since Humbert's Sentences. It was consummated under Paschal II. Of course, such a settlement could last only as long as the Pope did not have any alliances outside the Curia with which he could effectively combat the Curia and the upper clergy. But an ally of the popes against the Curia and upper clergy was in the making; this ally was to be found in the new pietistic orders. St. Bernard's relations to the popes of the period 1130-53 constitute nothing less than an alliance of pope and reform orders against the hierocracy created out of the Gregorian Reform. At least, one receives this impression from a study of the conflict of leadership ideals up to the schism of 1130. Such an alliance also assumes a rejection of the Gregorian leadership ideal. We shall see that rejection when we contrast the leadership ideals to be found in the Anaclectan (Gregorian) Liber Pontificalis of Pandolfo of Pisa and the concept of the papal power found in the writings of St. Bernard of Clairvaux.

Paschal swore to abide by the decrees of the Fathers, Scripture, the four oecumenical councils, and early papal

decrees; but the popes had always been, theoretically, so bound.[226] Paschal had certainly been acting in accordance with those decrees, at least in his own mind; and, according to Gregorian doctrine, who was better able to interpret the meaning of those decrees than the Pope?[227] But the decrees found in Gregory VII and Urban II are the very breath of life to the higher clergy and the Curia. Only by swearing to abide by these was Paschal swearing to remain faithful to certain administrative precepts. The real danger to the Curia was that Paschal would persist in his attempt to rid the Church of the temporalia it had received from the Emperors. The Curial action, in its insistence upon the excommunication of the Emperor and the branding of lay investiture a heresy, was designed to prevent Paschal's being able to effect a peace with the Emperor on anything but Curial terms.

In terms of leadership, this means that Paschal's reference group, the group of ideal leaders upon which he should base his actions, has changed. Prior to the Lateran Council of 1112 Paschal had been bound in only a vague way (much like Gregory and Urban before him) to follow the precepts of the ecclesia primitiva. The concepts of this reference group (along with Gregory I and Innocent I) could be used by any pope to substantiate almost any administrative position which he wished to take as long as this position could be justified in terms of such abstract concepts as charitas, humilitas, pax, paupertas, iustitia, aequitas. But once Gregory VII and Urban II are added to the reference group Paschal no

longer has a freedom of action which he might admire in the careers of Gregory and Urban. For now there exists a corpus of administrative concepts (in the registers of these popes) which has created final definitions of what constitute the best ways of achieving libertas, iustitia, etc., and Paschal is bound to these. The Curia is left as the final arbiter of the matter, guarding the Gregorian heritage, keeping the Pope in line, and ready to rebel if the Pope shows signs of deviation.

Significant also is the fact that Paschal did not sign the clause which was appended to the "confession" in which the Concordat of Sutri was defined, not as a privilegium, but as a pravilegium.[228] This clause was the work of the higher clergy and Curia, as witnessed by the unanimity which these two groups showed in the subscriptio. Among the signers were twelve archbishops, one hundred and fourteen bishops, fifteen cardinal priests, and eight cardinal deacons.[229] This was one show of Curial strength. The last years are full of such examples which we shall discuss after we have said a few words concerning Paschal's attempted abdication.

There are only two sources which speak of Paschal's abdication attempt. These are the episcopal history of Angouleme and the Pantheon of Godfrey of Viterbo. Only negative evidence exists in the Liber Pontificalis' Vita Paschalis which, although it is one of the longest lives in the Liber, says almost nothing of the Pope's career between the years 1106-1116.[230] The episcopal history of Angouleme should be a

reliable source; Gerard, Bishop of Angouleme, was one of the leading figures in the Curial revolt of 1112, it being he who composed the "confession" of Paschal.[231] This source states that Paschal did abdicate but was persuaded by the Curia to retain the papal seat.[232] Geofrey of Viterbo states that the Pope wished to abdicate, and places the time in the Lateran Council of 1112, but states also that he was restrained by the Curia.[233] The incident is mentioned in no other work. It seems within the realm of the possible, however, that Paschal did attempt to abdicate. Not only did he feel that his own work had been a failure, but he had been unhappy as Pope from the beginning of his reign. Yet, as we have noted above, the Curia could ill afford to have such a thing transpire. If the Pope had abdicated, it would have been as much as admitting that the "confession" of 1112 was really a compromise between the Pope's own desires and the desires of the Curia. That in fact a compromise had been effected is seen in the equivocal wording of the confession and the fact that the condemnation of the pravilegium had been appended to the document. Further evidence of Curial displeasure may be seen in the rebellion led against the Pope, first by Guy of Vienne, and later by Cono of Palestrina.

In September 1112, Guy of Vienne, dissatisfied with the turn of events in Rome, convened a council at Vienne. This council treated of a number of things, among them the issue of lay investiture as a heresy: "de investituras, de captione vestra et vestrorum, de proditione et perjuriis regis, de

pessimo illo pacto et privilegio quod a vestra magistrate violenter extorsit, tractare diligenter curavimus."[234] Lay investiture was condemned as a heresy, and Guy wrote to the Pope demanding immediate confirmation of his action, even though the Lateran Council of 1112 had already excused the Pope from committing himself so definitively as Guy would have it: "Et nunc, domine Pater, vestram, sicut dignum est, majestatem suppliciter exoramus, ut quod pro sancte catholice fidei robore, pro Dei et vestro honore fecimus auctoritate apostolica confirmetis."[235] This was plainly a challenge to Paschal, and, on 20 October, 1112, he confirmed the Vienne decisions, albeit in a rather vague way. As Hefele has noted: "La crainte d'un schisme avait determiné le pape a cette démarche."[236] The Pope was still strong enough not to commit himself to a war to the death with the Emperor. What he hoped to gain by delaying tactics is not readily apparent, but it is quite evident that the Pope and his Curia were at cross purposes in the interpretation of how the war with Henry V should be carried out.[237]

The determination of the Curia to force the Pope's detailed ratification of their ideas is seen in the constant pressure applied to the Pope during the last six years of his reign. During these years it is extremely dubious that Paschal had any effective hand in the management of Papal government. Witness, for example, the action of the papal legate, Cono of Palestrina, who, against the repeated wishes of the Pope, travelled to Cologne in 1115 and there launched

a decree of excommunication against the Emperor.[238] Paschal was completely helpless against his powerful legates, who by this time were more of an expression of curial will than of papal policy as such. The great legates seemed to wield absolute power in the provinces, and in turn they seemed responsible to no one but the Curia.[239] Appeal might be made to Rome, but the Curia decided the issues. The papal power constructed so carefully by Gregory and Urban during the period 1112-18 was dispersed among the members of the highest orders of the hierocracy. Power became a distinct entity, apart from the Pope who occupied the See of Peter, although that power was still wielded in Peter's name. The Curia manifested all the aspects of an organization which had seized power but maintained the outward show of traditional forms.

In branding lay investiture a heresy, the Curia effectively announced that it would not entertain any idea on this political question (for so Paschal and Ivo regarded it) which differed from its own. The Curia thus admitted, in a sense, that it could no longer depend upon charismatic leadership to sway the mass to its standard. The creative minority became, in fact, a dominant minority.[240] Politics and religious doctrine were no longer distinct realms of activity. Deviations from its political doctrine are made a religious heresy, even though the pope does not formally give his approval to this decision. Such an attitude is typical of the final stages in the development of the hierocracy. The

priestly hierocracy, through the propagation of law and dogma, attempted to secure not only general moral pronouncements but their own privileged administrative position as well.[241] It amounts to saying that the priesthood is the final arbiter in all matters even vaguely connected with the religious. Sociologically, one might compare this stage in the development of a religion to the final stages of any economic organization. Here the transition is made from the unorganized, spontaneous activity of a group of creative leaders, who deal with each situation when it arises, to the formation of the highly organized corporation in the later stages of its development, in which rules are set up by which every situation is to be handled.[242] Unorganized, prophetic religious activity is to be channeled into certain moulds, moulds which have their origins in Rome, specifically in the curia. If one does not support the curial position on lay investiture, he is, ipso facto, a heretic.

Thus had the shadow of Gregory VII fallen across the pontificate of Paschal II. That shadow was as much an active force in Paschal's reign as it had been in the time when the man was alive, for whatever was attempted in the curia, nay, in Rome, had to be done in the name of Gregory VII and in accordance with his ideal. Yet Paschal saw the ideal differently than the Curia did. To the Curia, Gregory was a financier a warrior, who had built an empire, created the great bureaucracy in Rome, and given the Curia its raison d'etre. To Paschal Gregory was the man who had attempted to

build the Church into a force within which the ecclesia primitiva could be restored. Gregory was all things to all men, depending upon the group who invoked his image. To the imperialists, he was a false monk, and the more the Curia made Gregory their own paragon, the more the Gregory "false monk" became possible for the pietists. Witness for example the events of the Lateran Council of 1116.

A council had been convened in the Lateran Palace in March, 1116, for the purpose of dealing with the imperial offensive which Henry V, having put down revolts in his own realm, was now preparing.[243] On the first day of the council a dispute arose between two prelates, both of whom claimed the archepiscopal seat of Milan. A committee of cardinal-bishops was chosen to decide the issue. On the third day of the council the Bishop of Pisa, Bernard, rose on the council floor and demanded to know the Pope's position on the pravilegium.[244] This meant that Paschal had avoided committing himself on that issue up to that time. This was undoubtedly the work of the radicals, for Bruno of Segni, once more in favor at the Curia, demanded that the Pope state his position on lay investiture.[245] Bruno wanted lay investiture pronounced a heresy in council by the Pope. The Pope hesitated, and then he asked for time to consider his answer. The following day, March 9, the council did not meet, but Paschal was visited by Pontius of Cluny, his chancellor, John of Gaeta, and Petrus Leo, head of the Pierleoni clan.[246] It is assumed that they discussed the imperial question. The Pope hoped

to escape the persistence of his Curia by re-reading the "confession" he had signed in 1112.[247] But then Cono of Palestrina rose and read the bull of excommunication which he had launched against the Emperor as papal legate and demanded to know whether Paschal supported his legates or not.

Paschal had already read to the council his idea on lay power of the Church. He eulogized the ecclesia primitiva as a time when the Church flourished according to the ways of God and not according to the ways of men. He had added that he felt the Church would have been better off if it had never acquired any temporalia whatsoever. But Cono wanted a specific answer: "Domine pater si tuae placet majestati, si vere tuus fui legatus, et quae feci, tibi placeant esse rata, in auribus sancti hujus praesentis concilii ore tuo edicitio, et legationem meam tua auctoritate corbora, ut sciant omnes, quia tu me misisti."[248] Paschal was thus given the opportunity to deny Cono's action. If he did so, it would have meant a blow struck against the Curia. Paschal did not dare strike such a blow; but that he was not willing to follow the Curial lead in the struggle against Henry V is seen by the nature of his answer to Cono:

> Vere legatus ex latere nostrus missus fuisti, et quidquid tu, caetereque fratres nostri Cardinales Episcopi, Legati Dei, et Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, hujus sedis nostra auctoritate fecerunt, probaverunt, ego quoque probo et confirmo: quidquid damnaverunt damno.[249]

Of course, Paschal had left himself a way out. He had said in effect: "What you do by my authority, I approve...etc."

This meant that if, in his own mind, he did not grant the authority to the acts of his legates, those acts were invalid. There is no doubt that had Henry not been advancing upon Rome the Curia would have pressed the matter, as they had done in 1112 and, judging from the actions of Cono and Bruno of Segni, were prepared to do again. The Pope fled to Beneventum and remained there until January 1118. Rome was ruled in his absence by the Pierleoni.[250] When Paschal returned to Rome, it was only to die.[251] The "clergy and people of Rome" elected the Papal Chancellor, John of Gaeta, a scholar and Latinist from Monte Cassino, as Pope Gelasius II.[252] Henry V was excommunicated shortly after the election, and the battle between Pope and Emperor entered the last part of the first phase of the Investiture Period.[253]

Summary and Conclusions of Part II: The Idea of Papal Leadership from Urban II to Gelasius II.

The period which encompasses the reigns of Urban II and Paschal II (a period which encompassed thirty years, 1088-1118) witnessed the shift of aims in the Papacy from aims which may be called general (moralistic, idealistic) to aims which are more particular, aims which partake of the nature of specific administrative goals. In this period the ideal of reform is subordinated to the idea of administrative centralization. In all probability, the administrators in the papal government did not see any difference between the two aims and could not conceive of one without the other.

Nonetheless, the shift to the latter type of aim resulted in a new concept of the leader who would attain such aims. A man such as Peter Damiani was devoted to ideals which were vaguely formed, mystical. Illusions could have little part in the type of administration which Urban II or Calixtus II sought. If Damiani represented the Curia in negotiations with Hanno of Cologne in 1062, it was probably due to the prestige he commanded outside the Curia as a saint rather than the prestige he commanded in the Curia (among such men as Alexander II and Gregory) as an administrator. Just as the Disceptatio Synodalis presents only a spiritual ideal to be striven for, canon law lays down specific procedural rules on concrete issues. The difference in approach between the mystic and the canon lawyer is the difference between the early days of the reform and the later. No mystic or holy man has a large role in the period 1100-24 in the Curia
254
except Paschal himself, and he was rejected. Men like Pontius of Cluny and William of Champeaux represent Calixtus II in negotiations with Henry V, and not infrequently the leading voice in such negotiations was the head of the Roman nobility, Petrus Leo, since 1116 undisputed favorite of the Papacy. We shall see this tendency change after the election of Honorius II (elected by force of arms of the Frangipani, the arch enemies of the Pierleoni, in 1124). Under Honorius the canonists in the Curia, the old guard, will be excluded from curial responsibility and "new men" will be introduced into the Curia, men chosen from the new reform orders, while

the leading voice in the Church becomes that of Bernard of Clairvaux.

This is not to say that the ideals of the canonists who dominated the curia were felt to be completely different from those of the mystics. But the curia, under the strain, say, of new taxing systems, new census systems, etc., found it exceedingly difficult to form its ideas in terms which the mystic element of the Church might understand. Once the great bureaucracy was in the making, one became wrapped up in it. When a man like Paschal wished to give away the lands, the temporalia, which were the very raison d'etre of that bureaucracy, it was natural for the curia to identify their own best interests with the generalized idea "papal power." This was when Humbert's hints at the right to judge the Pope for heresy bore fruit, as far as the curia was concerned, for they then interpreted this to mean that the curia was constrained to hinder the Pope from diminishing his own power. The Pope was all powerful, in their view, except insofar as he could willfully dispose of his own power. To the end of conserving that power in its entirety the curia was willing to call the Pope a heretic, and they threatened to so brand Paschal in at least three councils held between 1112 and 1116.

This action was based upon the assumption that papal power had to be manifested in certain material forms. Such a view was fatal in the light of a rising pietism which was based upon a social ideal of paupertas. The imperialists, either consciously or unconsciously, realized the potential

gains they could make, propagandistically, by the exploitation of this assumption. They hammered away at the idea that while the reform had been begun by monks desiring a moral reform, it had degenerated into a contest with the Emperor for possession of worldly power. This is why the "false monk" charge was developed against Gregory and his followers. Polemicists such as Walram von Naumburg, the Anonymous of York, Wido of Ferrara, Hugh of Fleury, and Sigebert of Gembloux saw the fundamental divergence between the Gregorian-publicized monkish ideals of paupertas, charitas, and humilitas and the erection of great worldly hierocracy based upon an extensive canon law system by which the temporalia could be wrested from imperial hands, along with the whole of imperial power as well. The curia could do nothing but fall back upon more canon law and repeat the formulae which they had inherited from Gregory VII. This they did to such an extent that nothing of importance in the canon law field was forthcoming from Rome from 1100 to around the time of Alexander III.

The attack upon the Gregorian leader as a "false monk" was not effectively denied by the idolization of combative virtues which the curia indulged in during Paschal's reign. When a monk like Paschal did assume the throne, he was rejected by the curia as an incompetent leader. This disillusionment about the monk-leader is shown in the election after Paschal's death of a grammarian, a specialist in the Leonine cursus, who had re-organized the Papal Chancellory

under Urban II and whose name was irrevocably linked with the great bureaucracy which the curia controlled. After Gelasius II, the same Curia elected, for the first time since Leo IX, a secular prelate, a prince-bishop type, Calixtus II, whose major accomplishments had been the extension of his own realms, by force when necessary, and the extension of papal power. That the curia was working now in an attempt to save their power is signaled by the new integration which all three orders of the College of Cardinals had achieved; papal election now was effected "et in commune communiter et singulariter singuli." Gelasius and Calixtus represent the apogee of the Gregorian leadership ideal to that curia, as we shall see in our analysis of the Liber Pontificalis as propaganda. After them, the curia becomes infiltrated with representatives of the reform orders and the next pope who assumes the papal chair as a conscious continuator of Gregorian ideas will be the professor of law, Rolandus Bandinelli, Alexander III.

What had been the effect of these events upon leadership ideals as such? In the first place, the imperialists had formulated their concept of office in the same terms as the pietists might use if they had formulated theirs. They had used Augustine and the idea of leadership by moral worth to attack the Amtscharismatic leadership ideals of the curia. They had, particularly, wished to juxtapose monastic ideals to priestly ideals in an attempt to separate the monks and the lower clergy from the curia and the higher clergy. The

Chartrians seemed to have sought a modus vivendi somewhere between the radical Augustinianism of the imperialists (radical in so far as they envisioned a Church without any formal organization) and the rigid legalism of the Curialists. The Chartrians seemed to envisage a society in which the king could keep his rights over temporal things, while the Church could maintain its Gregorian juridical and administrative organization. Of course, that juridical setup was to be used for the administration of the law of charitas and not as a coercive force.

But the events of 1111-12 served as a shock which drove the imperialists further left, demanding a greater share of societal control than even the Anonymous of York had demanded in his most vilent moods. The moderation of the Chartrians was formally disavowed and the good will of Paschal II was given, at best, only face-saving grace. The curia announced, in effect, that it would entertain no concept of leadership which did not conform to that put forth in 1111-12. If the pietists, or anyone else, had a different view of leadership, they would have to institute that leadership by force. This would involve revolution and schism. The development of the revolution is the story of the pontificates of Calixtus II and Honorius II. The schism comes with Innocent II and Anacletus II. That schism decided papal policy for a quarter century; it marked the end of the Reform Papacy. But it could only be a temporary stop in the growth of papal supremacy. For, as Toynbee has noted:

> The Papal Respublica Christiana was only established at the cost of a life and death struggle between the Papal and the Imperial power which threw the Papacy off its moral balance and betrayed it into replacing a discarded idol by an object of worship which was nobler in its nature and therefore more demoralizing in its effect when it was thus misused. The Papacy escaped from the idolization of the Empire only to fall into an idolization of itself. [255]

Of course, Toynbee was speaking of the Respublica Christiana created by Alexander III and Innocent III and culminating in Boniface VIII. But the way from Gregory VII to Alexander III leads through the years in which the real Pope of Rome was a mystic from Clarivaux, a mystic who imposed his will upon the Church and set the whole legal and administrative machinery of Gregory VII to nought. The story of Bernardine hegemony over the Church of his day is the story, if only a brief story, of the triumph of the charismatic leadership ideal in the Papacy. Bernard's triumph represents, in a sense, a throwback to a pre-Gregorian time. The Bernardine triumph is also, administratively speaking, the last triumph of the monk in the Papacy.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER IV

[1]There exists no good study devoted exclusively to the pontificate of Urban II. One is referred to the more general works such as Fliche-Martin, Histoire de l'Eglise, VIII, 199-337 and Haller, Das Papsttum, II, i, 491ff. Both of these works cite the relevant materials and bibliography concerning Urban in their handlings of medieval Church history. For more specialized investigations of papal administration during Urban's reign, see Karl Jordan, "Das Eindringen des Lehnwesens in das Rechtsleben der römischen Kurie," Archiv für Urkundsforschung, XII (1931), 13ff.; Karl Jordan, "Zur papstlichen Finanzgeschichte im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert," Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken, XXV (1933-1934), 80ff.; Hans Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," ZRG, KA, XXIV (1936), 199ff.; and Erdmann, Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedanke, 323-25.

[2]This point will be discussed in detail below. One may be reffered however to the work which supposedly came from Paschal's own hand in 1099, the so-called "Fragmentum Tractatus Paschalis II," Mansi, Concilia, XX, 1087ff. See also the papal letters published in Migne, Patrologia Latina, Vol. CLXIII, especially Nos. CLXXVII, p. 182; LXXXV, 106; LXXIII, 91; LXXIV, 92-3.

[3]The use of such designations as "pietistic" and "legalistic" does not imply a value judgment of either of the individuals invlolved. To state that Paschal II seems to have been generally motivated by the same kind of ideals that motivated mystics and pietists and that Urban II seemed of a more "legalistic" bent is to describe the character of their administrations, not to judge the "rightness" or "wrongness" of their activities.

[4]For an account of Urban's reliance upon his canon lawyers in the formulation of his politique, see Paul Fournier, "Bonizio de Sutri, Urbain II, et la Comtesse Mathilde d'apres le Liber de Vita Christiana de Bonizio," Bibliotheque de l'Ecole de Chartes, LXXXVI (1915), 265ff., and Paul Fournier and G. Lebras, Histoire des collections canoniques en occident depuis les Fausses Décrétales jusqu'au décret de Gratien (Paris: Recueil Sirez, 1931), II, 147. See also the remarks of Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 247-8.

[5]On this question see Fournier and Lebras who concluded: "Entre Yves de Chartres et Gratien, les auteurs des collections canoniques n'enlargissent guère ni leur curiosité ni leur information, ni leurs procédés. Les théologiens...sont plus actifs, plus createurs, font progresser la science religieuse." Fournier and Lebras, Histoire des collections canoniques, II, 351.

The theologians to whom the authors refer may be divided into two groups: the mystics (represented by men such as Hugh of St. Victor and Bernard of Clairvaux) and the dialecticians (represented by Abelard and Gilbert de la Porree). Even in theology the dialecticians were fighting a losing battle with the mystics; the rising tide of Augustinian mysticism would prove too much for the dialecticians of the twelfth century. See Etienne Gilson, La philosophie au moyen âge des origines patristiques à la fin du XIV^e siècle (2nd ed. rev.; Paris: Payot et Cie, 1947), 260ff. Here Gilson shows the decline of dialectic in the late twelfth century to where under William of Conches it becomes only the handmaiden of rhetoric. See also the comments of Wilhelm Windelband, A History of Philosophy, 301, who argues that dialectic was foredoomed to failure because it lacked the technical tools necessary for the exposition of its position. An intermediate group between the dialecticians and the mystics were the sentencers, men who sought to counteract the influence of the dialecticians by juxtaposing patristic evidence to their statements. On their activities, see Fournier and Lebras, op. cit., II, 327, and Stephen Kuttner, "Zur Frage der theologischen Vorlage Gratians," ZRG, KA, XXIII (1934), 243.

[6]Names such as Deusdedit, Anselm of Lucca, Bonizio of Sutri, and Bernhold of Constance tower above the curial lawyers of the following generation. The Roman Curia during the period 1100-1124 is dominated by the names of Bruno of Segni, Placidus of Nonantola, Gregory of St. Chrysogonus, Guy of Vienne (Calixtus II), Gerard of Angouleme, Pontius of Cluny, and Geoffrey of Vendome. The latter group will merely parrot the ideas of the former, as will be demonstrated in this section of the paper.

[7]Bruno of Segni's Vita Leonis IX is only a copy with minor variations of the Vita Leonis IX of Humbert of Silva-Candida. See H. Tritz, "Die hagiographischen Quellen zur Geschichte Papst Leos IX," Studi Gregoriani, IV (1952), 296ff. See also Bernhard Gigalski, Bruno von Segni: Sein Leben und sein Schriften (Munster: Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, 1898), 113.

[8]The Vita Anselmi Lucensi is merely a copy with variations of an earlier work by one Bardo, "Vita Anselmi," MGH, SS, XII, 11ff. See the analysis of Alfred Overmann, "Die Vita Anselmi Lucensi episcopi des Rangerius," Neues Archiv, XI (1895-96), 406-408.

[9]Gerard of Angouleme was so devoted to Gregorian ideals that he, with the aid of Robert, Bishop of Paris, composed the confession which Paschal was forced to sign by his curia in 1112. See the "confessio" in MGH, Const., I, 570-74. See also the comments of Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles, V, i, 532-4, and Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 370.

[10]See Ulysse Robert, Histoire du pape Calixte II (Paris: Alphonse Puard, 1891), 8-19, 29-44.

[11]Geoffrey was the spokesman for the group on theological questions, and, while he was thoroughly devoted to pietistic ideals, he could conceive of no other way of realizing them than that put forth by the Gregorians. See the analysis of Dempf, Sacrum Imperium, 219, where it is argued that Geoffrey represented the "zeitgeschichtliche Unmöglichkeit des Ideals Paschalis II."

[12]While one might wonder about the motives which led these thinkers to embrace Augustinian ideas, the wisdom of so doing, at least in so far as propaganda was concerned, is undeniable. In using Augustinian ideas and motifs for the exposition of the idea of the unitas Christiana, the imperial partisans were bound to strike responsive chords in the minds of the pietists, whose point of departure for criticizing the Church's "secularism" was essentially the same. See the discussion of Carl Mirbt, Die Stellung Augustins in Publistik des Gregorianischen Kirchenstreits, 110-111, and Wilhelm Berges, Die Fürstenspiegel, 23-5, 27.

[13]Consider for example the two most important expressions of the curial position, the Liber de Honore Ecclesiae of Placidus of Nonantola and the canonical collection, Polycarpus, compiled and written by Gregory of St. Chrysogonus. The former work presents nothing which had not already been put forth by men such as Bonizio of Sutri, while the latter is merely a copy of the work of Anselm of Lucca and the Sententiae of Humbert of Silva Candida. See Fournier and Lebras, Histoire, II, 173.

[14]As with all popular movements, the origins of the peculiar brand of pietism which appeared in twelfth century is obscure. For the various aspects of the movement, one may consult Michael V. Dmitrewski, Die christliche freiwillige Armut vom Ursprung der Kirche bis zum 12. Jahrhundert (Berlin: Abhandlungen zur mitteleren und neueren Geschichte, 1913), 72ff. This work discusses the movement of evangelical poverty in particular. See also the remarks of H. Grundmann, Religiöse Bewegungen, 23ff., on the movement called "idioti." The best discussion of the pietistic movement in Germany is in Ernst Landers, Die deutschen Klöster vom Ausgang Karls der Grossen bis zum Wormser Konkordat und ihr Verhaltnis zu den Reformen (Berlin: Historische Studien, 1938), 69ff. Stephen Runciman, Le manicheisme medieval: l'heresie dualiste dans le christianisme (Paris: Payot et Cie, 1949), 106, discusses the persistence of cathari cults in Christianity and the resurgence of such cults in the twelfth century. The best summary of the influence of pietism upon the institutional development of the Church is to be found in Schreiber, "Gregor VII, Cluny, Citeaux, Premontre zu Eigenkirche, Parochie und Seelsorge," ZRG, KA, XXXIV (1947), 31ff. Standard for the influence of reform psychology on art is the work of Werner Weisbach,

Religiöse Reform und mittelalterliche Kunst (Zurich: Verlagsanstalt Benziger, 1945), 71ff. The symbolism of the pietistic movement as it was manifested in the art of the twelfth century is described in the work of Adolfph Goldschmidt, Der Albanipsalter in Hildesheim und seine Beziehung zur symbolischen Kirchenskulptur des 12. Jahrhundert (Berlin: Verlag von Georg Seemons, 1895). Finally, see Cuthbert Burler, Western Mysticism: The Teachings of SS Augustine, Gregory and Bernard on Contemplation and the Contemplative Life (London: Constable and Co., 1926), 138ff.

[15]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 445-61.

[16]Fournier and Lebras, Histoire des collections, II, 322-34.

[17]Ibid., 335. Cf. Kuttner, "Die theologischen Vorlagen Gratians," 244.

[18]The collections listed by Fournier and Lebras which come from the Roman Curia are, while singularly unoriginal, distinguished nonetheless by their quantity. For the period from 1100 to 1124 (the date of the election of Honorius II) there exist no less than fourteen canon law collections, all of which may be identified as Roman in origin, in Fournier's listings. For the period from 1124 to 1140, none are mentioned. See Fournier and Lebras, Histoire, II, 222-26.

[19]St. Bernard stated the mystic's position when he stated that the Church needed more love and less law. See Bernardus, "Epistola XI," PL, CLXXXII, 110-111. Note the comments of Friedrich Heer, Der Aufgang Europas: Eine Studie zu den Zusammenhängen zwischen politischer Religiosität, Frommigkeitsstil und dem Werden Europas im 12. Jahrhundert (Wien/Zurich: Europa Verlag, 1949), 191ff.

[20]Duchesne, Le Liber Pontificalis, II, 296.

[21]Z.N. Brooke, The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1931), 29ff. It was this shift of emphasis in papal policy which was one of the factors in alienating the mass pietistic movements from the leadership in the curia, because the pietists still felt that the major problem for the Church was the implementation of moral reform. Centralization and its problems seem to have been the major concern of the Roman Curia from 1106 to 1124. With the election of Honorius II, the representative of the pietistic spirit, the centralization policy fell from grace within the Papacy itself, although not without a fight. But until 1124, canon law was used as the chief weapon of centralization by the curia, for, as Brooke notes, "whenever there was any divergence of opinion, the Papacy might answer with a single phrase: the law was on its side." Ibid., 30-31.

[22]Ivo, "Epistola," MGH, Lib., II, 654.

[23]Ivo, "Epistola" MGH, Lib., II, 654.

[24]Ivo had written to Hugh of Lyons in 1097 arguing that the king had a valid claim to a role in the elections of bishops. Ibid., 644-45. Urban II had immediately reprimanded Ivo for this pronouncement, and Ivo, his honor offended, had offered to resign his episcopate. Urban had refused to accept the resignation, but Ivo had sulked for the rest of Urban's pontificate, refusing to take any part in the disputes over investiture in which the Pope was involved. See the exchange of letters in Migne, PL, CLXII, 85-86.

[25]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 324-28. The bishops were especially upset at Urban's practice of removing monasteries from their jurisdiction. Above that, Urban made a practice of granting episcopal honors to abbots of especial merit by giving them the right of carrying episcopal insignia before them in processions. See Migne, PL, CLI, 292, 346-47. At the same time, many bishops were removed from the jurisdiction of their metropolitans. By the end of the eleventh century all of Spain and Italy consisted of dioceses directly responsible to the See of Rome and to no other. See Otto Vehse, "Bistums-exemption bis zum Ausgang des 12. Jahrhundert," ZRG, KA, XXVI (1937), 89.

[26]Morghen, "Ideali religiosi e azione politica nell' opera di Gregorio VII," 169.

[27]Mansi, Concilia, XX, 1087.

[28]Ibid.

[29]See Bonizio of Sutri's"Liber ad Amicum," MGH, Lib., I, 568ff.; Deusdedit,"Liber contra Invasores et Symoniacos," MGH, Lib., II, 350; and Bernhold,"Apologeticus,"MGH, Lib., II, 87. In another work, Bernhold writes: "Est autem privilegium Romani pontificis juxta assertionem sancti Sylvestri, Gelasii et reliquorum patrum, ut ipse de omnibus aeccle siae judicare valeat, nec alicuius judicio aubjaciet..." Bernaldus, "De Incontinentia Sacerdotum," MGH, Lib., II, 21.

[30]A number of "judices de clero" were established in the Lateran Palace prior to Urban's reign, but these were absorbed into the increasingly powerful office of "cameriarius." This latter office was, according to Jordan, an importation from Cluny, and the first holder of this office was one Peter, a monk from Cluny. and former chamberlain in the great abbatial court there. See Jordan,"Die päpstliche Verwaltung," 115, and Jordan, "Zur papstlichen Finanzgeschichte," 89.

[31]Jordan, "Die Entstehung der römischen Kurie," 107ff.

[32]Jordan, "Zur päpstlichen Finanzgeschichte," 73-89.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ferdinand Gregorovius, Storia della città di Roma nel medio evo (Citta di Castello: Editrice Unione Arti Grafiche, 1942), VI, 311.

[35]M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1926), 84-88.

[36]Mannheim analyzes the shift from the early days of an institution, from pioneering activity, to the more highly rationalized and complex organization at which the institution arrives in its later stages -- its period of integration. He argues that in the second stage decisions are no longer in the hands of a number of creative personalities somuch as directed by a group of trained specialists, bureaucrats. See Karl Mannheim, Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952), 264ff.

[37]See Erdmann, Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedanke, 325.

[38]Mirbt, Die Publizistik, 456-62.

[39]Mannheim, op. cit., 265.

[40]Ibid.

[41]Arnold Toynbee, A Study of History (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1935-1954), IV, 303ff., 340.

[42]Both Placidus of Nonantola and Bruno of Segni so argue. See below, p.

[43]See especially the work of Manegoldus,"Liber ad Geberhardum," MGH, Lib., I, 315, 331, wherein Gregory VII is eulogized as the monk who came from his cloister in order to save the Church. Compare the work of Bonizio of Sutri, "Liber ad Amicum," MGH, Lib., I, 589, wherein Gregory's character as a diplomatist and politician is stressed.

[44]Fliche explains this ommission most strangely, and he refuses to admit that Bernard is anything less than the "disciple de Gregoire VII." Histoire de l'Eglise, IX, 23.

[45]Walram had developed the theme that "Plenitudo autem legis est caritas, quia per sacram scripturam cognoscit homo." "Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae," MGH, Lib., II, 275.

[46]Urban II himself gave voice to the idea in one of his bulls: "Duae sunt, inquit, leges, una publica, altera privata; publica lex est quae a sanctis Patribus scripta est firmata, ut est lex canonum,.... Lex vero privata, quod instinctum est sancti spiritus, in corde scribitur, sicut de quibusdam dicit Apostolus, qui habet legem Dei scriptam in cordibus suis, et sibi et ipsi sancti sunt lex." Mansi, Concilia, XX, 714-15.

[47]Gratianus Concordia Discordantium Canonum i. 1-12.

[48]Fournier, "Un tournant de l'histoire du droit,"11. There exists an interesting dialogue written about the same time as the"Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae" which throws light on Urban's concept of the law. The debate is between Clement III, the antipope , and Urban, and Clement argues: "Hac, Urbane, tuum papatum destruo lege, nam cum papa forem, fis papa per ambitionem." Urban replies: "Sic igitur lex ista mihi contraria non est." "Alercatio inter Urbanum et Clementem," MGH, Lib., II, 170.

[49]The idea is admirably expressed in St. Augustine's Confessionum: "Quid est illud, quod interlucet mihi et percutit cor meum sine laesione? Et inhorresco et inardesco: inhorresco, in quantum dissimilis ei sum, inardesco, in quantum similis ei sum. Sapientia, sapientia ipsa est, quae interlucet mihi." **Augustinus**. Confessionum. **xi.** 9. See the comments of Butler, Western Mysticism, 63ff.

[50]Ibid., 138. Compare, however, the view of Gilson, who maintains that Bernard has a clear and consistent mystical philosophy. E. Gilson, La philosophie au moyen âge, 297-300, and E. Gilson, Lo spirito della filosofia medieovale, trans. from the 2nd French edition by Pia Sartori Treves (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1947), 200ff.

[51]Writing to Henry Murdach, Bernard affirmed: "Experto crede: aliquid amplius invenies in silvis, quam in libris. Ligna et lapides docebunt te, quod a magistros audire non possis." Bernardus, "Epistola CVI," PL, CLXXXII, 242.

[52]Bernardus, "Epistola LXIV," PL, CLXXXII, 170.

[53]Ivo of Chartres, commenting upon the bureaucracy at Rome, wrote: "Cubicularios et ministros sacri palatii multa exigere a consecratis episcopis vel abbatibus, quae oblationis vel benedictionis nomine palliantur, cum nec calamus nec

charta gratis...habetur." Ivo, "Epistola CXXXIII," PL, CLXII, 142. See also Jordan, "Zur päpstlichen Finanzgeschichte," 65.

53There was circulated at the time a document which attacked the greed of the Roman Curia in verse:

"Gens Romanorum subdola
Antiqua colit hydola
Argentum quondam coluit
Et in lucris insaniit.
Adhuc suspirat hodie,
Aurum colens Arabie,
Ornatus veste Grecie,
Ebur cum gemmis Indie,
Delitiosa Francie,
Non curat que sunt proximi
Verba spernens altissimi
Secundum pondus iudicat,
Causam auratam predicat;
Non audit vocem pauperis;
Non intras, si nil dederis,
Illi firmatur ianua
Qui venit manu vacua
Clamat avarus ianitor
Et parte clause venditor:
'Qui vult intrare cameram
Non agit mecum perperam!
Det mihi prius munera,
Et mox patebit camera.
Si dat, intrabis protinus,
Si non das, stabis eminuis.'
Sola regnat pecunia
Per terras et per maria."

"Carmina in Simoniam et Romanarum Avaritiam," MGH, Lib., III, 706.

54The Liber Pontificalis gives Paschal's origins as monastic, but the author of the Vita Paschalis also notes that Paschal had studied philosophy: "Hic puer monachus factus, philosophatium artibus eruditus." Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 296. Thus, supposedly, Paschal represented the right combination of professions to succeed the Gregorian popes. Further, Paschal's biographer is quick to note that Paschal received his promotion to the rank of cardinal because of his purity of life: "Quem et monastici ordinis sui gravitas et morum honestas et sallertis ingenii circa commissum prudentia domno Gregorio...notum fecit. Vidi eum et expertus est. Placuit, retinuit, certis temporibus in titulo sancti Clementis in Urbe presbiterum consecravit." Ibid.

55Desiderius of Monte Cassino, who ascended the papal chair as Victor III, was the friend of Peter Damiani and Abbot of the most important monastery in the West. He was an avid bibliophile, a competent architect, and apparently very devout. It is to Desiderius that Damiani directs some of his most important epistles, a number of which are undertaken to demonstrate the inadvisability of a monk becoming a member of the curia. Desiderius' short reign as Victor III (1086-1087) resulted in a major schism and general confusion. It was generally agreed that, although completely pious, he was not a good administrator. See A. Fliche, "Le pontificate de Victor III," Révue d'histoire ecclésiastique, XX (1942), 387-412. Paschal, by way of indicating the tenor of his own reign adopted as his papal name a sign of a pacifist. Paschal I (817-24) was distinguished by his co-operation with the emperors and a desire to extend the activity of monastic orders.

[56]See especially Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," 199-204, and Willi Schwarz, "Die Investitur in Frankreich," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLII (1923), 257-58. See also J.J. Juglas, "Yves de Chartres et la question des investitures," Mélanges Albert Dufourcq (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1932), 60-61.

[57]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 338-346.

[58]Gerold Meyer von Knonau, Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV und Heinrich V (Leipzig: Verlag von Dunker und Humbolt, 1909), V, 57ff., and Karl Hampe, Das Hochmittelalter: Geschichte des Abendlandes von 900 bis 1250 (Munster und Köln: Bohlau-Verlag, 1953), 158-60.

[59]Irene Ott, "Der Regalienbegriff im 12. Jahrhundert," ZRG, KA, XXXV (1948), 251ff. See also Paschal's letters to Anselm of Canterbury in PL, CLXIII, 90-93.

[60]The "Fragmentum Tractatus Paschalis II" was a dissertation on the ideal of paupertas supposedly written by the Pope. The document as it is known today is hardly more than a dissertation on Matthew 19:31 ("'Si vis perfectus esse, vade et vende omnia quae habes et da pauperibus, et veni et sequere me.' Et alia: 'Nolite possidere aurum et argentum.' Et: 'qui non renuntiat omnibus quae possidet, non potest meus esse discipulis.'"). Mansi, Concilia, XX, 1087. According to Paschal the ideal of poverty was to be developed as the rule for the entire Church; he argued that all orders of the hierarchy should follow the "apostolic life." The priest above all is admonished to content himself with the necessities of life, food and clothing, and to seek nothing else. Ibid., 1088. Paschal's letters are dominated by the ideal of charitas. See for example Paschalis, "Epistola CDXLV," PL, CLXIII, 397; "Epistola XVII," Ibid., 38; and "Epistola CCCXVII," Ibid., 285.

[61]Fliche maintains that Paschal II "loin d'adhére aux idées nouvelles lancéss à la fin du précédent pontificat par Yves de Châtres, maintenait dans toute sa rigeur la législation grégorienne." Histoire, VIII, 339. It seems difficult to sustain such an assertion. The agreements reached with the kings of England and France granted rights to the kings which the earlier Gregorian popes would never have recognized. For example, in the Council of Clermont, Urban II "interdit aux évêques et aux prêtes de jurer au roi ou à tout autre seigneur 'l'hommage lige.'" Juglas, op. cit., 59. See also Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles, V, i, 498. As both Schwarz and Carlyle have noted, the settlement with France seems to have compromised on this point. See Schwarz, op. cit., XLIII (1924), 140-41. Carlyle notes: "It would seem that in France the papal prohibition of lay investiture was gradually accepted, and that in principle the right of election was recognized, although it seems also that the king retained the right of approval and confirmation."

R.W. and A.J. Carlyle, A History of Medieval Political Thought in the West (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Son, 1922), IV, 111. Of course, the political situation of the kings of France was fundamentally different in France and England; the German kings were in a much more difficult position. They depended for their power to a large extent upon their control of the Eigenkirchen. See especially Geoffrey Barraclough, Medieval Germany, 911-1250: Essays by German Historians (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948), I, 47-73 passim.; Schwarz, "Die Investitur in Frankreich," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLII (1923), 92ff.; and Ott, op. cit., 239ff. The exact details of the settlement with the kings of France and England seem to have been the same, although we cannot state with certainty what they were. See Carlyle, op. cit., IV, 111-112.

[62]Steven Runciman, A History of the Crusades (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1952), II, 49.

[63]The "Leodicensum Epistola adversus Paschalem" was written by Sigebert of Gembloux c. 1103. See the introduction to the work in MGH, Lib., II, 451.

[64]Ibid., 454.

[65]Ibid., 455, 459.

[66]Ibid.

[67]Ibid., 460.

[68]Ibid.

[69]Ibid., 461.

[70]Ibid.

[71]For an account of the events, see von Knonau, op. cit., 220, and Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, III, 889.

[72]This idea was in keeping with Paschal's ideal of paupertas. As early as 1102, he had written to Anselm of Canterbury of his willingness to compromise with the temporal power for the spiritual libertas ecclesiae. See Paschalis, "Epistola LXXIII," PL, CLXIII, 91, and "Epistola LXXIV," Ibid., 92-3. After the affair of 1111-1112, in which Paschal had ceded the temporalia to the emperor and had ended by ceding (under force?) the right lay investiture, Paschal had written to Otto of Bamberg, explaining his actions and justifying them in the light of his interpretations of the aims of Gregory VII and the ideal of charitas. See his "Epistola CCCXVII," PL, CLXIII, 285.

[73]In a letter written in 1100, Paschal eulogized the unitas which Gregory VII had saved and saw the real basis of the unitas in charitas. See Paschalis, "Epistola XVII," PL, CLXIII, 38.

[74]See especially Tritz, "Die hagiographischen Quellen zur Geschichte Leos IX," 298ff.; Gigalski, Bischof Bruno von Segni, 166ff.

[75]The so-called Ponoclet life of Leo IX exists in one MS (Bibliotheca Valicelliana, XVI, folios 133-39). This biography is of the eleventh century and comes, in all probability, from southern Italy, possible south of Monte Cassino. It is edited anonymously as "Vie et miracles du Pape S. Léon IX," Analecta Bollandiana, XXV (1906), 258-97. On thedatation of the work, see Ibid., 258-61. This work will henceforth be referred to as "Ponoclet."

[76]"et in hoc tanta solempnitate beati Leonis totus in maligno positus erat,....veritas sepulto erat." Bruno, "De Symoniacis," MGH, Lib., I, 547. This work will hereafter be referred to as "Symoniacis."

[77]"Ita propterea Romanorum perfidias contra eum murmurantes, edinde prelia et bellum incipientes, infidelitas cause in eum gerentes perfidias." Ponoclet, 288-9.

[78]Symoniacis, 547.

[79]Ibid.

[80]Ibid., 550.

[81]Ibid., 547.

[82]Ibid., 548.

[83]See above, p.

[84]Mirbt, "Die Publizistik," 456-62, and Erdmann, Entstehung, 212.

[85]The troops are called "Christi milites et sanctorum exercitum." Symoniacis, 550.

[86]"Tunc autem imperator misit cum illos viros fortissimos et honoratos, qui cum...Leone Beneventum pergerent et populum fidelium ab oppressione liberarent." Ponoclet, 284.

[87]The Ponoclet life relates: "obsecrantes magna eius pietate ut subvenirent et liberarent eos de oppressione Francorum." Ponoclet, 279-80.

[88]Compare Bruno's Symoniacis, 550.

[89]See the article by Palmer Throop, "Criticism of Papal Crusade Policy in Old French and Provencal Poetry," Speculum, XIII (1938), 381.

[90]Ponoclet, 285.

[91]Symoniacis, 551.

[92]Ibid., 550.

[93]Ponoclet, 286-7.

[94]Ibid., 286.

[95]The Ponoclet life says: "Habet potestatem inter sanctos... Leo papa." Ponoclet, 292.

[96]Symoniacis, 550.

[97]Ibid., 551.

[98]Ponoclet, 277.

[99]Ibid.

[100]Ibid., 276.

[101]Symoniacis, 548.

[102]Ibid.,548-9.

[103]Ibid., 547.

[104]Bruno writes in the second half of the tractate in which he treats the problem of simony: "Ubi autem fides catholica non est, ibi baptismus non poeratur. Unde et qui extra ecclesiam baptizatur, prius quam ad ecclesiam redeat, non solvitur a peccatis....Corpus Christi ecclesia est. Qui ergo non vult separari a Christo, maneat in corpore Christi, ut possit esse membrum Christi." Symoniacis, 555. That Bruno considers the

terms "corpus Christi" and "ecclesia" to be the same as the formal hierarchy will be seen in our study of the stand he took in 1111-1112. While there is nothing unorthodox in this view, in spirit it seems quite different from the views of such individualists as Tertullian and Augustine. When Augustine would say "extra ecclesiam nulla salus," the spirit would be quite different from Bruno's writing: "Manifestum est itaque, quod extra ecclesiam nemo salvabitur.... Corpus autem Christi extra ecclesiam non est." Symoniacis, 556. When Augustine used the terms, he would be referring to the pagans; Bruno uses them as threat against the imperialists.

[105]On the date of the Vita Anselmi, see Alfred Overmann, "Die Vita Anselmi Lucensi episcopi des Rangerius," Neues Archiv, XI (1895-96), 406-407. Overmann dates the work between 1097 and 1099.

[106]Ibid., 407ff.

[107]Rangerius, "Vita Anselmi," MGH, SS, XXX, 1160, ll. 147-48.

[108]Ibid., 1158, ll. 58-62ff.

[109]Ibid., 1160, ll. 139-44.

[110]Ibid., ll. 167-72.

[111]Ibid., 1161, ll. 187-88.

[112]Ibid., ll. 199-200.

[113]Ibid., ll. 185-86.

[114]Ibid., ll. 133ff.

[115]Ibid., 1159, ll. 119-26. Cf. Acta Sanctorum, Bolland., Ian. II, 393-94.

[116]Rangerius, "Vita Anselmi," MGH, SS, XXX, 1181, ll. 1131-34.

[117]Ibid., 1163, ll. 295-307.

[118]Ibid., 1174, ll. 795-804; ll. 819; 1297, ll. 6773.

[119]Ibid., 1181, ll. 1175.

[120]Ibid., 1181, ll. 1180.

[121]Ibid., 1182, ll. 1179.

[122]Ibid., 1183, ll. 1215-16, 1229-30.

[123]Ibid., 1183, ll. 1265-66.

[124]Ibid., 1183, ll. 1270-76.

[125]Ibid., 1186, ll. 1385-86.

[126]Ibid., 1188, ll. 1501-07.

[127]Ibid., 1205, ll.2281-90.

[128]Ibid., 1207,l. 2392.

[129]Ibid., 1208-9.

[130]On the datation of the libelli, see H. Boehmer, Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im XI. und XII. Jahrhundert (Leipzig: Dieterc'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1899), 182-88. On the identity of the author, see Ibid., 259-66.

[131]Ibid., 198.

[132]"De Consecratione Pontificis et Regis," MGH, Lib., III, 663.

[133]Ibid., 667.

[134]Ibid., 664-65.

[135]"De Una Ecclesia," Boehmer, ed., op. cit., 432.

[136]Ibid., 438.

[137]"Meliorne fides et dignior baptismus Lugdunensis ecclesiae, quam Rothomagensis? Sed secundum apostolum una est fides, unum baptisma." Ibid., 440.

[138]"Non ergo qualitas locorum facit, ut inferiora unius ecclesiae membra superioribus alterius ecclesiae preferantur. Quae igitur erit causa, ut Lugdunensis ecclesia preferatur Rothomagensi et Turonensi, si non est in eo maior sanctitas vel dignior loci qualitas? numquid haec erit sacramentorum sublimitas?...Aut quae ei maior tirbuitur a Domino gratia?..." Ibid.

[139]"De Ecclesia Romana et Hierosolymitana," Boehmer, op. cit., 460.

[140]"De Una Ecclesia," Boehmer, 439. Here the Anonymous of York asserts: "Nam nullus alius caput est, nisi Christus, neque alterius capitis ecclesiae est corpus (nisi Christus). Huius autem capitis, quod est Christus, et huius corporis, quod (est) ecclesia, sancti omnis membra sunt, que secundum magnitudinem sanctitatis vel meritorum quantitatem in eodem corpore sub eodem capite prima fiunt vel ultima."

[141]"Apologia Archiepiscopi Rothomagensis," MGH, Lib., III, 660.

[142]"De Ecclesia Romana et Hierosolymitana," 458.

[143]Ibid.

[144]Ibid., 460.

[145]"Divina institutione nullus inter apostolos maior fuit, nullus magisterium vel principatum in alios habuit.... 'Reges gentium dominantur earum et qui potestatem habent super eos benefici vocantur. Vos autem non sic.... Unum est magister vester, id est Christus....' Fecerent enim eos aequales et electionis gratia et apostolatus dignitate et ligandi atque solvendi potestate. Neque enim solus Petrus electus est, non solus apostolus factus est, non solus potestate ligandi atque solvendi sublimatus est." "De Equalitate Ministrorum," Boehmer, op. cit., 475.

[146]Ibid., 477.

[147]"De Una Ecclesia," 435.

[148]"Et nos igitur Christum imitare debemus, ut quibus ipse equalem tribuit in celis dignitatem, nos in terris opinione humana non tribuamus inequalem." Ibid., 441.

[149]"Nam et in sacerdotis est in spiritu Christi regere populum, et regis est sacrificare et immolare Deo, sacrificium laudis, sacrificium iusticiae,...quod totum significatem est per carnalem sacrificium, quod sacerdos offerebat iuxta ritu visibilem sacramenti." "De Consecratione Pontificis et Regis," MGH, Lib., III, 665.

[150]"De Canonibus et Decretis," Boehmer, op. cit., 453.

[151]"...respondemus, quia quicunque per contemptum vel per pervaricatricem superbiam agit contra canones, huic paene subiacere merito debeat. Qui atuem vel per ignorantiam vel per necessitatem vel per infirmitatem cum timore tamen agit in canones, minime debet huic paene subiacere, quia licet peccet in canones, salvam tamen eorum venerentiam in corde retinet." "De Canonibus et Decretis," Boehmer, op.cit., 454.

[152]"An Summus Pontifex sit Iuditio Subiectus," Ibid., 436.

[153]Ibid.

[154]Ibid., 437.

[155]"De Depositione Sacerdotis," Ibid., 469-70.

[156]"Apologia," Ibid.

[157]Dempf, Sacrum Imperium, 198ff.; Carlyle, op. cit., IV, 102-103.

[158]Histoire litteraire de la France, X, 503.

[159]Hugonis,"Tractatus de Regia Potestate et Sacerdotali Dignitate," PL, CLXIII, 939-40.

[160]Ibid., 968-69.

[161]Ibid., 942.

[162]Ibid., 942-43.

[163]"Sed.his interim sepositis, rursus eum monemus ut mores subditorum exhortando, terrendo, blandiendo, corrigendo, et boni operis exemplo monstrando,diatim emendare procuret." Ibid., 950.

[164]Ibid., 944-45.

[165]Ibid., 946.

[166]Ibid., 948.

[167]"Unde inter nos et Deum mediator debet existere." Ibid., 954.

[168]Ibid.

[169]Hugonis, "Tractatus de Regia Potestate et Sacerdotali Dignitate," PL, CLXIII, 654.

[170]Ibid.

[171]Constantine gave to Sylvester: "vigorem et honorificentiam imperialem, privilegio suo discernens ut principatum obtineant tam super quator principales sedes,...et ut pontifex sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae celsior existat cunctis sacerdotibus mundi hujus." Ibid., 965.

[172]Ibid.

[173]Ibid., 968.

[174]Ibid., 948.

[175]Paschal was in constant contact with Ivo of Chartres during the first twelve years of his pontificate. When he left for France to begin negotiations with the king, he passed by way of Chartres and spent Easter 1107 there. See Jaffe-Wattenbach, 6129 (4557), 6130 (4557). We can only explain Paschal's settlements with the kings of France and England only if we assume that he accepted Ivo's theory of investiture -- the theory that Urban II had specifically rejected. The acceptance of Ivo's position shows that Paschal had rejected that of his curia. Placidus of Nonantola, the spokesman of the curia in 1111, wrote that there was an existential relation holding between the temporal and the spiritual goods of the episcopate. If one perished, so would the other. He states: "Sicut autem qui corpus ab anima dividit, destruit hominem, ita qui corporalia aecclesiae a spiritualibus dividit, destruit aecclesiam." Placidius, "Liber de Honore Ecclesiae," MGH, Lib., II, 586. Ivo of Chartres had taken a different view of the nature of the episcopate. Ivo made a distinction between the "investitura manualis (or corporalis)"--the investiture with the spiritual power of the see-- and the kingly"concessio." The "investitura corporalis" he considered to be a sacrament and therefore completely outside the competence of the king to administer. The "concessio" was the king's approval of the election of the bishop. The king was conceived to have this right by virtue of his position as leader of the people. It is his function, as leader of the people, to bestow the temporalia upon the newly elected bishop. See Ivonis,"Epistola ad Hugonem," MGH, Lib., II, 644-45, 654, and the comments of Ott, "Der Regalienbegriff," 240. Cf. the remarks of Anton Schnargl, Der Begriff der Investitur in den Quellen und der Literatur des Investiturstreites. (Stuttgart: Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen, 1908), 80, 136-37. Only the adoption of such a view of

investiture would allow Paschal to conceive of the possibility of dispensing with the regalia of the Church held from the king. See Paschalis, "Promissio Papae per Petrum Leonis Dicta," MGH, Const., I, 138, no. 85. Similarly, if Paschal had not held Ivo's view of investiture, he could not have granted the right of lay investiture to Henry V at Sutri in 1111. See "Privilegium Primae Conventionis," MGH, Const., I, 141, and see the comments of Carlyle, op. cit., IV, 99ff.

176 Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," 201ff.

177 Bruno Katterbach, "Die Unterschriften der Päpste und Kardinäle in den 'Bullae maiores' vom 11. bis 14. Jahrhundert," Miscellanea Fr. Ehrle (Roma:Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1924), 185-86.

178 "Domnus papa precipiet aepiscopis presentibus in die corronationis eius, ut dimitant regalia regi, et regno quae ad regnum pertinebant Karoli, Lodoici, Heinrici et aliorum praedecessorum eius." "Promissio Papa per Petrum Leonis Dicta," MGH, Const., I, 138, no. 85. This is the promise made by Paschal to Henry V which he would sign on the day of Henry's coronation. Henry, in his turn, was to release all claims to Church lands and regalia which had not come from his predecessors. See Carlyle, op. cit., IV, 116-17, 120. Interesting also is the document which Paschal had composed and was to have been signed on the day of the coronation in fulfillment of the "promissio." It is important to our evaluation of the document to discover whether this document was under conditions which made the Pope desperate and willing to sign anything or whether it was made under conditions in which the Pope arrived at his own decisions. The Pope still held Rome and could escaped to the south quite easily had he wished. The Pierleoni and the Normans were his allies, and they constituted no small military force. Their strength was shown after the King had abducted the Pope, for, after only three day's fighting, the King was forced to withdraw from Rome. See Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles, V, i, 512, note 2, where it is concluded that Paschal II made the overture to surrender the regalia out of his own convictions on the matter and not as a result of force. Gregorovius tends to accept the imperial version of the story and maintains that Paschal was merely making a propaganda move. See Gregorovius, op. cit., VIII, 18-19ff. Now, the fact that this document was drawn up as an expression of Paschal's own views on the subject of lay investiture is important in that it shows to what extent Paschal considered the higher clergy to be his enemies in effecting his reform of the Church morality as much as the kings. The whole thesis of the "Privilegium" is based upon the assumption that the priest and bishop should have nothing to do with secular affairs or secular courts except for the purpose of aiding the afflicted. Here was an attempt on the part of the Pope to order the Church in the light of the ideal of evangelical poverty. Paschal noted that in German territory bishops held cities, duchies, etc. and charges relating to service to the Empire which detracted from the proper execution of their spiritual offices. He argues that this was the main reason for the investiture struggle. Thus, the blame lies with

the bishops as much as with the princes. Then Paschal gives his view of the work of Gregory VII and Urban II. He argues that the work of Gregory and Urban had been to wipe out this evil state of affairs. These popes had condemned lay investiture as an admonishment to the bishops as much as to the princes. In order to correct the evils of investiture and to return the bishops to their proper function, all regalia held from the king is to be returned to him. Now, to argue that Paschal conceived of this statement under duress and not as a result of his own ratiocination isnot borne out by the facts and is to argue that Paschal would not have rebelled against the clear policy of Gregory VII, which policy was not to separate the regalia from the bishops but to obtain complete control of it. Anyone who so argues must be prepared to admit that he does so only on the basis of a belief that Paschal was a "Gregorian" who would not betray the Gregorian cause. Yet, we must remember that there was already developing a strong movement which had as its basis the ideal of evangelical poverty, and that this movement was probably influential in Paschal's development. One has only to think of St. Bernard view of the episcopal function and office to see how Paschal might have regarded the holding of the regalia by a priest. For Bernard's views, see his De Moribus et Officio Episcoporum, PL, CLXXXII, 809-834. Since this point is so important, it might be well to analyze full the terms of the "Privilegium."

First we note that Paschal did not attack the idea of lay investiture on the basis of canon law. He begins his work with a condemnation of bishops and priests who have become involved in secular affairs: "Et divine legis institutione et sacratis canonibus interdictum, ne sacerdotes curis secularibus occupentur, neve ad comitatum nisi pro dampnatis eruendis aut pro aliis qui injuriam patiuntur, accedant." "Privilegium Primae Conventionis," MGH, Const., I, 141. This idea is justified on the authority of St. Paul. Ibid. This is followed by an attack upon those bishops and upper clergy who live the courtly life: "In regni autem vestri partibus episcopi vel abbates adeo curis secularibus occupantur, ut comitatum assidue frequentare et militia exercere cogantur....Ministri enim altaris ministri curie facti sunt, quia civitates, ducatus, marchias, monetas, curtes, et cetera ad regni servitium pertinentia a regibus acceperunt." Ibid. Paschal here might have been describing the careers of the Gregorian popes, in particular that of Leo IX. Cf. Bernardus, "Epistola ad Sugerium," PL, CLXXXII, 191ff. Paschal then concludes that this "courtly" character of the clergy is the cause of the disturbances with the State, and he justifies that conclusion on the grounds of the ideal of poverty. He ends by arguing that the course he isabout to take is the same as that begun by Gregory VII and Urban II: "His et aliis plurimis malis, que per investituras plerumque contigerant, predecessores nostri Gregorius VII, Urbanus II, felicis memorie pontifices excitati, collectis frequenter episcopalibus conciliis, investituras illas manus laici dampnaverunt,..." "Privilegium," 141. This was followed by the dispositio which granted the king fullclaim to all of the regalia that had come

from the king. Hauck concluded that such an action on the part of Paschal was thoroughly in keeping with the ideals of a monk who had become pope. Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, III, 900-901.

[179]A source friendly to Paschal, the "Relatio Registri Paschalis II," argues that the Pope signed the agreement with Henry V because of representations made to him of the devastations of the countryside, sacking of the churches and cities of Italy, and the fear of schism. Paschal himself is represented as saying: "Cogor, ait, pro ecclesiae liberatione hac pace hoc pati, hoc permittere quod pro vita mea nullatenus consentirem." MGH, Const., I, 149. It must be noted that the final agreement reached with Henry V coincided in theory with the view of Ivo of Chartres concerning the nature of the episcopal office. Bishops and abbots were to be freely elected without simony but with the consent of the king. Then they are to be invested with the ring and the staff. Consecration would follow this investiture. MGH, Const., I, 145. See Carlyle, who writes: "Henry conceded in principle the right of a free election, and only claimed for himself the right to give or refuse assent. The concession may be construed as formal, but it is not unimportant." Carlyle, op. cit., IV, 126-27. Again, this coincides with Chartrian theory, since Ivo held that it did not matter what part the king took in the election as long as he did not claim to be investing the bishop with the spiritual power of his office. See Ivonis, "Epistola ad Hugonem," MGH, Lib., II, 644-645;"Epistola ad Ioscerannum," Ibid., 654.

[180]See the bibliography cited in Hefele-Leclercq, op. cit., V, i, 512, note 2.

[181]Petrus Diaconus,"Chronicon Cassinanensis," MGH, SS, VII, 782ff.

[182]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 364.

[183]Chron. Cass., 782.

[184]Hildebertus, "Epistola," MGH, Lib., II, 672, 668.

[185]"Rythmus de Captivitate Paschalis Papae," MGH, Lib., II, 674-675.

[186]Bruno Sigenensis, "Libellus I," MGH, Lib., II, 563.

[187]Gigalski, Bruno von Segni, 82.

[188]Migne, PL, CLXIII, 290.

[189]Migne, PL, CLXIII, 290.

[190]The "Collection in Five Books" (Vat. Lat., 1348), written during the period 1099-1118; the "Collection 'Brittanica,'" written during Paschal's reign; the "Collection in Seven Books," (Vat. Lat., 1346), written during the period 1112-1120; the "Polycarpus," written during the period 1109-1119; the "Collection in Three Books," (Vat. Lat., 3831), written sometime during Paschal's reign; and numerous recensions of Anselm of Lucca's collection, all display the same tendencies to stressthe uniqueness of Peter's See, the impossibility of anyone judging the See of Peter, and the essential differences between the secular and regular clergy. See Fournier and Lebras, Histoire, II, 131-208 passim.

[191]Bruno, "Libellus II," MGH, Lib., II, 564.

[192]Ibid.

[193]Bruno, "Libellus III," MGH, Lib., II, 565.

[194]Bruno, "Libellus IV," MGH, Lib., II, 565.

[195]It was not until the end of the year 1112 that Paschal in two letters, one to Ivo of Chartres and the other to Guy of Vienne, admitted that he had been forced to sign the Concordat of Sutri. See Paschalis, "Epistolae CCCXXXII," PL, CLXIII, 292.

[196]Bernaldus, "De Incontinentia Sacerdotum," MGH, Lib., II, 21.

[197]See Ivonis, "De Epistola ad Ioscerranum," MGH, Lib., II, 654. Carlyle notes that "Ivo looked upon the prohibition of lay investiture as an administrative rule, which might be enforced or on not, as might seem expedient, and not as a permanent part of the law of the Church." Carlyle, op. cit., 99-100.

[198]W.-H. Maigne D'Arnis, Lexicon Manuale ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis, Caroli Dufresne D. Ducangii, et al. (Parisiis: Apud Garnier Fratres, Editores et J.-P. Migne Successores, n.d.), 1128.

[199]Placidus, "Liber de Honore Ecclesiae," MGH, Lib., II, 637-38.

[200]Ibid.

[201]Placidus, "Liber de Honore Ecclesiae," MGH, Lib., II, 637-38.

[202]Ibid., 618.

[203]Ibid., 586, 603.

[204]On Norbert's chiliastic prophecies, see Bernardus, "Epistola LVI," PL, CLXXXII, 162-64.

[205]In a letter written to Bruno of Cologne, Bernard made the distinction between the sacerdotal hierarchy and the ascetic hierarchy of values. Office alone, Bernard argued, did not guarantee salvation, and Bruno, by accepting the office of archbishop of Cologne, had only increased his contact with the world. He had thus increased his opportunity to sin. Bernard: "Si cunctos qui vocantur ad ministerium, constat eligi et ad regnum, profectos securus est Coloniensis archiepiscopus. Quod si etiam et Saulem in regno, et Iudam in sacerdotio legitur elegisse non alius quam ipse Deus; et non potest solvi Scriptura quae hoc assertit: timeat necesse est et Coloniensis archiepiscopus. Si vero (quod verum est) et illa sententia hodie quoquo viget, quia non multos nobiles, non multos potentes, non multos sapientes elegit Deus, nunquid non triplicem quoque habet timendi causam Coloniensis archiepiscopus?" Bernardus, "Epistola IX," PL, CLXXXII,107.

[206]Reinke, Die Schuldialektik, 82-83.

[207]Placidus, "Liber de Honore Ecclesiae," 569.

[208]Fournier and Lebras, Histoire, II, 334ff.

[209]Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles, V, i, 531.

[210]"Si quis vero laicus ad hanc porumpit insaniam, ut in datione et acceptione virgae putet se posse tribuere sacramentum vel rem sacramenti ecclesiastici, illum prorsus iudicamus hereticum non propter manualem investituram, sed propter presumptionem diabolicam." Ivonis, "Epistola ad Ioscerranum," MGH, Lib., II, 654. Further, Ivo argued that lay investiture could not be a heresy for "et fides et error ex corde procedunt. Investitura vero illa, de qua tantus et motus, in solis est manibus dantis et accipientis, quae bona et mala aegere possunt, credere vel errare in fide non possunt." Ibid., 653.

[211]In the epistle to Jusserand of Lyons, Ivo had remained faithful to what he considered the real Gregorian tradition, arguing that one might presume to judge the pope not at all: "non possumus eas personas, contra quas agitur, condempnare

vel iudicare, quia nec vostro nec illius hominum probantur subiacere iudicio." Ivonis, "Epistola ad Ioscerranum," MGH, Lib., II, 652. Compare Ivonis, "Decretum," PL, CLXI, 327.

[212]This work is dated as coming immediately after the Lateran Council of March 1112. See the preface to the work by Ernst Sackur, MGH, Lib., II, 658-9.

[213] "Disputatio vel Defensio Paschalis Papae," MGH, Lib., II, 665.

[214]Fliche maintains that "à la fin de 1111 que Paschal II manifeste les disposition nouvelle et confesse qu'il n'a cède qu'a la force. Une lettre a l'archevêque de Vienne, Guy, est plus explite encore: le pape y annonce son intention formelle d'abroger et d'infirmer le privilège accordé a Henri V." Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 370.

[215]"À la suite de ces blames sèveres, Paschal se decide, vers la fin de l'année 1111, a rétirer ses concessions, et êcrivait dans ce sens a Yves de Châtres,...Paschal s'explique plus energetiquement dans une lettre a Guy, archêveque de Vienne." Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles, V, i, 531.

[216]Jaffe-Wattenbach 6325(4678) is dated June 19, 1112. Jaffe-Wattenbach 6326(4679) is dated June 19, 1112. It is interesting to note that both of the letters contain the same wording essentially as that found in Paschal's confession, composed by Gerard of Angouleme and delivered at the Lateran Council of 1112.

Paschalis, "Epistola CCCXXXII:"

"...pro libertate ecclesiae, et pro absolutione captivorum omnium, et pro excidio quod ecclesiae, Urbi et universae provinciae, superincumbente undique gladio." PL, CLXIII, 292.

Again: "Ea vero quae sacri apostolorum canones, et Antiochenum, ac universa concilia, et predecessores nostri, et praecipe felicis memoriae domnus Gregorius et Urbanus de his prohibuerunt,

"Relatio Registri Paschalis II:"

"Cogor, ait, pro ecclesiae liberatione hac pace hoc pati, hoc permittere quod pro vita mea nullatenus consentirem." MGH, Const., I, 149.

In the "confessio:" "Amplector omnem divinam scripturam, scilicet Veteris et Novi Testamenti, Legem a Moyse scriptam, et a sanctis prophetis; amplector IIIIevangelia, VII canonicas epistolas...Pauli apostoli, sanctorum Apostolorum canones, IIII universalia concilia,...

dampnaverunt, statuerunt, et firmaverunt, ego prohibeo, damno, constituo, et confirmo et me illorum sanctiones profiteor servaturum. Ibid.

et decreta sanctorum patrum Romanorum pontificum, et praecipue decreta sanctorum patrum nostri pape Gregorii et...Urbani. Qui ipsi laudaverunt, laudo, qui ipsi tenuerunt, teneo: que confirmaverunt, confirmo, etc..." Duchesne, Liber Censum, II, 136.

We note the similarities holding between the two documents only to highlight the relations of Paschal with his curia. If the two letters to Guy and Ivo had been composed prior to the Lateran Council of 1112, then both Fliche and Hefele-Leclercq would have been justified in assuming that Paschal had really wished to break the Concordat of Sutri. However, there is no evidence to sustain the basis of the assumption. If the Pope really was in accord with his curia, why did he attempt to abdicate in 1111-1112? If, as Fliche argues, the Lateran Council dissipated all doubts of the Pope's "Gregorianism," how is one to explain the same action being repeated at the Lateran Council of 1116? For a complete discussion, see W. Schum, "Kaiser Heinrich V und Paschalis II im Jahre 1112," Jahrbücher des Königliche Akademie zu Erfurt , VIII (1877), 221ff. We discuss the attempted abdication in detail below.

[217]Paschal wrote to Henry V on 26 October 1111: "sed ipsi etiam qui circa nos sunt, cervicem adversus nos erexerunt, et intestinis bellis viscera nostra collocerant, et multo faciem nostram rubore profundunt. De quibus, quia judicium consequi non possumus, de judicio relinquimus, ne Dei Ecclesiam gravius perturbemus." PL, CLXIII, 291.

[218]Jusserand replied to Ivo: "Novum et inauditum philosophandi genus ortari contra fortes timidos, contra importunes desides, fieri in bello fugaces, in pace vero audaces, in periculo securos, in securitate providos. Intestabilis magister navis, qui in tranquilla serenitate artis suae fastigium exercet, in tempestate vero clavum et cetera armamenta remittit." Ioscerranus, "Epistola ad Ivoem," MGH, Lib., II, 656.

[219]The libelli of Geoffrey of Vendome consist for the most part of a series of letters which span the years 1111-1112. In these letters we see that Geoffrey conceives of the priestly hierarchy as consisting "vicarii Christi" subject only to the "ius Christi." This led him to assert that only the priest could interpret the "ius Christi." If necessary the priest could even judge the pope himself, if the pope violated the "ius Christi." See his "Libellus I,"MGH, Lib., II, 676. In this work, Peter stands for the power on earth, while Paul stands for heavenly power. Ibid., 680-81. Gregory VII is seen as the

incarnation of both powers who "pro defensione huius fidei mortuus est, in exilio, investituram palliantes, eam negarent haeresim esse, verbis ad secundum compositis, si possent." Ibid., 682. In another letter, Geoffrey warned the Pope that he who was not with the Gregorians was against them. The role of the Pope was, according to Geoffrey, to conserve the law, not to change it: "Romana itaque aecclesia divinarum scripturarum legem solvere non debet, sed conservare." "Libellus II," MGH, Lib., II, 688. Obsession with the idea of controlling the temporalia had made attempts to dispense with it heresy on the part of the Pope? The differences between Ivo of Chartres and Geoffrey of Vendome are patent. To Paschal, Gregory VII had been the incarnationof charitas. To Ivo of Chartres, Gregory VII had been the pope who had revealed the nature of canon law. To Geoffrey of Vendome and the Roman Curia, Gregory VII had been the creator of a great hierocratic empire and an ideology by which the creation of the empire was to be defended. To deviate from the Gregorian ideal was heresy! For the differences between Paschal and Geoffrey, see Dempf, Sacrum Imperium, 219ff., and Ernst Sackur, "Zur Chronologie des Streitschriften des Gotfried von Vendome," Neues Archiv, XXVII (1892), 327-47.

[220]Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V, i, 529.

[221]Hampe, Das Hochmittelalter, 163.

[222]Witness, for example, the ruling obviously directed against Bruno of Segni that no cleric might hold at the same time a major abbacy and a bishopric. Chron. Cass., MGH, SS, VII, 783. Bruno tried tomaintain hispower at Monte Cassino by having a puppet elected as abbot, but the Pope would have none of these machinations. Bruno was back, however, stronger than ever under Gelasius II. See Gigalski, op. cit., 96ff.

[223]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 370.

[224]Duchesne, Liber Censum, II, 136.

[225]See the letter of Hugo Candidus quoted in Benon, "Gestae Romanae Ecclesiae," MGH, Lib., II, 419.

[226]Gregory's eulogization of the ecclesia primitiva had been based upon this assumption.

[227]See above our discussion of the Dictatus Papae, p. 131.

[228]Mansi, Concilia, XX, 52-53.

[229]Ibid.

[230]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 301-308.

[231]"Hac occasione Papa reliquit investituras Imperatori quae fiebant per annulum et virgam, et super sacrosancta juravit propriam manu et Curia ejus Imperatorem se non excommunicare pro investituris. Quia vero Papa rem illicitam facerat, deponere se a Papatu promiserat, et ad Pontianas insulas habitu religioso exulire disposuerat, si investituras, salvo sacramento, ad pristinam libertatem,...in qu re nullum remedium a toto Concilio inveniri poterat." "Ex Historiam Pontificium et Comitum Engolismemsis," Bouquet, Recueils, XII, 394.

[232]Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V, i, 533.

[233]Baronius, Annales Ecclesiastici, XII, 116.

[234]Duchesne, Liber Censum, II, 136.

[235]Ibid.

[236]Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V, i, 537.

[237]Witness the vague confirmation of the Vienne decisions in Paschalis, "Epistola CCCXLVIII," PL, CLXIII, 305.

[238]Hefele-Leclercq, op. cit., 552-53.

[239]On the papal legates and their powers under the popes of the early twelfth century, see Karl Reuss, Die rechtliche Stellung der päpstlichen Legaten bis Bonifaz VII (Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schoningh, 1912), 68ff. Cf. Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," 218-221, and Jordan, "Die Entstehung der römischen Kurie," 125.

[240]See Toynbee, A Study of History, IV, 2-6.

[241]Weber, Aus den Schriften zur Religionssoziologie, 255-60.

[242]Mannheim, Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge, 264.

[243]Von Knonau, Heinrich V, VII, 1-5, 30ff.

[244]Ekkerhardus, "Chronicon," MGH, SS, VI, 250.

[245]Ibid.

[246]Ekkehardus, "Chronicon," MGH, SS, VI, 251.

[247]Ibid., 250.

[248]Paschal is recorded as having said: "Ecclesia primitiva, Martyrium tempore, floruit apud Deum, et non apud homines. Dein ad Fidem conversi sunt Reges, Imperatores, Romani principes, qui matrem suam Ecclesiam, sicut boni bilii bonestaverunt, conferenda Ecclesiae Dei praedia, allodia, saeculares honores, et dignitates, regalia quoque jures et insignia, quemadmodum Constantinus, caetereque Fideles: et coepit Ecclesia florere tam apud homines quam apud Deum." Ibid., 251.

[249]Ibid.

[250]Von Knonau, Heinrich V, VII, 30ff.; Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 301.

[251]Ibid., 302. Compare the account of Paschal's death presented in Wilhelm Levison, "Aus Englischen Bibliotheken: Englischen Handschriften des Liber Pontificalis," Neues Archiv, XXXV (1910), 398-99.

[252]See Joseph March, Liber pontificalis prout exstat in codice Manuscripto Dertuensis textum genuinem complectens hactenus ex parte ineditum Pandulphi (Barcelona: Typis "la Educacion," 1925), 164-65. This MS predates that printed by Duchesne and for the lives from Paschal II to Honorius II supersedes his edition.

[253]See Ekkerhardus, "Chronicon," 254; Petrus Diaconus, "Chron. Cass.," 792; "Annales Romani," MGH, SS, VI, 478.

[254]There were eighty-three cardinals appointed by Paschal during his long reign. The occupations of thirty-three are known. Of these thirty-three, nine were from either Cluny or Monte Cassino. See Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," 206ff., Exkurs I.

[255]Toynbee, A Study of History, IV, 340.

CHAPTER V

THE PONTIFICATES OF GELASIUS II AND CALIXTUS II (1118-1124): THE APOGEE OF THE GREGORIAN PAPACY

The definition of papal leadership ideals had been, until 1112-1118, a problem for the entire Church community. Inevitably the definition of those ideals was subsumed under the larger questions which the Investiture Struggle raised. This meant that the general Church membership would discuss the problem of papal leadership and the papal role in terms of whether it was ranged with or against the emperor. The Gregorian Reform was revolt and aggressive virtues were eulogized for the leader of that revolt, even though the revolt was carried on in terms of institution of what was essentially a nonaggressive ideal, monasticism. Constant pressure from the emperors, especially their claim to rights in papal elections, led to a closer definition of the formal aspects of the papal office during the period between the Dictatus Papae and the Council of Piacenza. Canon lawyers and papal polemicists examined the legal aspects of the papal office in their finest details. Imperial polemicists, on the other hand, argued against the role which the Papacy was assuming as a political force, and they pointed to specific acts by specific popes which were not in keeping with the spiritual nature of the Church which the popes led. The imperialists had a good arguing point insofar as they showed how the Papacy was denying its spiritual charge, but

constant pressure from the emperor made the Papacy's stand seem pragmatically necessary. That is, the papal polemicists could argue that the Papacy was fighting for its very life, not just for political power.

However, by the end of the reign of Urban II, it was quite apparent that the existence of the Papacy or its independence was no longer the issue. What mattered now was which of the two goliaths, Church or State, would control society. Pietistic ideals of the type championed by Ivo of Chartres and Paschal II were shown to be completely unacceptable to the Curia after Sutri in 1112. Although Paschal was not allowed to abdicate, it was apparent that the Curia as a corporate body controlled papal affairs in the last six years of his reign. The Curia, once in control, were kept from excommunicating the emperor only by Paschal II, but its members were quite apparently sworn to a struggle to the death. The death of Paschal II in 1118 removed the last restraint on the Curia in Rome, and they immediately opened full war against Henry V.

Now, in 1118, the Curia assumed open control of the Papacy which they had controlled in fact since 1112. The election of the Papal Chancellor, John of Gaeta, to the papal throne as Gelasius II signified this curial victory. The election of the radical Gregorian John of Gaeta, the grammarian <u>par excellence</u>, was an open blast at both Henry V and any moderates in the Church who might be harboring ideas that <u>charitas</u> would be a permanent feature of papal policy.

The excommunication of the Emperor followed immediately upon Gelasius' election; and the turbulent events of Rome, in which the Emperor's allies, the Frangipane, succeeded for a while in capturing the Pope, forced the withdrawal of Gelasius from the city and the beginning of the deadly combat which would end three years later at Worms.[1]

The problem of leadership values now shifts insofar as its geography is concerned. There are no more moderates in Rome. The Curia and a large part of the Roman nobility are all in the radical camp. Only the Frangipane family and its allies remained anti-papal in Rome, and this because of imperial gold. To be anti-papal now is to be pro-imperial, even in the provinces. It is no longer a question of what the papal virtues are, because they are officially defined in Rome as the aggressive, radical virtues, as outlined by Bruno of Segni, Rangier of Lucca, and Placidus of Nonantola. The most influential men in the hierarchy are now Guy of Vienne, Geoffrey of Vendome, Gerard of Angouleme, and Pontius of Cluny. Undoubtedly, at the same time, the most influential men in Rome were Cono of Palestrine and the Pierleoni family.[2] Canon law was the accepted standard for determining the efficacy of any action, and the Curia, with its concomitant bureaucracy, waxed rich off its iron control of the lowest reaches of the hierocracy.

But to the younger generation of c. 1118, especially the younger generation of religious leaders in France, the struggle between Church and State was not so important. Indeed,

to young Norbert of Xanten, appearing before the Council of Rheims (1119) barefoot and ragged, the struggle for the formal control of the Church hierarchy seemed insane.[3] To young Bernard of Clairvaux, struggling with God and the Devil in the woods around Clairvaux, control of the dominium temporalis was child's play.[4] To Matthew of Rheims the real issues were religious and moral reform.[5] And these young men did not stand alone, for mass asceticism, part of the same strain that Urban II had turned to papal advantage in the Crusades, was increasing once more.[6]

The new asceticism had become organized by 1118, the year of Gelasius' election. It had been channeled into various religious orders, of which the Cistercians, Carthusians, and Canons Regular the best known.[7] In its second phase it would be joined by the Premonstratensians and Knights Templars, but that comes under the reign of Honorius II (1124-1130).[8] What is important about the new orders is their purely otherworldly character. By this I mean to say that whereas the Cluniac Order reformed the mores of the monks in its time, it emerged into the twelfth century as really a kind of Eigenkirche in itself, a great economic and administrative empire as secular in its administrative technique as the Curial bureaucracy.[9] Cluny was a reform to be sure, but not in the sense in which Citeaux was a reform. Cluny did not seek to overthrow the existing order of things in order to return to the sources of an idealized corpus mysticum, the ecclesia primitiva. Cluny

was an organizational revolution, not a reform. Citeaux and Clairvaux, in reacting to Cluny, sought to re-institute a life which had existed in its purest state only in the golden age of the Church, the apostolic period.[10] In its individualism, its spiritualism, its ascetic bent, its social organization, the Cistercian Order represented a real threat, not only to Cluny, but to the whole complex which had grown out of the merger of Cluny with the Gregorian Reform. In fact, Cistercianism is based upon completely different metaphysical and emotional assumptions. These fundamental differences could not but affect the leadership ideals which the Cistercians embraced. Both in their concept of the hierarchy of being and in their concept of status, the Cistercians stood directly opposed to the psychology then prevailing in the Cluniac monastic empire and the papal bureaucracy.[11]

The phenomenon which is represented on the practical plane by the Cistercians and Premonstratensians is represented on the purely intellectual level by the Victorine mystical school of Paris. In the work of Hugh of St. Victor (1096-1141) we find possibly the finest expression of the intellectual bases of the Augustinian pietism of the twelfth century.[12] His is the systematic attempt to a complete theology.

The most outstanding aspect of the thought of Hugh of St. Victor is the resurrection of the metaphysics of inner experience of St. Augustine. In the Paris of Abelard this was a difficult feat for a man firmly devoted to the liberal arts to attempt. We find the same distinction between

sapientia and scientia as that made by Augustine. This distinction had tended to disappear under the impact of dialectic, and it was a foregone conclusion in canon law that religious knowledge could be handled like any objective knowledge and treated to analysis, criticism, and classification. The Victorines reaffirm the uniqueness of religious knowledge, and although they are learned in the liberal arts they hold that the liberal arts in themselves have no inherent worth. If Bernard of Clairvaux was suspicious of formal learning, Hugh of St. Victor developed his theology on the assumption that formal learning might prepare the soul for real knowledge, but could do nothing more. As a later anonymous writer put it: "Mira sunt, Fratres, que de Sacramento isto dicuntur. Fides est necessaria: scientia rationis supervacua. Scientia ratione et intellectu colligitur: fides sola auctoritate inducitur."[13] The idea was, of course, by no means new, nor was it the last time that it was stated; but the Victorines in Paris and Bernard all over Europe brought a new and rigid enforcement to the doctrine which had tended, especially in the heat of investiture polemic and canon law, to be discarded.

Now it is fundamental to both the Victorines and the Cistercians to assume a dichotomy between body and soul, the two entities "being considered of such different natures that their very union was looked upon as an enigma."[14] The Victorines do not examine the enigma thus posited, but accept it as a starting point for their speculations. Soul

Hugh conceived to be the heart, the seat of feeling and sentiment, rather than intellect.[15] As a result of this his theology tends to resolve itself into a discussion of concepts of will, the "vital process of the soul developing out of feeling in which faith conditions the course of knowledge."[16] The construction of the dichotomy between intellect and will is, of course, dangerous for the adherents to the new learning. For just as Augustine opposed the ratio scientiae to the ratio sapientiae, Hugh of St. Victor, learned as he is, manifests the same suspicion of formal learning and relegates dialectic to the rank of an auxiliary science which can aid the searching soul only in the primary stages of its quest.[17] In St. Bernard, of course, this tendency results in a complete voluntarism in which formal reasoning is denied to have any validity whatsoever.[18] This means further that while in Rome, in the curia, policy is explained always in terms of dialectic and law, such explanation can have little real meaning in Citeaux and the Victorine school in Paris. In 1130 it will have practical consequences in complete misunderstanding of both parties of the schism in which the very concept "legality" is approached from two completely different, if not opposed, Weltanschauungen.

In terms of the ethic which is derived from Hugh's presupposed dualism we also see a return to pre-Gregorian sources. Hugh approached his theory of action always from the viewpoint of a monk. The ideal society for him existed only in the cloister, insofar as an ideal society was possible

in this world. In the De Claustro Animae, Hugh's dualism is carried through in the erection (unconscious?) of a dichotomy between the cloister and the rest of the world.[19] As he had noted in his De Sacramentis, all human sin springs from two faults in the human character: ignorance and concupiscence.[20] In the properly organized monastery the individual can conquer both of these faults. Through the withdrawal from contact with carnal affairs he can overcome the second; and through proper instruction, meditation, and contemplation he can conquer the first.[21] The monastery itself represents an oasis in a desert of sin and strife. It partakes of a bit of heaven on earth, a fact which Hugh seemingly argues in likening heaven itself to the perfect cloister.[22] It is a fount of strength; indeed, that is how Bernard of Clairvaux conceived of it, returning after his bouts with the forces of the new learning and the curia to receive sustenance in contemplation and renewed knowledge in the beatific vision.[23]

From the cloister the mystic surveys society. Hugh sees two archetypes of all activity and all societal organization. He juxtaposes the "old Adam" to the "new Adam," the "celestial Jerusalem" to Babylon, and he identifies the fruits of each according to whether they partake in charitas and salvation or luxury and sin.[24] The celestial Jerusalem exists in another world and its citizens own a spiritual citizenship in it. On the other hand, Babylon is constantly among us, tempting us and luring us away from the

celestial Jerusalem by luxury and pride. The Church itself, seen under the aspect of Hugh's dualism, is not made of stone and wood; it is purely spiritual.[25] Its walls are Holy Scripture alone, and its members are a universal priesthood of believers, having no need of external signs or insignia to show their membership but identified by the fruits of their activity.[26]

Such a view of the nature of the Christian community naturally has overtones for the interpretation of the relationship holding between the secular clergy, the regular clergy, and the laity. Like almost the entire thinking body of his age, the curialists excepted, Hugh conceived of the essential unity of the Christian community. God's power was the adhesive which held the whole of existence together metaphysically and which held society together in such a way that the members of the celestial Jerusalem here on earth might seek their salvation. This power comes from God to the Supreme Pontiff and is then dispersed throughout all orders of society.[27] This power is, however, strictly magisterial and does not allow the priesthood to encroach upon the rights of the laity, except insofar as the teaching function of the priesthood consists in the defense of justice.[28] But even the orders of society tend to break down and merge into one another where the clerical is concerned. If Hugh vaguely outlines the relationship of king to bishop, he is much more careful in his exposition of the relation of monk to priest.

The persecution which the new monastic orders felt at the hands of the curia, through canons specifically directed against them prohibiting them to preach, forbidding their reform activity, was apparently felt by Hugh.[29] Certainly the Gregorians had erected within the general Church hierarchy a purely hierocratic structure which had its center in Rome. Just as certainly, that hierocracy was dominated by Amtscharismatic concepts of rank in which the sacerdotal idea of value predominated. Hugh strikes at the privileged position of the hierocracy which is grounded in sacramental concepts of role, office, or function. Indeed, he maintains, the only difference between monk and priest is the fact that the latter has been authorized to perform certain tasks by legal authority, external authority.[30] Does this mean that the monk is of a lower rank? If the monk must assume the garb of the priest before he can administer the sacraments, does that mean that he is inferior? The mere fact that Hugh considered the question is important, for it demonstrates the growing concern in monastic circles over the increased power of the curia and the growing prestige which the priesthood was beginning to assume over the regular clergy. The eleventh century reform had come to being as a result of the monkish moralists' coming forth from their cells in order to criticize the laxity of the personal lives of the priesthood. The reform had been pursued in the name of monkish ideals, and its greatest leaders were monks. But the monasteries which provided this leadership, they had

changed. Were they any longer real exponents of the monkish ethic? Bernard answered with a resounding "No!"[31] And it was his opinion that if the curia now gave lip service to the monkish ideal, this was only an affectation, not at all supported by deeds.

Hugh of St. Victor holds that the monk is superior to the priest and the real leader of society. The monk does not give the sacraments because they would only distract him from activities which are much more important.[32] Here is the monkish rejection of the whole Gregorian ideal of the conversion of the world. The otherworldly ideal of the monk formally rejects, in the thought of Hugh, the activity of the priest as distracting to the life of the cloister. The life of the cloister is, in fact, conceived to be a sacrament in itself, the highest sacrament, for it is purely spiritual, internal, given by God rather than by another priest--it signifies the union of the soul with God and the promise of the beatific vision.[33] The higher morality resulting from knowledge of God, possessed by the monk to an ultimate degree, is therefore the example for all society, the priesthood included. The priest who would be the good priest must practice the ascetic virtues. Only thus can he lead his flock by example and consecrate his external ordination with the excellence of his personal life.[34]

Now this means that the archetype of all societal life is the monkish ideal. A hierarchy has been set up in which the relationship stands monk, priest, layman; and the basis

of order is one thing--morality. It is this concept that Bernard of Clairvaux imposes the Church of his time through the implementation of his practical ethics. It is this simple view of office which overthrows the curial idea and results in the schism of 1130.

Bernard dominates the second quarter of the twelfth century. Freidrich Heer has called Bernard the "Schimäre des Jahrhunderts (Halb Monch, halb Weltritter").[35] In an age of transition, Bernard is, to Heer, a study in conflicting ideas. He notes:

> Bernhard rüft gegen Cluny die spiritualen "neue Seite" seiner eigenen Personlichkeit zu Hilfe, gegen Abalard und die Ketzer aber als das alt-konservative sakramental-symbolistische und religios-politische Element seiner Person. So werden Wende eines Jahrhunderts, welches an sich schoneine-eine Epoche der Krisis, des Ubergangs ist.[36]
> Situation Bernhards, seine Zwischenstellung in der Wende eines Jahrhunderts, welches an sich schon eine Epoche der Krisis, des Ubergangs ist.[36]

Professor Heer sees the difficulties of the study of the period made more complex by confusion of terms which all groups use in criticizing the others:

> Alle drei Parteien, Bernhard und die orthodoxe. Reform, Abalard und (zum dritten) die Sektierer, kampfen mit den selben Schlagworten: Nachfolge Christi, apostolische Armüt (als neuer Lebensstil der Wahren Christen, der Armen Christi), eine innere geistige Kirche, die Seele als wahres Himmelsreich, jeder Christenmensch als König und Priester in Gott.[37]

Not so the curia, however, and therein lay the difficulties between them and Bernard of Clairvaux. None of the concepts mentioned by Heer may be properly identified with the curia after the defeat of Paschal II at their hands. Terms such

as these are abandoned by the curia even as propaganda motifs during the period of their ascendency, 1112-1122.

Now, the Cistercian Order acts from a social theory with a purely ascetic or monkish base. Thus envisaged, the attack which it launched against Cluny was also an attack against the curia, for its objections to Cluny extended from broad moral precepts to specific activities, artistic, intellectual, practical, as well as the Cluniac concept of a highly centralized administrative organization.[38] They (the Cistercians) deplored the luxury and ceremony of Rome and Pope Calixtus as much as they did that of Pontius, Abbot of Cluny.[39] From an examination of the Cistercian social organization we can receive some idea of the underlying bases of the Cistercian concept of office.

The asceticism of the Cistercians led them to attack the luxury of the eating and clothing habits of the Cluniacs above all, but that was not the most important point upon which the two orders clashed. Citeaux envisioned a kind of monastic organization which was directly opposed to the centralized autocracy under which the Cluniac Order flourished.[40] The Abbot of Cluny was elected for life, ruled with absolute power, was subject to no bishop, and headed a vast economic and governmental empire of subject houses; this abbot assumed the title abbas abbatum as well as countless insignia and honors formerly given only to the secular clergy and bishops.[41] The Cistercian abbot-general, on the other hand, was the head of a patriarchal order, in which the member

houses were not regarded as ancillae of the parent house so much as daughters with lives of their own to lead.[42] The Cistercian abbot-general was prohibited by the Charta Charitatis from taking direct action in the affairs of any of the daughter houses.[43] Furthermore, he was visited once a year by the abbots of the four leading daughter houses who might judge him for morality or ability, and he might be deposed by the general chapter if, after four warnings of laxity, he persisted in such laxity.[44] Relative to the bishops the Charta Charitatis decreed that "no abbeys should be founded in any dioceses unless the bishop of that diocese had himself confirmed and ratified the written decree."[45] Finally, the Charta Charitatis affirmed that the Cistercian Order was composed of obedient servants of the one true King, Lord, and Master, and that therefore they would "exact not of the abbots and of our brother monks...any material services or any temporal dues."[46]

Now, this means that the Cistercian Order is more loosely organized, more individualistic on the local level, less organized for struggle against any external power which might present itself against the Church, than the Cluniac Order or, for that matter, the curial bureaucracy. But what was lacking in organization per se was more than made up for in charisma for the masses, especially as that charisma was embodied in St. Bernard of Clarivaux. On the emotional appeal of words such as paupertas, humilitas, and charitas, the Cistercians could ride the crest of the ascetic

wave sweeping Europe at that time. But in their individualism, their insistence upon real poverty in the Church, their insistence upon a real corpus mysticum, and their disdain of formal learning and formal organization in an administrative sense, the Cistercians represented a basic reaction to the whole of the Gregorian movement; not its fulfillment.[47] In fact, it is only after the Concordat of Worms is signed in September of 1122 that the Cistercians are able to move on Rome for the purpose of implementing a real moral reform. And in order to implement this reform, it is necessary for them to oust the old Gregorian radicals from the curia by force.

It was apparent to both the curia and the Cistercians that the latter could never have the kind of reform it envisioned so long as the former was in power. We see them attempting to implement their concept of reform as early as 1119 through the socially recognized channels, but all to no avail.[48] The reason for this failure was apparent; the Papacy was itself controlled by the very elements which the Cistercians conceived to be most needing reform, namely, the curia, Cluny, Mone Cassino, and the canon lawyer-dialecticians. These elements remained in control of the situation in Rome up to about 1124. The underground battle between the Cistercians and the Gregorians in the curia, however, begins to rage in the period 1119-1124.

The opening gun of the battle was sounded in 1119 by the issuance of Bernard's famous first epistle, in which

Cluny and the curia were brought under fire.[49] This letter was written by Bernard in an attempt to win back to Clairvaux his nephew, Robert of Chatillon, who had defected to Cluny.[50] The case had gone to Rome, and there the Abbot Pontius, possibly the most powerful man in the curia at that time, had won an easy decision against Bernard and his monks. Paragraph after paragraph of Bernard's letter condemns the life led at Cluny, which had, according to Bernard, become nothing but an idler's dream.[51] The activity which Bernard pictures there is exactly the same sort as that criticized by Walram von Naumburg in his De Unitate Ecclesiae! In other words, the virtues of the Gregorian organized monasteries, training grounds for the papal diplomatic corps, have, under Bernard's interpretation of the Rule, become vices. Criticism of Cluny hinges, of course, upon Bernard's disdain of worldly learning and the "modern" art of the time. Above all, Bernard's judgment of Cluny as completely decadent hinges solely upon differences in attitudes towards certain values, differences which separate him from the Gregorian idea-world.

The sanctity of St. Bernard has led a number of historians to take as absolute truths statements which can, at best, be regarded only opinion.[52] That is, it has become almost a commonplace to speak of the decadence of the rule at Cluny under the leadership of Pontius.[53] Yet Bernard is the only authority. Are we to accept his authority over the authority of three "good" Gregorian popes, Paschal,

Gelasius, and Calixtus, who are unanimous in hailing Cluny under Pontius as the "mirror of monastic life"?[54] Or, are to we conclude that Cluny somehow changed overnight, between the death of Calixtus II and the accession of Honorius II, into a "synagogue of Satan"? If we do so, we must also assume that the same thing happened to Monte Cassino. For only thus will the factual data provided by Bernard and the factual data provided by the successors of Gregory VII coincide. It is not until Honorius II assumed the throne that either Cluny or Monte Cassino came under criticism from any papal source, and Honorius himself, as we shall see, was merely the instrument of the new reform movement.

There is the key to the matter. There was no decline at Cluny under Pontius, nor was there a decline at Monte Cassino under Oderisius, and there is no factual data to indicate that there was.[55] There is data on the other hand to indicate that a complete shift of values took place in the curia with the accession of Honorius II; but if we accept this data we must also be prepared to accept a concomitant conclusion: that is, that the Cistercian Reform is not the continuation or fulfillment of the Gregorian Reform, as many have assumed, but was a direct reaction to it. Both Cluny and Monte Cassino are considered decadent by Bernard of Clairvaux precisely because they are still the training grounds for an autocratic curia which they were under Gregory VII and Urban II. The monks there, engaged in the study of rhetoric, dialectic, and law and in the production

of magnificently illustrated manuscripts and great architectural monuments, may be considered decadent only if one accepts the rigid moral standards of Bernard of Clairvaux as somehow absolutely valid and rejects the activity of these centers for what they were: a natural outgrowth of the Gregorian Reform, to which both Cluny and Monte Cassino were allied. The first epistle of Bernard, while an opening gun against Cluniac monasticism, is thus also an attack against the very idea world of Gregory VII, for no matter how much alike Bernard and Gregory VII were in their "piety," their ideas of the means of implementing that piety were so radically different as to make the similarities inconsequential.

In the first epistle we are given a preview of Bernard's position, stated in 1125 in the Apologia and in 1149 in the De Consideratione. For after concluding his critique of the life at Cluny (the subject of the Apologia), Bernard enters upon a discussion of the nature of the curia in Rome (the subject of the De Consideratione, in part), and his general concept of leadership is introduced.[56]

That Rome was the final authority in all matters spiritual and temporal was, as we have noted, a major plank in the Gregorian (and especially the curial) platform.[57] It is impossible to conceive of the Gregorian Reform without conceiving of the emergence of this legalistic concept of the papal office as the absolute limit of the hierarchy. Furthermore, as noted above, bishops cannot be judged by their inferiors,

according to the canonists, and the pope cannot be judged by anyone, on moral grounds. For the individual member of the Christian community there is no appeal beyond Rome and there is no criticism of Rome. Bernard, in the first epistle, challenges all of these views.

Neither Ivo of Chartres nor Hugh of Grenoble, although they decried the corruption of the curia, even considered challenging it. They, being part of the Gregorian idea-world, looked upon the curia as part of the papal office, an integral part, which, viewed in the light of the Gregorian struggle against the State, indeed it was. But Bernard stood in no such awe of the Curia. He, like Walram von Naumburg, Hugh of Fleury, and Sigebert of Gembloux, and above all the Anonymous of York, looked at the curia from the vantage point of the "celestial Jerusalem" in which this manifestation of formal organization was so much gilt.

First, Bernard notes that the curia hears only one side of a case and judges for the side which is heard. What meaning does the whole concept of appeal have, thus envisaged?

> Mittitur interea pro eo Roman: Apostolica commpellatur auctoritas; et ut Papa non neget assensum, suggeritur ei infantem olim a parentibus oblatum fuisse monasterio. Non fuit qui refelleret (nec enim contradictor est expectatus), iudicatum est de parte, abiudicatum absentibus. ... Et hic tenor litterarum, haec iudicii summa, haec totius causae definitio, ut teneant qui tulerunt, sileant qui amiserunt: inter haec autem pereat anima pro qua Christus mortuus est, et hoc, quia Cluniacenses volunt. Fit professio super professionem, vovetur quod non solvetur; proponitur quod non tenebitur: et cum primum pactum irritum factum sit, in secundo geminatur praevaricatio, et fit supra modum peccans peccatum.[58]

Bernard therefore conceived of Rome as being no longer

the champion of the oppressed but the oppressor. The curia itself he saw as an arena in which wealth and influence meant power; Bernard repeated the charge in his De Consideratione, when he wrote to Eugene III: "Clericum curiam frequentantem, qui non sit de curia, ad idem notis pertinere ambientium genus... Non ratio habet, non antiquitatis habuit."[59] Here Ivo of Chartres would have halted and merely sighed, but Bernard knew no such qualms. He knew of an authority to whom he could appeal over and above Rome. This authority was the special property of the mystic, and Bernard had had frequent concourse with Him. In his appeal directly to God, Bernard by-passed the whole of the Gregorian legal machinery and challenged the Gregorian concept of the papal office itself. He writes:

> Veniet, veniet qui male iudicata reiudicabit, illicite iurata confutabit; qui faciet iudicium iniuriam patientibus, qui iudicabit in iustitia pauperes, et arguet in aequitate pro mansuetis terrae. Veniet pro certo, qui per Prophetam minatur in Psalmo dicens: Cum accepero tempus, ego iustitias iudicabo. Quid faciet de iniustis iudiciis, qui ipsas quoque iustitias iudicabit? Veniet, inquam, viniet, dies judicii: ubi plus valebunt pura corda, quam astuta verba; et conscientia bona, quam marsupia plena: quandoquidem Iudex ille nec falletur verbis, nec flectetur donis. Tuum, Domine Iesu, tribunal appello: tuo me iudicio servo, tibi committo causam meam, Domine Deus sabaoth, qui iudicas iuste, et probas renes et corda; cuius oculi sicut fallere nolunt, ita falli non possunt; tu vides tua, vides qui quaerunt et sua.[60]

Such a sentence is reminiscent of Damiani in no small measure: typical in that all mystics take their point of departure in the certainty of the illumination derived from concourse with the Godhead and in the all-pervasiveness of the message which

they have received in the process of illumination for all society.

Recent work has attempted to demonstrate that Bernard was aware of the significance of the conon law revolution which he witnessed, but a bad case is made of it.[61] Were Bernard's words meant to be taken literally? They are consistent with his reforming actions, especially insofar as Bernard was connected with the schism of 1130. "I appeal to your Tribunal, O Lord, and to you I commit my cause!" Here the Roman tribunal, the Roman legal machine, was by-passed; Bernard of Clairvaux is thus seen to be an outgrowth of the Damiani strain in the reform movement. The mystic-ascetics had made a comeback, and by the end of the reign of Calixtus II this attitude was championed by a considerable number of the Curia itself under the leadership of Aimerich. The Curia could err and the Pope could err; if Bernard was not yet willing to resort to force to prove that contention in 1119, he was more than willing in 1130. In 1119, however, he was quite willing to set up a dichotomy between the law of God and the rulings of the Pope: To his nephew he wrote: "Et quid tibi frustra quisipiam blanditur de abolutione apostolica, cujus conscientiam divina ligitam tenet sententia."[62] And finally with the esstatic mystical cry, Bernard writes: "Itaque, arbiter meus, Domine Iesu, devultu tuo iudicium meum prodeat, oculi tui videant aequitatem."[63]

For Bernard, as for his followers, all issues hinged

upon their inherent goodness or badness, and they did not at all equate this with their formal legality or illegality. In a letter written c. 1126 which appears in the saint's collected correspondence as a tractate entitled De Discretione Obedientiae, Bernard stated his position in specific terms:

> Sane hoc advertendum, quod quaedam sunt pura bona, quaedam pura mala, et in his nullam deberi hominibus obedientiam, quoniam nec illa omittenda sunt, etiam cum prohibentur; nec ista, vel cum iubentur, committenda.[63]

And, referring to a specific action:

> Quomodo ergo vel abbatis iussio, vel Papae permissio licitum facere valuit quod purum (sicut irrefutabiliter probatum est) malum fuit, cum superius nihilominus allegatum sit, ea quae huiuscemodi sunt, id est pura mala, ut nunquam iuste iuberi, sic nec licite posse fieri?[64]

Of course, the Gregorians would have argued the same, with the additional qualifying statement that the Pope did not err; that he did not attempt to make a thing bad which was good and vice versa. But Bernard conceived of that possibility, and indeed, in his dealings with his own monks saw the actuality. In referring to the case of a monk who had deserted his monastery on permission of the Pope himself, Bernard wrote:

> Apostolicam, inquiunt, licentiam quaesivimus, impetravimus. Utinam non licentiam quaesissetis, sed consilium; id est, non ut liceret, sed an liceret. Unde tamen quaerebatis licentiam? Ut liceret quod non licebat? Facere itaque volebatis quod non licebat? Sed quod non licebat malum erat...Nisi forte tale hoc fuisse dicatur, quod absque licentia quidem non liceret, liceret autem si cum licentia fieret....Nunquid ideo aut malum esse desiit, aut vel minoratum est, quia Papa concessit? Quis vero malum esse neget, assensum praebere malo?...Profectos nempe plangimus, profectum non cernimus....[65]

"Can a bad action be made good because the Pope consents to it?" Here was the crux of the matter in St. Bernard's mind. The Pope's consent to a bad action could not render invalid the obligation of the individual to the good. But if this were so, this meant that the Pope could err, in fact, did err. And who was to judge the errant Pope? And what was to be the standard of judgement? Now that the emperor no longer constituted a threat to the libertas of the Church, that question might be answered much more simply in Bernard's time than had been possible in the time of Anselm of Lucca, Deusdedit, Bonizio of Sutri, Urban II, Guy of Vienne, Bruno of Segni, the radical Gregorians. To the mystics of the new reform, adherents to the idea of simplicity and divine ignorance, good was good and bad was bad, and any man with the light of God might judge any action for its inherent worth. No canon law complex was needed for that. The Curia, Rome, the Papacy, all stood open to the unitas for judgement and, loath as he was to take up the burden, Bernard of Clairvaux, driven by the mystical force, stood ready to judge them all. To the Chancellor Aimerich he writes in 1127: "Nam etsi tanti non sum, ut Romae habeam propria negotia, nulla tamen quae Dei esse constiterit, a me duco aliena."[66] And in a letter written to Matthew, Cardinal-bishop of Albano, in the same year, begging not to be called from the cloister to take part in secular activity:

> Quod si ita est, Domine Deus meus, quomodo tuum ed me solo frustratum est iudicium, ponens sub modio lucernam, quae poterat lucere super candelabrum; et volens abscon-

> dere in tabernaculo tuo in die malorum,
> hominem necessarium mundo, sine quo episcopi
> non possunt sua pertractare negotia?[67]

There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of Bernard's words when he testifies to his desire to remain in the cloister, but in like manner such a desire made him attack his work with a vigour and a sense of righteousness that make truly the prophet type: a humble monk, without official authority, dictating to the hierocracy of Rome and the world.[68] It is his desire above all to cut through the great mass of bureaucratic and courtly sophistry, to cleanse the Papacy and give it back in its purified state to the whole of the unitas Christiana.

Now precisely because the canonial life was looked upon as the most precious of the Church's activities, the "decline" of the Benedictine Rule at Cluny and the "decline" of the Curia in Rome were linked in Bernard's mind. These two elements of the Gregorian Reform complemented each other, and, if we may judge by Bernard's first epistle, Bernard associated the two evils of the Church, luxury and pride, with Cluny and the Curia of Rome. Both criticisms, that of Cluny and that of Curia, are grounded in the fundamentally ascetic character of Bernard's world view. Luxury violates the ideal of paupertas; this is the sin of Cluny. Pride transgresses humilitas;[69] this is the sin of the Curia. Neither Cluny nor the Curia can be said to pass the monkish inspection, and this is where they fail; for in St. Bernard's mind monkish values are universal values, good alike for

judging priest, monk, and layman.

Now, Calixtus II at Reheims had repeated Urban's idea of the differences between the two hierarchies. One labored in the mountains with fasting and prayer; the other labored in the world with the liturgy. Both were equally necessary to the Church, but there were different ways of determining leadership in the two hierarchies, different ways of granting authority in them, different scales for judging their work and their personal lives. Calixtus' canon lawyers instituted special legislation to keep the monks out of these affairs of the Church which were the charges of the secular clergy.[70] Furthermore, the Gregorian idea that bishops and the pope were not subject to judgment by their inferiors in matters of morality was steadily maintained up to Calixtus' death in 1124.[71]

Bernard of Clairvaux accepted none of the above concept of Church society. We shall see that by 1130 the saint has arrived at a concept of status in society which can be thus: n o o f f i c e i s l e g a l l y v a l i d u n l e s s t h e p e r s o n h o l d i n g t h a t o f f i c e h a s a m o r a l w o r t h c o n - c o m i t a n t w i t h h i s o f f i c i a l s t a t u s . An English authority on Bernardine studies, Mr. Watkin Williams, holds that this is precisely the thing which makes St. Bernard a "Gregorian." Williams states that "St. Bernard's touchstone is just this--character," and he goes on to argue that this insistence in excluding everyone

from high office who is not in every way respectable and suitable "is entirely Gregorian."[72]

Of course, it is true that the moral aspect of the Gregorian Reform and that of the Cistercian Reform had as common ends the improvement of the incontinent clergy, but such a view is not original with Gregory VII and can hardly be called the distinguishing mark of the Gregorian Reform. Insistence upon moral reform was probably the reason why Gregory could command vast resources among popular religious movements that he otherwise might never have been able to use. But the distinguishing mark of the Gregorian Reform was its creation of an impregnable administrative and legal hierocracy. This is the fact of Gregorianism, and unless a man can be shown to support this aspect of the Gregorian program he can hardly be called a Gregorian. Of course, we are not interested in terms as such; it is the ideals which they represent which are important. Gregorianism's logical, indeed its inevitable, outcome was the formation of the great hierocracy based upon Amtscharismatic ideals; this means the gradual exchange of ascetic values for those which are more nearly sacerdotal. It is foolish to assume that the ideals of moral continence stated by Gregory VII in the early days of the reform are monkish ideals and that therefore the hierocracy necessary for implementation of the moral ideal is also a monkish hierocracy. As we have seen in our study of the differences between Peter Damiani and Humbert of Silva Candida, conflict was inherent in the very formation of the

Gregorian party, a conflict which went deeper than mere personality clashes. In the latter days of the pontificate of Alexander II, Peter Damiani had been effectively removed from active participation in the reform. He was kept on for prestige reasons as evidenced by his participation in the dispute between Alexander II and the antipope Cadalus. But the ascetic view of the world was such that it could not be effectively used as an anti-imperial tool, because ascetic ends are only indirectly societal ends. Witness the Disceptatio Synodalis of Damiani, which was immediately abandoned by Hildebrand and Alexander II once the schism had been healed. Instead of the kind of spiritual unitas envisioned in the Disceptatio, the Gregorians erected a legal one, a complex of offices which were held together by Roman authority alone and which could not be criticized on moral grounds by any one save the Roman Pope himself. Such a view assumed that the Roman Pope could distinguish between good and evil easily and that he himself was above correction from any mortal, but it also assumed ultimately that the ascetic hierarchy of values did not hold in the official hierarchy of priest, bishop, archbishop, and pope.

Now, even if we limit ourselves still to Bernard's correspondence dated prior to 1130, we see that he cannot be said to accept such a view. In a letter to Fulco, archdeacon of Langres, Bernard maintains that not only must the priest live a morally good life but he must also embrace the ideal of paupertas.[73] What has paupertas to do with the execution

of the priestly office? Paupertas is specifically a monkish virtue. But Bernard insists that paupertas is a key concept for holders of all offices:

> Dignum est qui altario deservit, de altario vivat. Conceditur ergo tibi, ut si bene deservis, de altario luxurieris, ut de altaris superbias, ut inde compares tibi frena aurea, sellas depictas, calcaria deargentata, varia griseaque praeter necessarium victum ac semplicem vestitum de altario retines, tuum non est: rapina est, sacrilegium est.[74]

This is no speculative admonition. Bernard had already been scandalized by the luxury of Cluny, but he made no distinction between the sin in the regular clergy and in the secular. In a letter to Suger of St. Denis, written some years later, he spoke of clerics who were better prepared to serve as warriors than as priests, again the admonition of Damiani to Leo IX.[75] In another letter he vowed that it was no great thing to be a bishop but to be a bishop and to remain poor--that was unique.[76] We shall see this preliminary criticism of the secular clergy in the light of the ascetic hierarchy grow until it reaches a peak in the schism of 1130.

In a letter to Bruno of Cologne the position to be held in 1130 is previsioned by Bernard. In this letter Bernard shows his traditional suspicion of any member of the regular clergy who would accept the office of the secular. Here Bernard assumes the differences between the formal, Amts-charismatic hierarchy and the charismatic, ascetic one. What is the basic issue? It is simple: salvation of a man's own soul is a great enough task and Bernard wonders why a man wishes to add to that task by accepting offices from

Rome.[77] Salvation does not come through occupation of any foraml office and one can teach the flock through example. Why then accept, O Bruno, the office of Archbishop of Cologne?

> Si cunctos qui vocantur ad ministeriam, constat eligi et ad regnum, profecto securus est coloniensis archiepiscopus. Quod si etiam et Saulem in regno, et Iudam in sacerdotio legitur elegisse non alius quam ipse Deus; et non potest solvi Scriptura quae hoc asserit: timeat necesse est et coloniensis archiepiscopus. Si vero (quod verum est) et illa sententia hodiequoque viget, quia non multos sapientes elegit Deus, nunquid non triplicem quoque habet timendi causam coloniensis aprchiepiscopus?...Quanto maior es, tanto humilia te in omnibus... A lioquin iudicium durum his qui praesunt; timeat potestas... Timeat nobilis, quia iudex omnium non est acceptor personarum.[78]

"God is not an acceptor of masks", that is, of offices. Office in itself has no meaning whatsoever in the hierarchy of being. A man's place there is governed solely by the moral cleanliness of his personal life. This was Bernard's position c. 1130, that is, in the pre-schism years. We shall see this positon come to be more fully expounded in the course of the schism itself and reach its fullest development in the De Consideratione. At this point we only wish to note the vaguely formed anti-officialness of the Cistercians' position so as to better understand their reactions to the curia as it developed under Paschal's successors, Gelasius II and Calixtus II. The activity of the curia under these two popes provided the incentive first for the coup de main of Honorius II and the Frangipane in 1124 and then for the schism itself in 1130.

The Election of John of Gaeta as Pope Gelasius II: The Reaction of the Curia to the Pontificate of Paschal

The election of the Papal Chancellor to the papal throne in 1118 was a direct rebuke to the pietistic ideals of Paschal II. John of Gaeta assumed the throne as Gelasius II, thus returning to the Gregorian position of taking a name which, in the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals, symbolized complete control of all secular and spiritual power in the hands of the pope.[79] Only if we assume that John's election was meant as a rebuke to the pietists can we explain the appearance of the inordinately long Vita Gelasii in the Liber Pontificalis; for Gelasius' reign encompassed only a brief one year and five days (24 January, 1118, to 29 January, 1119), yet his biography is the longest of all those of the popes of the reform period in the Liber.[80]

The author of the Vita Gelasii was Pandolf of Pisa, papal hostarius under Paschal and Gelasius, possessing a more important post under Calixtus,[81] and cardinal under the anti-pope Anacletus II.[82] Pandolf was a grammarian, like John of Gaeta, and he seems to have been one of the few men in Rome who had mastered the Leonine cursus which John had introduced in the chancery.[83] He was also a first-class propagandist, and the most important letters of Anacletus II seem to have been written by Pandolf.[84] His contribution to the Liber Pontificalis was three lives: those of Gelasius II, Calixtus II, and Honorius II.[85] In all probability he had

added a life of Anacletus which is now lost. These works were issued as propaganda tracts during the years 1130-38 and, as we shall demonstrate later, were probably attempts on the part of Pandolf to show the decline in leadership ideals which had transpired from men such as John of Gaeta, high born, cultured, devout, to Honorius II, accommoner, pawn of the pietists, and enemy of the curia.[86] That this was Pandolf's purpose may be shown by the comparison of two texts of the Liber Pontificalis, one of which was Pandolf's version and the other of which is a version "doctored" by the scribes of Innocent II in 1143.

Prior to the discovery of the Tortosa MS of the Liber Pontificalis in 1914, it was believed that the version of that work copied by the Roman monk, Petrus William, was indeed Pandolf's history of the Papacy during the years 1118-1130.[87] The Petrus William version was included in Duchesne's edition of the Liber Pontificalis. The discovery and publication of a manuscript in Tortosa, Spain, of the Pandolf portions of the Liber was attended with so little fanfare that its existence is still today unknown to many church historians.[88] Either that or, as is probably the case, its importance is not sufficiently appreciated.

No study of either the pontificate of Honorius II nor the schism of 1130 can ignore the Tortosa version of the Liber Pontificalis, because this document reveals that 1) the election of Honorius II was a coup de main, complete-uncanonical; 2) that the retention of power by Honorius split

the curia into two parts--one dominated by the older Gregorians in the curia, and one composed of new men controlled by the Cistercians; and 3) that Honorius instituted a change of papal policy designed to put into effect the ideals of leadership in the Papacy which we have outlined above as typical of the new pietists. Seen in this light, the roots of the schism of 1130 extends back at least as far as the election of Honorius II and have ramifications which go far beyond mere civic struggles between the two leading families of Rome.

Examination of the lives of Gelasius II and Calixtus II reveals that in all probability the schism's political roots are to be found in the pontificates of Paschal and Gelasius. Only twelve years separate the curial rebellion against Paschal and the coup of Honorius II of 1124. Cardinals created by Paschal (or better, by the curia) after 1112 were still sitting until 1130.[89] They were all strongly devoted to the kind of idea-world which could produce a Bruno of Segni and a Guy of Vienne; they considered themselves to be real Gregorians, trained in a school of battle against the emperors. If they were pious, this piety was not the source of their actions, nor was their concept of the Church community governed by it. It is men such as these who direct the struggle against Henry V, and it is they who control curial policy up to 1122.[90] In the pursuance of that policy, the curia was forced to decisions which clearly indicated that the kind of reform desired by the

Cistercian pietists was impossible so long as "Gregorians" were in control in Rome. These decisions fall in the period 1118 to 1122. The first of the decisions had been previewed in the curial attack upon the leadership of Paschal II. According to our interpretation of the Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis of Pandolf of Pisa, the first great indication that the radicals were radicals is to be found in the election of John of Gaeta to the papal throne.

The Liber Pontificalis records of Paschal that he was a learned but also a pious monk.[91] As we have seen, his monkish piety had been his undoing at the hand of the curia. While the laudation of this traditional Christian virtue is to be found in Pandolf's life of Gelasius, this is by no means the central theme of the work. Quite the opposite: John of Gaeta became pope precisely because he was the most brilliant star of the intellectual renaissance of Monte Cassino, because he was a grammarian and rhetorician. His election in itself is the next to last stage in the drama of papal elections from Gregory VII's time to the schism of 1130. For consider Gregory posing as monk on the papal throne, carrying his monk's garb under his papal vestments, propagandizing himself as the carrier of the monkish ethic, while creating the sacerdotal hierocracy necessary for the sustainment of his ideas. Then consider the elections of Victor III, abbot of the greatest monastery in the West, Monte Cassino, and Urban II, from Cluny and leader of the greatest ascetic movement of the time, the Crusades. Finally, consider the return to

real monkish values attempted by Paschal II, who saw that Urban had triumphed, if only temporarily, and who wished to reduce the secular load of the Church. Paschal had been rejected as too weak. Now a grammarian is elected pope and, after a reign of only on year, will be replaced by a man who was never a monk at all, Guy of Vienne.

John had been a monk, it is true, at Monte Cassino during its most brilliant period. He was of a noble family, was sent as an ablate to Monte Cassino, and there had studied with the master of the Ars Dictandi, Alberic.[92] Urban II had called him to Rome to reform the Papal Chancellory at the time he had called the monk Peter from Cluny to reform the curial financial system.[93] In the chancery, John of Gaeta had instituted in the scriptorium the Leonine cursus, a complicated system of terminations of the Latin phrase which was as pleasant to hear as (the state of Latin being what it was) it was difficult to imitate.[94] It was John who had been the first of the cardinal-deacons to assume a titulary church and append it to his name, an action suggesting that he was probably one of the leaders in that order's struggle for powers equal to the cardinal-bishops and cardinal-priests.[95] During the years 1112 to 1118 John had acted as spokesman for the radicals while remaining a close friend and advisor of Paschal.[96] His favor with the radical cardinals, the respect with which he was held by the Roman nobility, his connections with Monte Cassino, and his nobility made him a perfect choice for the war party in

the curia to show exactly what they considered to be the right man to lead them against the emperors. Upon Paschal's death, therefore, he was elected with great joy and unanimity as Gelasius II.

Pandolf notes the educational and parental background of Gelasius with approval: "Hic a nobilibus iuxta saeculi dignitatem parentibus feliciter educatis, litterarum studiis pura mentis intentione est traditus."[97] The beginning is traditional enough, but it conforms much more closely to the Vita Leonis of Humbert than to, say, Bernard's Liber de Vita et Rebus Gestis S. Malachiae.[98] John's life at Monte Cassino is praised mainly for his contact with the great grammarian Alberic.[99] Then we are told that Urban II, "papa litteratissimus et facundus," called John of Gaeta, "virum utique sapientem ac providum," to Rome to help organize the Papacy against the forces then threatening it.[100] This means that John is given his entrance into the curia and is begun on the road to the Papacy through his abilities in the liberal arts, nothing else. To what extent rhetoric formed a desirable part of the ideal education in the sense in which it did in classical times or even in the late twelfth century is difficult to say concerning the Rome of Urban II. There can be no doubt that it was important in Rome.[101] One need only recall the verses penned by the noble Petrus Leo, the prestige of Monte Cassino, and the ability of Anacletus II to see that it played a large role.[102] Pandolf himself knew Livy, and in his lives of Calixtus and Honorius

we find speeches that ring of Cicero.[103] Furthermore, the whole idea of the Rome of pagan marvels was being revived; one need only review the contemporary guidebooks to realize to what extent classical culture itself was being eulogized in Rome at the time.[104] In any event, John comes to Rome, and his contribution to the effort against Henry IV was to introduce elegance into the language of the popes: "ut per eloquentiam sibi a Domino traditamantiqui leporis et elegantie deperditum, sancto dictante Spiritu, Johannes Dei gratia reformaret ac leoninum cursum lucida velocitate reduceret."[105] One might validly wonder to what extent Bernard had John of Gaeta in mind when, in the De Consideratione, he wrote of the curia: "Quod quidem interius malum tegunt principia, posteriora produnt. Verbosulum adolescentem, et studentem eloquentiae, cum sapientiae sit inanis, non aliud, quam justitiae hostem reputes."[106] Pandolf says that Gelasius: "ad liberales artes ediscendas adiunctus et ipsas prae omnibus fere aliis diversarum regionem praeclarae indolis pueris artes in breve et monasticum ordinem plene nimis addicicit et aliquantum temporis in monasterio patris Benedicti sanctissimi irreprehensibiliter conservare curavit."[107] This prestige which training in the liberal arts gives is seen in Pandolf's mention of the antipope Gregory VIII as "homo litteratus et nobilis," as well as his condemnation of Honorius II as "homo porcini moris et in specie bubalus."[109] Thus, learning is a laudable attribute in any man and, in Pandolf's opinion, is a desirable prerequisite for any

aspirant to the papal throne.

Urban II called John to save a Church from the calamities of the time, calamities which Pandolf sees as foreshadowings of the troubles of his own time.[110] The forces which rallied around Urban and Paschal, which saved the Church in her hour of need, Pandolf sees to be three: the curia, the Roman nobility, and the great monastic houses of Cluny and Monte Cassino. The Roman nobility are praised in the persons of Petrus Leo and his son, Peter Pierleoni.[111] Both Cluny and Monte Cassino are singled out for special praise, the latter as the origin of the great Pope and the latter as the place of his death.[112] The curia is given special attention, partially in the career of John himself as a cardinal-deacon.

It is interesting to note that Pandolf considers John of Gaeta's exertions toward the betterment of the city of Rome important. John, as a cardinal-deacon, was given a Roman church, Sta. Maria in Cosmedin or "schola Graeca." He rebuilt and redecorated the church assigned him, no doubt in accordance with tastes derived from Monte Cassino. Pandolf describes his activities thus:

> Diaconium Romae quam Sanctam Mariam in Cosmydin vulgariter nuncupant, sibi cardinali diacono a domno Paschal commissam, in auro vel argento, in libris seu paramentis, in domnibus praecipue, in quantum Roma patitur, super omnes alias inalteverit, requirenti sagaciter luce clarius enitescet.[113]

Thus John re-decorated his church, giving it the general form that it has today.[114] The Cosmati did the pavement and

frescoes were put in the walls of the nave. The lively colors and sumptuousness of the church was in accordance with the taste of the time in Rome. Already in the late eleventh century, Roman artists were freeing themselves from Byzantine art forms, and mosaic work of the kind found in the apse of St. Clements in Rome is typical of newly acquired technical proficiency in that field. In the early twelfth century appeared the De Coloribus et Artibus Romanorum, which showed a decidedly worldly interest in problems of color and form.[116] Church decoration itself was becoming less a lesson from the Apocalypse, as exemplified by the Vatican eleventh century "Last Judgement" by the brothers Giovanni e Nicolo.[117] Increasingly, it was coming to be used as a means of glorifying the Papacy, as one sees in the mosaic begun by Calixtus II and conpleted by Anacletus in the Chapel of St. Nicholas in the Baptistery of the Lateran.[118]

In these developments at Rome one sees again the influence of the artists and intellectuals who came from Monte Cassino and Cluny. The art learned there was quite different from the horrible last judgements to be seen in new reform areas such as Autun and Vezelay.[119]

Now, in fact, the Cistercians had their own ideas on the nature and function of art. In their cult of the Virgin, the Cistercians reacted against both the "horror Dei" motif of Romanesque art as well as the more subdued semi-classicism of the early Gothic of Cluny III.[120] In the General Chapter meeting of 1134, the Cistercians forbade all manuscript

illumination in the monasteries and throttled what had been auspicious beginnings of that art under Stephen Harding.[121] Bernard had specific ideas on architecture and church decoration, and the Abbey of Fontenay, built in accordance with his theory, as well as the abbey church of Casa Mara, a few kilometers from Monte Cassino, are eloquent examples of his variance with the Roman artists of Gelasius' time.[123] One need only regard his Apologia to realize that here Bernard adhered to the same ideas in art that he did in his views on ecclesiastical vestments for the upper clergy.[124] Seen thus, the artistic renaissance patronized by the reform popes will cease with the accession of Honorius II, Bernard's man, just as patronage of intellectuals will cease, and the Church will attempt to follow Bernard's maxim: "The wealth of the Church is the alms it gives to the poor."[125] But to Pandolf, Gelasius' magnificence is merely another indication of his noblesse.

In the account of Gelasius' election we have another example of conscious propaganda on the part of Pandolf. This propaganda attempt is conditioned by the time in which Pandolf wrote. It was during the schism between Innocent and Anacletus, when the issue had reduced itself to a conflict of what exactly constituted papal election. As we shall demonstrate, the variations in the concept of legality sprang from more fundamental differences in ideology; but for the present we shall only note that the Anacletans were traditionalists in their view, arguing that canonical

procedure must be followed above all, while the Innocentians broke with the Gregorian procedure completely, here as in almost all things, and argued that the most important aspect of the good pope was his morality. Pandolf of Pisa attempts to demonstrate in his account of Gelasius' election that 1) the curia alone may elect the pope, 2) that this means all of the curia and not just the College of Cardinals or a part of the College of Cardinals, 3) that the curia acts as the representative of the people and clergy of Rome in so doing, and that 4) the pope thus elected represents the will of the curia. Pandolf does this again in his account of the election of Calixtus II and then shows how Honorius II has deviated from this tradition in his life of that pope. Let us note Pandolf's account of Gelasius' election.

First we will note that there is no talk of a "sanior et melior pars" electing the pope or even nominating him. Pandolf tells of the events thus:

> Inter autem, Paschale papa defuncto, venerabilis pater domnus Petrus, Portuensis episcopus, qui primatum post papam per longaiam diutius tempora detinuerat, cumque eo omnes presbiteri ac diaconi cardinales de eligendo pontifice, et in commune communiter et singulariter singuli pertractare ceperunt, cum domnus cancellarius in monasterio Casinensi commanens de his sic gestis modis omnibus inscius, nuntius de reprente comparuit, qui cancellarium ipsum, iuxta quod acceperat in mandatis, ad cardinales Romam cum omni faceret celeritate redire.[126]

Two things are important in this passage: the fact that Peter of Porto assumed command of the situation on Paschal's death (as he did on the deaths of Calixtus and Honorius II) and that the cardinals elect the new pope "in commune communiter et singulariter singuli." Both points will be adduced

in favor of Anacletus' election in 1130. The cardinal-bishops are not mentioned as a particular group but are included in the general category of cardinals. Furthermore, it is noted that the election of the pope is regulated by representatives of the people of Rome.

The role accorded the Roman nobility in the papal elections is most important, for it reveals that both existentially and ideologically the papal office was conceived to be the province of the entire Roman populace. In fact, the election of Gelasius II is the last such instance of this concept; for although Calixtus II was given the support of the whole of the Roman populace after his irregular election at Cluny in 1119, the election of Gelasius II is the last tranquil papal election until after the return to Rome of Alexander III. It is part of the Cistercian program to eliminate the Roman people from a part in the papal election and to make the papal office a universal office. This they accomplished by decrees passed by Innocent II after his return to Rome in 1138, but it was accomplished only at the expense of twenty years of strife.

Pandolf notes that the representatives of the Roman people act as guards for the election (infra domos Leonis et scelestis Cencii Fraiapane, qui fide rectius voarentur, pariter convenerunt, ut iuxta scita canonum de electione tractarent).[127] Gelasius is then elected "ad communem omnium cardinalium primum et omnium petitionem electo manus solummodo imponendi."[128] This aspect of Gelasius' election is

irrefutable. It is the last election of a pope in which all of the sources grant this unanimity of people and clergy "et in commune communiter et singulariter singuli." Peter the Deacon speaks of John of Gaeta's election "a clero, senatu, populoque Romano in Gelasium papam eligitur."[129] Falco of Beneventum says that the election was the work of "totius populi Romani unamimi voto et concordia."[130] Romulado of Salerno says "statim a clero et populo Romano in Romani pontificatus honorem electus."[131] And Romulado stresses that when Henry V wished to create his antipope Gregory VIII: "imperator autem hoc videns, convocato populo Romano cum quibusdam clericis, iussit eligi in ordini summi pontificis quemdam Burdinum nomine,"[132] thus stressing the necessity of the Roman populace's approval of the election of the popes. Ekkehard states that Gelasius "eligitur et cunctorum catholicorum unanimi consensu rite consecratur."[133] All of these statements, in sum, indicate that at least up to the time of Gelasius' election the populace of Rome had a real part in the papal election, more than merely the formal recognition which Gregorians had used to stave off imperial claims to a role in the election. Those who wish to argue that papal elections after the papal election decree of 1059 were the province of the cardinal-bishops exclusively must take into account the fact that Gelasius' election is the last to accord the Roman populace a place in papal elections, while at the same time his election marks the beginning of twenty years of struggle in which

the Roman people effectively break away from papal control, form their own senate, set up their own councils, and attempt to re-institute a secular republic. There is more than mere form involved in the almost unanimous source agreement that the entire clergy and people of Rome participated in Gelasius' election, for his reign is followed by three irregular elections, two of which almost created schisms and the third of which did.

Thus, Gelasius the grammarian assumed the papal throne, but not without difficulty. During the course of the election, according to Pandolf, the Frangipane broke into the conclave and pulled the Pope from his throne. The Pierleoni saved the day, as was fitting from Pandolf's view, since they had a record of service to the popes from the time of Gregory VII and since Pandolf himself was writing in the service of a Pierleoni pope.[134]

Unfortunately for Pandolf, Gelasius did not live long enough to manifest the ruling virtue inherent in one with so much learning. He did, however, live long enough to flee Rome and deliver a speech in Pisa ("sermonem talem habuit qualem certe vix faceret Origenes in carnes"[135]--again the eulogy of his rhetorical skill).

Gelasius, upon leaving Rome, headed directly for Cluny, a fact which was fortunate for our biographer since a symbolic play could be made of John of Gaeta coming out of Monte Cassino, rising from the Curia to the papal throne, and expiring at Cluny. In fact, the central or over-all

impression which one receives on the reading of the Vita Gelasii is the harmony with which the four elements of radical Gregorian power are blended together. John of Gaeta comes from the great supporter of papal interests in the south, the training ground of the papal bureaucracy. He rises to his post in the Curia and honors it when he achieves the papal throne: "A quo sane pontifice, inter alia sancta quae fecit,...scriptores suos omnes ac cappellanos, presbyteros ac diaconos cardinales cum non paucis aliis in his et ordinibus minimis certis temporibus promoveri."[136] He is sustained by the Roman nobility, specifically the Pierleoni, and he is given his power by the Roman clergy and people. Finally, he flees, when the imperial forces threaten him, to the center of papal power in the north, Cluny. Here Gelasius is met with the honor he deserved, a fact which shows Cluniac devotion to the Pope no less than the magnificence with which the Abbot Pontius lived.[137] Gelasius repaid Cluniac hospitality by confirming the special privileges held by that order at papal hands.[138] Of course, the propaganda element is easily discerned here. Anacletus II, a former Cluniac monk, had hoped for the aid of Peter the Venerable and had been refused, and Pandolf is seeking to show the variations between the treatment Cluny received under "Gregorian" style popes and the kind of treatment it can hope for under a pope who is the protege of Bernard of Clairvaux (Innocent II).

Gelasius expired at Cluny, and, apart from his excom-

munication of the Emperor, little of his reign is significant. Only if we see his election as the last of the Gregorian heritage does his long biography in the Liber Pontificalis make sense. Pandolf apparently took the conditions of Gelasius' election and the Pope's training for his office to be archetypal. A humanist, a grammarian strongly allied to traditional centers of Curial strength, was his ideal as pope. This will be made more clear after we have examined the reigns of Calixtus II, and Honorius II and the schism of 1130.

Calixtus II: The Apogee of Curial Power (1119-24)

Gelasius expired at Cluny, and by so doing, set in motion a series of events which led inevitably to the schism of 1130. It will be remembered that the Church was under great pressure from three sides at the time. Henry V was on the offensive. His antipope Gregory VIII occupied a part of Rome. Within the city itself the rebellious Frangipane aided the imperialists, and the curia, with the aid of the Pierleoni, were hard pressed to maintain papal interests there.[139] Gelasius, upon departing for France, was accompanied by only six cardinals at the most. Lambert of Ostia, John of Cremona, Cono of Palestrina, Peter Pierleoni, and Gregory of St. Angelo seem to have been among the party.[140] In any event, the great majority of the College of Cardinals were in Rome under the direction of the dean of the College, Peter, Cardinal bishop of Porto.[141] Thus, when Gelasius

expired at Cluny, one must speculate as to the motives of the slim minority of cardinals who decided to proceed to the election there rather than to return to Rome.

Tradition has it that Gelasius, in the last moments of his life, designated Cono of Palestrina as his successor, but Cono refused the charge.[142] It is then said that Cono named Guy of Vienne as successor to Gelasius.[143] We must suppose that Pontius of Cluny had a great deal to do with this choice, not only because of the personal relations which existed between himself and Guy, but because of their common views on the nature of the Church and the leadership ideal.[144] Undoubtedly, Guy was the logical choice in a number of ways, but at the same time there is cause for wonder. For example, was the threat of Henry V such as to render necessary the election of the new pope immediately? If so, why was this done at Cluny instead of informing the curia by messenger of Gelasius' death so as to allow the curia to execute its rights? It was necessary that the curia approve the election before Guy could legally assume the office of pope anyway. This confirmation was given, it is true, but over a month later.[145] Calixtus had not awaited confirmation but had had himself crowned pope in his own cathedral at Vienne three days after his designation by Cono and Lambert of Ostia.[146] He assumed full papal powers; and since at least two months were necessary for the dispatching of the message of his designation to Rome, its confirmation by the curia, and the return message to France, we must assume that Calixtus ruled for

two months solely on the strength of his designation by six cardinals and the backing of the monastery of Cluny. Of course, none of this created any danger to the papal and curial leadership immediately, for Guy was an obvious choice for the papal power. But there were decided overtones to the election which could be easily turned against the papacy, not by the Emperor, but by the Cistercians.

In the first place, Calixtus' power was peculiarly associated with Cluny. He and Pontius had worked together constantly, and the two had been the basis of the radical revolt against Paschal II in France. It must be supposed that Calixtus was grateful for the role played in supporting him, first as a rebel against the Pope Paschal, and then as a pope himself created without benefit of canonical procedures.

Secondly, one might consider the dangerous precedent to the radicals which an uncanonical election such as this represented. It signified that canonical procedure, which had been the very pillar of Gregorian strength, was admitted to be unnecessary in an emergency period, a crisis. From Gregory VII, at least, through the election of Gelasius II, the curia had been careful to maintain the fiction which had been created by Humbert and his polemicists concerning the nature of the papal election. In Humbert's concept of the election, it will be remembered, the papal office was considered as merely another episcopal see to which the clergy and people of that see elected a bishop. The papal power came with the office, but the fiction had been maintained

that it was really the clergy and people of Rome who elected their own bishop. This idea had been expanded in the various lives of the popes from Leo IX on, as well as in the standard polemical writings known as libelli de lite. It had been, in fact, this interpretation of the nature of the papal office which had led to the assumption on the part of the curia of a part of the papal power. The curia participated in the papal power, because that power was a thing apart from the personality which occupied the See of Rome at any one time. They (the members of the curia) were the holders of the power of that see as members of the clergy of Rome, being incardinated into the various churches of the city.

This whole structure had been built up in order to exclude the Emperor from actively interfering in the papal elections. But by the time of Paschal II this same concept of the nature of papal office served to eliminate all kinds of outside interference in the papal office, with the result that when moderates, such as Ivo of Chartres, attempted to diminish that power, the whole of the curia rose against him and affirmed that papal power had been committed to the care of the curia to judge and to maintain. Thus, all outside interference in the affairs of Rome was discouraged, whether that interference came from enemies, such as the Emperor, or friends, such as the new reforming orders like the Cistercians. The greater body of the Church membership were eliminated from any voice in Church affairs if they

merely had varying interpretations of the nature of papal power. Legislation originally designed to be used against the lay interference in Church affairs was now turned upon the monks.

But meanwhile the old fiction of legality of election was maintained. Papal elections were still the charge of the curia, because they represented the people and clergy of Rome. Once, however, Rome was foresaken, once Rome had itself rebelled against the popes, as it had in 1118, how could the curia justify its action in electing a new pope.[147] It could do so only by a strict adherence to the legal form of elections, by arguing that the rebellion by which they had been turned out of Rome was illegal and that they still held legal rights to elect the pope. But for the first time since Gregory VII, clearly canonical procedure had not been followed in the election of Calixtus. Calixtus ruled for two months purely on the basis of his designation by six cardinals, only two of whom were cardinal-bishops.[148] Now this situation caused no difficulty at the time, because Guy of Vienne was the strong man of the radical party and an obvious choice for the election. But a dangerous precedent was established; one which would be used whenever the state of the Church was considered to be such that emergency measures were necessary. It would be so used in the next election by the Cistercians to establish the legality of Honorius II. In the following one to establish that of Innocent II.

Finally, the radicals departed from strict Gregorian tradition by electing as pope a cleric who had never been associated with monastic activities. Guy of Vienne was of the secular clergy, the first member of that order to hold the papal office since the initiation of the reform. How far this factor influenced the members of the monastic reform orders is difficult to say. But no matter what can be said of Guy's piety and morality, there is little doubt that he was a man whose interests were anything but "other-worldly."[149] Gregorovius comments on Calixtus' election by noting "a foreigner was elected in a foreign country."[150] This "foreigner" was the fifth son of William, Count of Burgundy. He was related to Louis VI by marriage of his neice to that monarch.[151] He had other relations which made him a power in secular affairs. He had ruled his own diocese of Vienne with an iron hand, in the tradition of the prince-bishop of an earlier age. His conflict with a neighboring diocese held by Hugh of Genoble, which lasted for over ten years, certainly could not have endeared him to the monkish orders. For in his relations with Hugh Guy manifested a ruthlessness which sometimes bordered upon banditry.

On the border between the sees of Hugh and Guy were twenty-six churches which Guy, upon his assumption of the episcopal dignity, claimed were his. He forthwith occupied the disputed area with his troops. Hugh of Grenoble appealed to Rome. A papal legate investigated the matter and ruled against Guy, but Guy promptly distributed five hundred marks

among the members of the curia and received a favourable verdict from that body.[153] Urban II, being informed of this action, reversed the curial decision and ordered the churches returned to Hugh. Guy refused to obey, and he even went so far as to threaten the pope himself with physical violence when Urban passed through his diocese.[154] In 1107, the churches were still in Guy's control, and Paschal sought to settle the matter by dividing them.[155] Guy accepted this judgement which left him thirteen churches richer and left Hugh of Grenoble an embittered man over the corruption of the curia.

Now this Hugh was no ordinary cleric. It was he who, in 1084, had given land and protection to St. Bruno of Cologne for the foundation of the Grande Chartreuse, and Hugh himself had become known for the saintliness of his life and his devotion to the ascetic ideal.[156] He was a fast friend of Bernard of Clairvaux.[157] Perhaps as a result of his contact with the curia in the Guy of Vienne affair, we shall find him along with almost all of the other leaders of religious orders,[158] aligned against Anacletus II. In any event, Guy of Vienne was now Pope Calixtus II, devoted to a program of new statesmanship for the Church and a ruthless prosecution of the Gregorian program against the Emperor. As Erich Caspar has noted: "Die monchische Tradition, die seit Gregor VII bei der Auswahl der Kandidaten für Peters Stuhl geherrscht hatte, war damit unterbrochen und ist zunächst nicht wieder aufgenommen worden."[159] One might add

the qualification "except for the period of Church history in which the Papacy was dominated by Bernard of Clairvaux."

But the Cistercians were not inactive during Calixtus' reign. Pressure exerted by Henry V no doubt prevented them from an open break with the curia, as evidenced by the fact that after the Concordat of Worms in 1122, they were not so hesitant. Nevertheless, the Cistercians could and did snipe at curial power. This sniping took the form of criticism of the curia (but not the Pope), attacks against the two bulwarks of curial power (Cluny and Monte Cassino), and general criticism of canon law, dialectic, and the life of Rome, all of which were critized in the light of the ideal of paupertas and humilitas. Constant pressure upon Calixtus and the curia forced a definition of the idea of the papal office in terms which made clear the basic differences between the Gregorian concept of that office and the Cistercian religious ideal. By the end of Calixtus' reign, it was clear to the Cistercians that they must radically change the nature of the papal office as well as the personnel of the curia.

Calixtus affirmed his adherence to the Roman nobility as an integral part of papal power immediately. A number of statements by the Pope himself as well as the Vita Calixti of Pandolf indicate this occurence. In Toulouse Calixtus held a council which opened in July 1119. This council is important in that here for the first time the Pope proclaimed the use of the secular arm of the Church for the punishment of heretics: "tanquam haereticos ab

ecclesia Dei pellimus et damnamus: et per potestates exteras coerceri praecipimus."[160] Although it had been the practice since the time of Leo IX to use the cry of crusade against the Normans in the south and although Paschal II had advocated use of armed force in pursuance of his policy against Gembloux, this was the first official statement of such a position by the Papacy. It was incorporated into the canons of the Council of Toulouse. It was not inconsistent with Calixtus' background.

This use of the secular arm of the Church was balanced by Calixtus' recognition of the power of the Roman nobility immediately after his election. Such recognition at once gave evidence of the Pope's desire to make alliances only with this body.[161] See for example Calixtus' first bull, in which, although it was obvious that he had not been elected by the clergy and people of Rome, he wrote: "episcopi, cardinales, et clerici et laici Romanorum invitum me ac penitus renitentem in Romanae ecclesiae pontificem Calixtum unanimiter assumpserunt."[162] A bull dated 1121 concerning the settlement of a dispute over Corsica between Pisa and Genoa was issued in the name of: "communi Episcoporum, cardinalem, et clericorum, atque nobilium Romanorum."[163] This apparent cooperation between Pope and curia was stressed excessively by Pandolf of Pisa, who looked upon Calixtus as an ideal pope, not less for the ability displayed than for Calixtus' position as the embodiment of will of the curia. In his relation of the events concerning the ratification of the

election at Cluny, Pandolf writes:

> Propter quod vix ammantari sustinuit, donec nuntii redientes a Roma per domnum Petrum episcopum, tunc vicarium, per cardinales omnes, per domnum Petrum Leonis, nam isti nimium laboravit in verbo propter diaconum filium suum Petrum Leonis qui potissimum Franciae peregerat causam, per prefectum et consules, per clerum atque populum viva voce ac litteris electionem ipsam canonice ireque firmarent.[164]

This relationship between the Pope, the curia, and the Roman nobility was again stressed in Pandolf's account of how Peter of Porto and Petrus Leo held Rome until Calixtus returned: "Petruo Portuensi vicario, cardinalibus, clero toto ac populo tanta gloria est et honore susceptus quanta diebus nostris nullus unquam fuerit presul de Roma tractatus."[165] Calixtus rewarded the Pierleoni for their services by reducing to rubble the towers of the Frangipane, their enemies, and promoting the son of Petrus Leo, Peter Pierleoni to a higher post in the curia.[166] Furthermore, Peter Pierleoni was made a legate to France and England and served there until Calixtus' death in 1124.[167] Finally, Calixtus embarked upon a program of restoration of the churches of Rome which must have made Bernard of Clairvaux uncomfortable, if, indeed, it was not these very church decorations to which Bernard referred in his libelli against the luxus of Rome.[168] Thus was Calixtus' position vis a vis the Roman nobility defined. There was little reason for the Cistercians to take heart at such definition.

In 1119, at the Council of Rheims, the Cistercians and their adherents launched an open attack against Cluny and

its abbot, Pontius. The occasion was auspicious for such an attack, since the major part of the curia was in Rome. Also, it must be remembered that since 1107 the Investiture Struggle had had little real immediacy in France;[169] there was no feeling of crisis there such as that manifested in Rome. The moderates and the pietists, straining under the centralization which they had accepted when the Church-State struggle was widespread, now had a number of bishops on their side who wished a return to the pre-Gregorian semi-autonomy.[170] John of Cremona, Lambert of Ostia, Cono of Palestrina, Peter Pierleoni, were all in Calixtus' train. John of Cremona seemingly gave hope to the congregation when he stated: "Non enim ad bellum instructi veneramus: sed inermes pacem universali Ecclesiae procurabamus."[171] The settlement of a number of disputes and the promulgation of the Truce of God and Crusade indulgences occupied the assemblage for the first few days.[172] Then, as the proceedings drew to a close, the Bishop of Macon opened the attack against Cluny.

Ordericus Vitalis writes:

> Masconensis episcopus ad hanc sanctum synodum clamorem facit, quod Pontius Cluniacensis ipsum ecclesiamque suam damnis, multisque injuriis affecit; ecclesias decimasque suas, debitasque subjectiones sibi violenter abstulit et congruas dignitates, suorumque ordinationes clericorum denegavit.[173]

He continues:

> Multis, ut charaxatum est, clamoribus in synodo propulsatus, respondit 'Cluniacensis ecclesia soli Romanae ecclesiae subdita est, et papa propriae: et ex quo fundata est, a Romano obtinuit privilegia, quae proclamatores isti sua nituntur abolere et frustrari violentia.[174]

Pontius of Cluny is quoted as saying:

> Cluniacensis Ecclesia soli Romanae Ecclesiae subdita est et papae propria...Nulli damna vel injurias ingressimus, res alienas non diripuimus, nec aliquatemus diripere sua cuilibet concupiscimus.[175]

The council adjourned in an uproar, but the next day John of Cremona took the floor to state the position of the Pope. He began with a restatement of the exact words that Humbert of Silva-Candida had used to set up curial power: "Ergo apostoloica sedes caput omnium ecclesiarum a Domino, et non ab alio constituta est. Et sicut cardine ostium regitur, sic apostolicae sedis auctoritate omnes ecclesiae Domino disponente reguntur."[176] The Cistercians, the new reformers in the council, waited, and John delivered the Pope's view of Cluny:

> Igitur cum Cluniacensis Abbatia soli Papae subjiciatur, et illi qui, praecipiente Deo, in terris super omnes est ipsam patrocinetur; Romana auctoritas Cluniacensium privilegia corroborat, et in virtute Dei omnibus Ecclesiae filiis imperat, ne quis eos temere pristina libertate privet, nec possessionibus olim habitis spoliet, nec insolitis exactionibus praegravet.[177]

There could be little doubt where Calixtus stood on the question of Cluny and its abbot. Seemingly to make the matter more definite, Calixtus named Pontius as one of the negotiators to represent him in treating with the Emperor Henry V.[178] Peter Pierleoni was given to the Emperor as hostage as a sign of the Pope's good faith.[179] These negotiations ultimately led to the signing of the Concordat of Worms, and the role played by Pontius has led at least one authority to characterize that treaty between Church and State as the

culmination of Cluniac ideas.[180]

Pontius was given the dignity of cardinal by the Pope as a reward for his service to Rome.[181] Privileges and benefices flowed in an ever-increasing stream from Rome to Cluny, and Calixtus hailed that monastery as "religionis monasticae modernis temporibus speculum."[182] The offensive of the bishops and the pietists had failed and St. Bernard's polemic had gone for naught.

This first failure did not discourage the new reformers, however, and immediately after the Concordat of Worms, they opened an attack against Monte Cassino. The center of this attack was the new Abbot Oderisius, who on 17 January, 1123, had been elected to fill the vacancy created by the death of the Abbot Desiderius II.[183] Oderisius was already a cardinal and had served the curia from the time of Paschal II.[184] He was the same type as Bruno of Segni, learned, proud, and passionately devoted to Gregorian ideals.[185] Oderisius came to Rome from Monte Cassino to be consecrated at the Council of the Lateran convened on 18 March, 1123, and here the new orders attacked him.

Peter the Deacon described the magnificence of that assemblage: "Ibi ab eodem papa, qui tunc forte synodem celebrabat, honorifice satis consecratus, et a cardinalibus nobilibusque Romanis in magna est gloria habitus."[186] Apparently such opulence was not appreciated by the bishops and monks at the council. Peter describes their reaction thus:

In qua etiam synodo episcopi et archiepiscopi adversus

> monachos proclamationem fecerunt, dicentes nil aliud superesse, nisi ut sublatis virgis et anulis deserverint monachis: illi enim ecclesias, villas, castra, decimationes, vivorum et mortuorum oblationes retinent; et rursum haec saepius ante pontificem conquerentes: Decidit pudor canonicorum, honestas obliterata est, clericorum religio cecidit, dum monachi contempto coelesti desiderio iura episcoporum instabiliter concupiscunt....[187]

Oderisius defended himself thus:

> Cumque super huius rei negotium diversi diversa sentirent, tandem ex summissione nostri abbatis surgens in medium quidam ex nostris dixit: Congregati sunt inimici nostri, et gloriantur in virtute sua: sed tu, domine noster, contere virtutem illorum, ut agnoscant, quia non est alius qui pugnet pro nobis, nisi tu dominus noster....[188]

Calixtus then addressed the assemblage, and, if we may believe Peter the Deacn, stated:"Casinensis ecclesia non ab hominibus, neque per hominem, sed per Iesum Christum fundata est."[189] And the Bishop of Liguria, speaking for Calixtus, drew upon the ideas of Urban II to state the Church's position on the differences between the two hierarchies of value:

> A principio namque surgentis ecclesiae, duos ordines coepisse notissimum est: unum qui laboraret in verbo et doctrina, alterum qui vocaret orationi: unum qui activae, alterum qui contemplativae vitae deserviret. Unde non immerito nos potius diligere monachos, quam insequi convenit.[190]

This was mead to the monks, but, of course, the difficulty for the new orders was their inability to agree that Monte Cassino and Cluny were representatives of the monkish life. Calixtus, however, affirmed that the Abbey of Monte Cassino "sub solius sanctae Romanae ecclesiae defensione perpetuo manere decernimus." This was the same kind of protection given to Cluny at Rheims.

The mere fact that these two pillars of the Gregorian Reform could be openly attacked at major councils is important. More than any other series of events these attacks manifest the change which had come over the monastic life of the West. On a secondary level, these attacks represent a thrust, a challenge to traditional alliances of the successors of Gregory VII and Urban II. Was there really a decline at Cluny and Monte Cassino, as Bernard and his men claimed? Only if one accepts the standards of Bernard of Clairvaux. Every indication is that both of these monastic houses were essentially the same in the time of Calixtus as they were under Urban II and Paschal II, at which time both were universally respected.[192] But social events had changed since that time and new social ideals had come forward to match that change. Complaints against Monte Cassino and Cluny as centers of secular learning, for their pomp and ceremony, were complaints made by Walram von Naumburg. These same complaints are now voiced by Bernard of Clairvaux, which suggests less that the monasteries attacked have declined than the fact that a new spirit has permeated the general body of believers.

What was to be Calixtus' reaction to these attacks? Obviously there was no reason at all for him to consider the Cistercian attacks as justified. Both Cluny and Monte Cassino were still providing the curia with its trained personnel, and the very curia for which Calixtus had labored so long was an expression of the social ideals which

193
those two monasteries represented. Cluny and Monte Cassino, with their extensive holdings, represented the same kind of power for the Papacy that the Eigenkirchen represented for the German Emperors. If they were broken and placed under episcopal control they could not be used as advance guards for the exercise of papal power on the local level, and Calixtus certainly had no idea of decentralizing the papal power, as had Paschal before him and Honorius II after him. Thus, as long as a Gregorian-style pope ruled a Gregorian-style Church there was little hope for the Cistercians to institute a thoroughgoing monastic reform, because they regarded Monte Cassino, Cluny, and the curia as more in need of reform than any other elements of the Church community. By 1123 the Cistercians had tried the traditional ways of instituting social change. Calixtus, in his statements concerning the curia and the monasteries of the old style, had rejected those attempts. Therefore in 1123 the Cistercians began the infiltration of the curia itself.

The Concordat of Worms of 23 September, 1122, was signed by Lambert of Ostia, Gregory of St. Angelo, and Saxo
194
of Anagni for the Pope. Lambert of Ostia ruled as Honorius II and Gregory as Innocent II, and as popes both men turned upon the older members of the College of Cardinals to achieve their rules. The Concordat itself need not concern us here. It is generally regarded as a formal recognition of the impasse at which the struggle between Church and
195
State had arrived by 1122. It was a compromise between the

two groups,[196] but it had significant overtones. In the first place, it established "das Papsttums als selbständige, politische Macht in Abendland,"[197] as Dempf would have it. Furthermore, it undoubtedly signalled the establishment for all time of the whole corpus of canon law which had been specifically created by the Gregorians to undercut the Eigenkirchenrecht[198] of the Sacrum Imperium.

But in order to accept these two conclusions, it is necessary for us to jump from the time of Calixtus II to that of Alexander III, at least. For the period between 1122 and 1154 these generalizations do not hold. For certainly, while the Church was probably the greatest single factor in this period of European history, it wielded that power through neither its essential political strength (it was in exile the greater part of the time) nor through the overwhelming acceptance of a formal canon law, but rather through the charismatic leadership of St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Neither canon law nor political power were proper aims of the Papacy as he conceived it;[199] therefore, the Concordat of Worms, if it meant anything to the new religious orders, merely meant that now they could deal with the curia. Furthermore, it meant that this curia had effectively denied the ideal of the unitas Christiana as an ideal which was attainable through its own program. The Gregorian program, as outlined in the Dictatus Papae, had been opposed, and after fifty years of Gregorian leadership instead of the unitas Christiana, ripe for a real moral reform, the situ-

ation was much as it had been, except for what might be termed the dubious gains made in the establishment of the Papacy as a political power and the establishment of canon law as the basis of that power. Where was curial policy to be directed after the peace between Church and State?

The answer seemed to be found in the Lateran Council of 1123. This was meant to be a great reforming council which would codify the ideals of the Gregorian Reform in an aura of peace--the first period of peace since the accession of Gregory VII. And, indeed, this codification was accomplished; but was it, in the eyes of the new reform orders, enough?[200] As we have seen by the failure of the attack launched against Monte Cassino, it would seem not. But whether or not we accept this as an indication of a general rejection by Rome of the Cistercian program, in no sense can the Lateran Council of 18-27 March, 1123, be regarded as cut from the same spiritual cloth as that which forms the warp and the woof of the Cistercian revival.[201] It is true that canons were promulgated here which might be used by any reformer who came to power, but the Cistercian spirit was lacking. Is this too vague a statement? Simony and lay control of the Church were, of course, the main business. Eight canons were devoted to the restatement of the Gregorian position on this matter.[202] Six canons concerned the problem of priestly continence, but even in this Calixtus was really only restating the Gregorian position.[203] What was lacking was that sense of spirituality which the Cistercians

were laboring to infuse into the rule of the Church, a labor which might be construed as an attempt to return to the ideal of the ecclesia primitiva, the corpus mysticum. For, in reality, the new pietists might question the fact that was no effort made to remove the Church from that state of martial law under which it had labored so long. Why was not the great bureaucracy cut down and a measure of local power restored to bishops and abbots? Canon XIX stated that new churches should be placed under control of bishops, "as had been the custom since the time of Gregory VII," [204] but nothing was done to reduce the great empires of Cluny and Monte Cassino.

Furthermore, there is a real effort manifest in this council to remove the monks, the new orders, that is, from all contact with the Church community. Monks are forbidden to visit the sick, publicly celebrate mass, or to administer extreme unction. [205] Here Calixtus strengthened individual action he had taken against the monks in canon law texts and served warning that the kind of activity in which Norbert of Magdeburg, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Honorius of Autun indulged was not looked upon with favor at Rome. The Pope had already refused a license to preach to Norbert of Magdeburg, an action which could not have been well received by Norbert's friends in the new orders which, while in no sense mendicant, at least were possessed of a compelling social message. [206] Such actions seemed to indicate that the secular clergy, specifically the curia, and the great

monastic empires of Cluny and Monte Cassino, which were defined as extensions of Roman power, were in full control of society and the proper arbiters of what was good for it.

Thus envisaged, the Lateran Council of 1123, while it may be considered the balance sheet of the Gregorian movement, was at the same time the last grand gesture of that movement. Viewed in the light of the passionate demands for reform which the chiliastic and apocalyptic visions of the new orders embraced,[207] it could be regarded only as an attempt to keep them from what they considered their rightful role in instituting a real reform of the whole of society. Far from recognizing the spirit of the new reform, the Lateran Council of 1123 served merely to underline the differences between it and the Gregorian psychology as it had evolved up to that time. We will note in our study of the pontificate of Innocent II how incomplete these canons instituted at the Lateran Council were considered to be and how new canons were promulgated to fill in the lacuna. The Council of Clermont of November 1130 specifically incorporates the reform program of the Cistercians into the general body of papal doctrines.[208] But before such a move was possible, Rome witnessed the forced election of Honorius II and the schism of Innocent II, cataclysmic changes in the curia, and a revolution in the ideals and administrative structure of the Roman Papacy.

The changes thus described as occurring during the pontificate of Honorius were made possible through the rise

to power in the curia of the Papal Chancellor, Aimerich. This figure, combined with that of Matthew, Cardinal bishop of Albano, dominates the curia from 1123-24 until the full emergence of Bernard of Clairvaux as the power behind the papal throne.[209] Aimerich makes his appearance as Cardinal deacon of Santa Maria Nova and Chancellor on 8 May, 1123.[210] Prior to that time, he had been Archbishop of Bourges, a friend of the new reform, and a personal friend of Bernard of Clairvaux. He is also connected with other members of the reform, especially Matthew of Albano, at the time still prior of St. Martin des Champs, and Peter the Venerable.[211] He is a shadowy figure, never fully emerging from the events of 1123-38, but always mentioned as an actor in them. Yet it is undeniable that he was connected with changes wrought in the curia which made possible the election of both Honorius II and Innocent II. We have already seen that Aimerich served as a sounding board for Bernard's criticism of the curia.[212] Why this man should have suddenly emerged in the days immediately following the Lateran Council as Papal Chancellor is unknown. The former Chancellor, Saxo of Anagni, was certainly capable enough, and the fact that Saxo had visions of being elected pope himself after Calixtus' death is no reason for retirement from the most influential post in the curia.[213] Furthermore, Aimerich had none of the usual requirements for the post. Both Saxo and his predecessor, John of Gaeta, had come up through the ranks of the staff or the Lateran Palace.[214] Why was this outsider from the

teeming northern France reform area suddenly introduced into the most responsible post in the curia? There is no answer to this question. However, from the time of his introduction into the curia, new cardinals created by Calixtus are preponderantly of the new reform ideology.[215] These new cardinals were behind Aimerich, and the support of the Chancellor by such older members of the curia as Lambert of Ostia, Gregory of St. Angelo, John of Cremona, and Conrad of Sabine was consistent.[216] Perhaps the influence of these men with Calixtus accounts for his appointment in the first place. In any event, by 1124, Aimerich controlled at least ten votes in the College of Cardinals and an alliance with the Frangipane family in Rome as well as the unqualified support of the new reform orders in the provinces. The stage was now set for the first open move to cleanse the curia, a move which forced the old members of the curia into the action of 1130 as a means of revenging themselves. This first move was the forced election of Honorius II.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER V

[1]See March, Liber Pontificalis, 176; Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 344-48, which contains the account of the Annales Romani.

[2]Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," 133.

[3]See the "Vita Sancti Norberti," PL, CLXX, 1283.

[4]See the "Vita Sancti Bernardi Auctore Guafrido," PL, CLXXXV, 310ff.

[5]In Mabillon's edition of Bernard's works there is included a spurious text formerly attributed to Bernard. This was a sermon delivered at Rheims and dedicated to Matthew of Albano entitled "In Parabolam de Villico Iniquitatis Sermo." Bernardus, Opera Omnia, III, 616-21.

[6]See Dmitrewski, Die freiwillige Armut, 74-75, in which the exordium magnum of the Cistercians is shown to be an expression of the mass ascetic ideals of the time. Compare the comments of Georg Schreiber, "Gregor VII, Cluny, Citeaux, Premontre," 147ff., and the same author's "Mittelalterliche Passionsmystik und Frömmigkeit," Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift, CXXII (1941), 32-44.

[7]Schreiber, "Gregor VII, Cluny,...," 144.

[8]Ibid., 157ff.

[9]Ibid., 145. See also Kassius Hallinger, Gorz-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen in Hochmittelalter (Roma: Studia Anselmiana, 1951), II, 737. Compare also the Statuta of Pontius of Cluny, PL, CLXVI, 839ff., with the Capitularies of the Order of Citeaux in D. Joseph Miacaniwez, Statuta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis ab anno 1116 ad annum 1786 (Louvain: Bureaux de la revue, 1933), I, 15ff. Note the comments also of Grundmann, op. cit., 38ff.

[10]See the work of Guigo the Carthusian, "Epistola ad fratres de Monte Dei," Bernardus, Opera Omnia, III, 180. Guigo argues that the monk best approximates the ideals of the ecclesia primitiva and are the real inhabitants of the civitas Dei. Ibid., 194.

[11] See the mystical tractate by Guafridus, "Declamationes ex Bernardo," Bernardus, Opera Omnia, III, 273. On the combination of otherworldly values and reforming zealwhich drove Bernard in his desire to destroy Cluniac monasticism see Heer, Aufgang Europas, 185, 196-97, and Dom Othon, "Les origines cisterciennes," Révue Mabillon, XXII (1932), 133-64.

[12] On Hugh of St. Victor, see the remarks of Gilson, La philosophie au moyen âge, 304ff., and Windelband, History of Philosophy, 303ff.

[13] See the anonymous, "De Excellentia Sanctissimi Sanramenti et Dignitate Sacerdotum," Bernardus, Opera Omnia, III, 595.

[14] Windelband, op. cit., 305.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid. Gilson writes: "Les novices auxquel il s'adresse ne doivent pas imaginer qu'ils sont entres a Saint-Victor pour s'y instruire comme dans une ecole d'arts liberaus. Ce qui leur importe d'abord, c'est la reforme des moeurs et l'apprentissage de la vie contemplative." La philosophie au moyen age, 303. In Hugh's own Eruditione Didascalicae, we are given a complete view of his discontent with the limitations of philosophy. He begins by asserting that man is distinguished fromthe brute by his ability to reason. Hugonis,"Eruditione Didascalicae," PL, CLXXVI, 744. Philosophy itself is called the "art of arts" and "discipline of disciplines." Ibid., 751. However, for Hugh, "philosophy" is not the same as science but equals what theologians in the Augustinian tradition called "sapientia." Logic itself was merely a tool of explanation, not a means by which truth might be attained. See Ibid., 742, 750, 765. For all of Hugh's sophistication, his message is essentially the same as that of the monk Arnulfus de Boerlis, who wrote at about the same time: "Summaque philosophia, meditatio mortis assidua." "Speculum Monachorum," Bernardus, Opera Omnia, III, 712.

[18] Windelband, op. cit., 305.

[19] Hugonis,"De Claustro Animae," PL, CLXXVI, 1094.

[20] Hugo of St. Victor, On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith (De Sacramentis), trans. Roy T. Deferrari (Cambridge: Medieval Academy of America, 1951), 253. There is no critical edition of the De Sacramentis yet published. Deferrari's translation is made from a critical edition still unpublished.

[21]See above, note 13.

[22]Hugonis, "De Claustro Animae," PL, CLXXVI, 1159.

[23]Bernard writes: "Et, si vultis scire, Clarae-vallis est. Ipsa est Jerusalem, ei quae in caelis est tota mentis devotione et conversationis imitatione, et cognatione quadam spiritus sociata." Bernardus, "Epistola LXIV," PL, CLXXXII, 169-70.

[24]Hugonis, "De Claustro Animae," 1131-32.

[25]"Materialis Hierusalem est quaedam civitas in Judaea posita, mystica vero est Ecclesia moralis quaelibet fidelis anima, anagogica coelestis patria. Prima constat ex lapidibus et lignis; secunda ex justis justificandis, tertia ex virtutibus quarta ex angelis et hominibus. Materialis aliquando destruetur, mystica transferetur, moralis aedificabitur, anagogica vero in aeternum non commovebitur. Prima continet res gestas, secunda mysteriorum figuras, tertia exempla morum, quarta diversitates coelestium mansionum. Restat igitur ut de iis, quae proemisimus, ad aedificationem claustralium aliquid disseramus." Ibid., 1131-32.

[26]"Mystica Hierusalem est Ecclesia per orbem terrarum ubique diffusa. Ipse enim Hierusalem designat Ecclesiae pacem." Ibid., 1140. Again: "Quaelibet fidelis anima Hierusalem dicitur, quae contemptis saecularibus curis mediatando coelestia contemplatur. Haec autem civitas abundat mulititudine civium, id est, simplicium cogitationum copia, et abundantia virtutum." Ibid., 1141.

[27]"Indeed, among the laics, to whose zeal and providence those things which are necessary to the earthly life belong, is earthly power. But among theclerics to whose office look those things which are the goods of the spiritual life is divine power....In both powers are diverse grades and orders of powers; yet in both they are distributed under one head, and, as it were, deduced from one beginning and referred to one. The earthly power has as its head the king. The spiritual power has the highest pontifex." Hugo, De Sacramentis, II, 4, 256.

[28]"For just as the royal power cannot give to another the support which it owns, so also possession itself obtained by ecclesiastical persons cannot deny the obedience which is due royal power for support by law." Ibid., II, 2, 258.

[29]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 461.

[30]Hugo, De Sacramentis, II, 3, 255.

[31]"Quid plura? attrahit, allicit, blanditur, et novi Evangelii praedicator commendat crapulam, miseriam dicit; ieiunia, vigilias, silentium, manumque laborem, vocat insaniam; et contrario otiositatem cunctam denique nuncupat; edacitatem, loquacitatem, curiositatem, cunctam denique intemperantiam nominat discretionem....Qualis vero religio est, fodere terram, silvam excidere, stercora comportare?" Bernardus, "Epistola I," PL, CLXXXII, 73. See also Heer, Aufgang Europas, 184.

[32]Monks do not accepted the pastoral care, "because they might be compelled to seek an impediment to their quest externally." Hugo, De Sacramentis, II, 2, 261.

[33]"Therefore, that inwardly they may live more quietly, the orders of the divine ministry are conceded to them through indulgence, not to exercise preference among the people of God but to celebrate inwardly the communion of the sacrament of God." Ibid.

[34]According to Hugh, the priest is a priest not only by his dignity of office, but also by the excellence of his personal life. He writes: "Ut plebs eis commissa atque eorum disciplinis edocta, gratanter eis obediat, et eorum imitatione de die in diem proficiat." Hugonis,"De Sacramentis,"II, 3, PL, CLXXVI, 430.

[35]Heer, op. cit., 182.

[36]Ibid., 197.

[37]Ibid., 201.

[38]See Schreiber, Kurie und Kloster, 297-303; Hallinger, Gorz-Kluny, 738; Hampe, Das Hochmittelalter, 180; and J.P. Mahn, L'ordre cistercien et son gouvernement des origines au milieu du XIIe siècle, 1098-1265 (Paris: Bibliotheque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 1945), 178-9, 180-86.

[39]Heer has summarized Bernard's situation well: "er kampft gegen der neuen Weltstil der Kurie, gegen jene Verbindung von Kanonistik, Scholastik und römischen Recht, päpstlicher Hofverwaltung und Geltwirtschaft, Legatenwesen und sorgfaltigem Ausbau kurialer Machtpositionen." Heer, op. cit., 191. See especially Bernard's letters to Suger of St. Denis and his tractates "De Moribus et Officio Episcoporum" and "De Consideratione." The letters are "Epistola LXXVIII," PL, CLXXXII, 196-99, and "Epistola LI," Ibid., 158-59. See in the "De Moribus," PL, CLXXXII, Ch. 2, pp. 812-16, and in "De Consideratione," Ibid., Bk. I, Chs. 8-10, pp. 737-41.

[40]The Statuta of the Abbot Pontius assume the subjection of every coenobium of the congregation, down to the smallest priory, to the monarchia of the Caput Ordinis. See PL, CLXVI, 846. Pontius is called "abbas abbatum" by Calixtus in Mansi, Concilia, XXI, 151. This same title was given to the Abbot of Monte Cassino, according to Peter the Deacon. See "Chron. Cass.," MGH, SS, VII, 750, and Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V, i, 557.

[41]See the "Charta Charitatis" in Miacaniwez, Statuta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis, I, xxvi, and the comments of Watkin Williams, Monastic Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), 75-83.

[42]Miacaniwez, op. cit., I, xxvii-xxix.

[43]Ibid., xxvii.

[44]Ibid., xxx.

[45]Ibid., xxvi.

[46]Ibid.

[47]As both Fliche and Williams maintain. Fliche presents St. Bernard as "le disciple de Grégoire VII." Histoire, IX, 23. We quote parts of the passage written by Fliche to indicate the nature of traditional views of the relationships holding between Bernard and Gregory VII. Fliche writes: "Le trait dominant du caractère de Grégoire VII, c'êst une foi ardente illuminée par une piété toute mystique; saint Bernard a récu lui aussi'la grande et suave blessure de l'amour' et s'êst uni au Verbe devenu l'epoux de son ame. 'Je meurs en mois, mais je vis en Jésus,' confiait Grégoire VII a son ami Hugues de Cluny,...'Savoir Jésus et Jésus crucifié, c'êst la résumé de ma philosophie,' s'ecrie a son tour saint Bernard. Grégoire VII a été, au moyen âge, l'un des promoteurs de la dévotion envers la Vierge,...c'êst encore la Vierge qui inspirerá à saint Bernard de sublimes accents." Ibid. For an historian to indulge himself insuch specious logic seems unpardonable, for even if one grants that Gregory and Bernard have in common the characteristics cited by Fliche, we should still not be able to call Bernard the "disciple de Grégoire VII." The characteristics which unite Gregory and Bernard spiritually are simply those which unite the whole body of Christian believers together and in no way make a special relationship between any two Christians important.

[48]That is, by criticism of Cluny, Monte Cassino, and the Roman Curia itself at the Council of Rheims in 1119 and the Council of Rome in 1122. See below Ch. 6.

[49]See Bernardus, "Epistola I," PL, CLXXXII, 67-74.

[50]Ibid., 67-70.

[51]See above, note 31.

[52]See the discussion of this point in Charles Stevenson, Ethics and Language (New Haven:Yale University Press, 1944), 2-3.

[53]See Fliche-Martin, Histoire, IX, 114-16, and Joan Evans, Monastic Life at Cluny, 910-1157 (London: Oxford University Press, 1931),34-41.

[54]L.M. Smith, Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries (London: Phillip Allan and Co., 1930), 237. See the documents in Alexandre Bruel, Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1894), V, nos. 3887, 3897. Cf. the "Vita Gelasii" in March, Liber Pontificalis, 178, and Robert, Bullaire de Calixte II, 313.

[55]See Haskins' comments on the flowering of the ars dictandi at Monte Cassino just prior to 1124. Haskins does not link the decline of Monte Cassino with the accession of Honorius II. See Charles Homer Haskins, Studies in Medieval Culture (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1929), 173ff., and Haskins, The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), 37-8.

[56]See Bernardus, "De Consideratione," IV, 2-4, PL, CLXXXII, 772-74.

[57]See above p. 131.

[58]Bernardus, "Epistola I," 6, PL, CLXXXII, 73-74.

[59]Bernardus, "De Consideratione," IV, 3-4, PL, CLXXXII, 773-74.

[60]Ibid., I, 7, p. 736.

[61]Bernardus, "Epistola I," 9, PL, CLXXXII, 75. See also Commission de l'histoire del'ordre de Citeaux, Bernard de Clairvaux (Paris: Editions Elsatia, 1953), 429-33.

[62]Bernardus, "Epistola I," 7, PL, CLXXXII, 74.

[63]Bernardus, "Epistola VII," 4, Ibid.94-95.

[64]Ibid., 97-98.

[65]Ibid., 98-99.

[66]Bernardus, "Epistola XX," Ibid., 123.

[67]Bernardus, "Epistola XXI," Ibid., 123-24.

[68]"Non tamen idcirco, etiam me latente, et tacente, cessare puto murmur Ecclesiarum, si non cesset Romam curia pro voluntate assistentium facere praejudicium in absente." Bernardus, "Epistola XLVIII," Ibid., 157.

[69]Bernardus, "De Moribus et Officio Episcoporum," II, PL, CLXXXII, 812-816.

[70]Besides the canons of the Council of the Lateran of 1123 which specifically denied certain functions of the priests to the monks, we find in a recension of the canon law collection Polycarpus, composed in Rome between 1119-23, a canon which is directed against the new preaching orders. "Sit ergo suo claustro contentus, quia sicut piscis vita caret sine aqua, ita monachus sine monasterio. Sedeat igitur solitarius et taceat, quia vivens Christo mortuus est mundo. Agnoscat enim suum nomen; monas enim graeca latine dicitur unus, achos graece latine dicitur tristis. Unde monachus interpretatur unus tristis. Sedeat igitur solitarius tristis ad suam celebrandum officium. Ad hec sinodus universa respondit, scilicet osius episcopus et quamplius ait: Vestram sententiam placet confirmamus." Bibliotheque Nationale, MSS Latinus, 3882, Book I, Canon 35, quoted in Fournier and Lebras, Histoire, II, 88-89.

[71]Ibid., 75-100.

[72]Watkin Williams, St. Bernard of Clairvaux (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935), 250.

[73]Bernardus, "Epistola II," 5, PL, CLXXXII, 82.

[74]Ibid., 11, p. 86.

[75]Bernardus, "Epistola LXXVII," 11, Ibid., 197-98.

[76]Bernardus, "Epistola XXIV," Ibid., 128-29.

[77]Bernardus, "Epistola VIII," Ibid., 105-107.

[78]Bernardus, "Epistola IX," PL, CLXXXII, 107-108.

[79]See Hinchius, Decretales Pseudo-Isidoreanae, 635.

[80]See Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, Preface.

[81]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 315. The "Vita Gelasii" was written after 1132. See Joseph March, "Ancora su Pandolfo continuatore del 'Liber Pontificalis': Attribuzione di altre opere," La civilta cattolica, LXVI (1915), 172ff. See also March, Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis, 37-46.

[82]On the career of Pandolf, see Ibid., 7-10, and Joseph March, "Sull'autore della biografia d delle precedente del 'Liber Pontificalis' cominciando da quella di Leone IX," La civilta cattolica, LXV (1914), 402-20.

[83]The use of the Leonine cursus by Pandolf of Pisa has helped to establish him as the key polemicist of the Anacletans. When Mühlbacher made his first studies of the sources of the schism of 1130, the use of the cursus had not been discovered. On the basis of internal evidence, Mühlbacher attributed most of the literature of the schism on the Anacletan side to Peter of Pisa, one of the Anacletan cardinals. See Engelbert Mühlbacher, Die streitige Papstwahl des Jahres 1130 (Innsbruck: Wagner'schen Universitätsbuchhandlung , 1876), 13ff. Watterich had accepted the authority of Giesebrecht, who had also analyzed the sources, and the combined authority of these three historians established Peter of Pisa's authorship beyond reasonable doubt. See Watterich, Pontificum Romanorum, I, liv ff. Duchesne published his critical study of the Liber in 1886-92 and also concluded that Peter of Pisa played the role given him by Mühlbacher, Giesebrecht, and Watterich. However, in 1914-1915, Joseph March published news of the discovery of the Tortosa MS of the Liber. On stylistic grounds March argued that Pandolf of Pisa was the author the tracts formerly attributed to Peter of Pisa. At the same time, March asserted that since the Leonine cursus was not used by the author of the "Vita Paschalis," Pandolf, who had formerly been considered the author of that life, could no longer be so considered. See his critique of Duchesne's conclusions in March, Liber Ponfificalis Dertuensis, preface. Duchesne answered March's criticisms in "Le 'Liber Pontificalis' aux mains des Guibertistes et des Pierleonists," Melanges d'Archeologie et d'Histoire, XXXVII (1920), 164-93. At this writing, the authorship of the "Vita Paschalis" must remain an open question.

[84]See Mühlbacher, op. cit., 9ff.; March, Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis, 70-81.

[85]The dates of the vitae: Gelasius, 1132 or after; Calixtus, 1132-39; Honorius, 1133-38. March, "Ancora su Pandolfo..," 172-73.

[86]Duchesne,"Le 'Liber Pontificalis' aux mains des Guibertistes...," 183ff.; March, Liber Pontificalis Dert., 208, note 4; Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 394-401.

[87]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, I, xxivff.

[88]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, IX, 43.

[89]Of the cardinals alive in 1130, fifteen were created during the reign of Paschal II, 1 by Gelasius, twelve by Calixtus, and thirteen by Honorius. Innocent II and Anacletus II had been made cardinals during the reign of Paschal. See Klewitz, Das Ende...," 373; Brixius, Die Mitglieder des des Kardinalkollegiums, 17ff.

[90]Ernst Bernheim, Das Wormser Konkordat und seine Vorurkunden hinsichtlich Entstehung, Formulierung, Rechtsgültigkeit (Bresslau: Untersuchung n zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte, 1906), 65-68.

[91]See Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 296.

[92]See Petrus Diaconus, "De Viribus Illustroribus Casinensibus," PL, CLXXIII, 1046.

[93]See Jordan,"Die Entstehung der romischen Kurie," 107-110. See also R.L. Poole, The Papal Chancery (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1915), 84ff. See also Harry Bresslau, Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien(Leipzig: Verlag von Veit, 1912), 139ff.

[94]On the Leonine cursus in the Roman Chancery, see Francesco di Capua, Fonti ed esempi per lo studio dello "Stilus Curiae Romanae"(Roma: P. Maglione Editore, 1941), 5ff, 56-65. See also Louis Duchesne, "Notes sur l'origine du 'cursus' au rythme suivi dans la redaction des bulles pontificales," Bibliotheque de l'Ecole des Chartes, L (1889), 161-63.

[95]Kuttner, "Cardinalis...," 197.

[96]See above p. 250ff.

[97]Pandolfus, "Vita Gelasii," March, Liber Pont. Dert., 162.

[98]Bernard's life of the saint is to serve as the model of life as well as Humbert's Vita Leonis was to serve as the model of the ideal Church leader. But note the difference given to the leader's orientation by Bernard: "Lex est tamen praefixa ab Apostolis, Apostoloribus successoribus: 'Victum et vestitum habentes,' inquiunt, 'his contenti simus.' Ubi forma haec? In libris cernimus eam, sed non in viris. Habes vero de justo, 'quia lex Dei ejus in corde ipsius,' et non in codice....Unde quonism a terra defecit sanctus...." Bernardus, "De Vita Sancti Malachae Hiberniae," PL, CLXXXII, 1073-74.

[99]Pandolfus, "Vita Gelasii," March, Liber Pont. Dert., 162.

[100]Ibid., 163.

[101]See the poem ascribed to Petrus Leo in Urban's honor in Ordericus Vitalis, "Historia Ecclesiastica," X, 1, PL, CLXXVIII, 717-18.

[102]Ibid. On Monte Cassino and its school, see Haskins, The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century, 36ff.; and Schramm, Kaiser, Rom und 'Renovatio,' I, 248-50, 293.

[103]Pandolfus, "Vita Gelasii," March, Liber Pont. Dert., 169; "Vita Honorii," Ibid., 208.

[104]See Schramm, op. cit., I, 292. Note especially his discussion of the"Graphia Auree Urbis Roma" in Ibid., II, 36ff.

[105]Pandolfus, "Vita Gelasii," March, op. cit., 163.

[106]Bernardus, "De Consideratione," IV, 4, PL, CLXXXII, 778.

[107]Pandolfus, "Vita Gelasii," 162.

[108]Ibid.

[109]Pandolfus, "Vita Honorii," March, op. cit., 203.

[110]Pandolfus, "Vita Gelasii," 163ff.

[111]Pandolfus, "Vita Gelasii," March, op. cit., 169,176.

[112]Ibid., 164-65, 177-79.

[113]Ibid.

[114]On Santa Maria in Cosmedine, see Mariano Armellini, Le chiese di Roma dal secolo IV al XIX (Roma: Edizioni R.O.R.E. di Nicola Ruffolo, 1942), II, 737-40.

[115]Raymond Van Marle, The Development of the Italian Schools of Painting (The Hague: Martinus Nyhoff, 1923), I, 179.

116 Text in Schramm, op.cit., II, 148-50.

[117]See A Short General Guide to the Museums and Picture Galleries of the Vatican and Lateran and of the Vatican Library (Vatican City: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1950), 177 and plate XXX.

[118]See G. Ladner, "I mosaici e gli affreschi ecclesiastico-politici nell'antico Palazzo Lateranense," Rivista dell'archeologia christiana, XII (1935), 270-79; Louis Duchesne, "Le nom d'Anaclet II au palais du Latran," Memoires de la Société des Antiquairies de France, XLIX,(1889), 197-206; Wilpert, Romanische Mosaiken und Malereien, I, 152ff.

[119]On Autun and Vezelay as reactions to Cluniac art see Hans Rose, Die Baukunst der Cisterzienser (München: F. Bruckmann, 1916), 133-34, 91ff. See also Max Hauttmann, Die Kunst des Fruhenmittelalters (Berlin: Propylaen Kunstgeschichte, n.d.), 77, 363.

[120]Werner Weisbach, Religiöse Reform und mittelalterliche Kunst (Zurich: Verlagsanstalt Benziger, 1945), 67ff.

[121]G. Oursel, La miniature du XIIe siècle a l'abbey de Citeaux d'aprés des manuscripts de la bibliothèque de Dijon (Dijon: Librairie L. Venot, 1926), 49ff.

[122]L. Begule, L'abbey de Fontenay (Paris: H. Laurens, 1928), 15ff. Compare Rose, op. cit., 17-37, and Weisbach, op. cit., 23, 71.

[123]On Casa Mara, see Rose, op. cit., 30, 34, 43, 60.

[124]Bernard's views onchurch decoration are expounded in the twelfth chapter of his "Apologia,"which represents a general attack upon Cluny III. See Bernardus, "Apologia," PL, CLXXXII, 911-916. See also K.J. Conant, "Medieval Academy Excavations at Cluny," Speculum, XXIX (January, 1954), 1-45.

[125]Bernardus, **loc.** cit.,

[126]Pandolfus,"Vita Gelasii," March, Liber Pont. Dert., 165.

[127]Ibid., 166-67.

[128]Ibid., 167.

[129]Petrus Diaconus, "Chron. Cass.," IV, 64, PL, CLXXIII, 885.

[130]Falconis Beneventani, "Chronicon," PL, CLXXIII, 1169.

[131]Romualdus Salernitanus, "Chronicon," Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, 208-209.

[132]Ibid.

[133]Ekkehardus, "Chronicon," PL, CLIV, 1038.

[134] March, Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis, 167-69, 170.

[135]Ibid., 177.

[136]Ibid., 164.

[137]Ibid., 178.

[138]Ibid., 179.

[139]"Annales Romani," Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 344-48.

[140]Pandolf of Pisa says that Johnof Cremona, Gregory of St. Angelo, and Peter Pierleoni accompanied Gelasius when he fled Rome. March, Liber Pont. Dert., 176-77. Cono of Palestrina,Lambert of Ostia and some of the minor clergy are added by Ordericus Vitalis, "Hist. Eccles.," PL, CLXXXVIII, 849.

[141]March, Liber Pont. Dert., 192.

[142]Falconis, "Chronicon," PL, CLXXIII, 1172.

[143]Ibid., 1172-73. The Historia Compostellana of Diego of Compostella states that Gelasius designated Guy of Vienne or Pontius of Cluny as his successor. See Didacus, "Historia Compostellana," PL, CLXX, 1052. Compare the account of Calixtus' election related in Guafridus Bruilensis, "Chronicon," MGH, SS, XXVI, 200, wherein it is stated also that Pontius was a candidate for the papal office. Ordericus Vitalis argues that Lambert of Ostia and Cono of Palestrina designated the new pope, acting in accordance with a "special prerogative" which they had from Rome. "Hist. Eccles.,"PL, CLXXXVIII, 858. See also March, Liber Pont., 192.

[144]Diego of Compostella, a pro-Innocentian in 1130, presents Pontius of Cluny as the real defender of canonical election procedure inthe election of Calixtus II. See Didacus, "Hist. Comp.," PL, CLXX, 1151. Compare the account of Ordericus, op. cit., 880.

[145]Calixtus was elected on 2 February, 1119, and consecrated on 9 February, 1119. March, Liber Pontificalis, 197, note 4. Pandolf wishes to make appear that Calixtus awaited confirmation of his election from Rome before proceeding with the consecration. He notes that Calixtus sent news of his election to Rome and that Peter of Porto approved the election in a conclave: "Fit igitur hoc omnium subscriptionibus optime roborato, tunc papa solempniter a Lamberto tunc Hostiensi episcopi et allis quam plurimis in Dei nomine consecratus." Ibid., 192. The Historia Compostellana gives a different version: "Postquam (the consecration) itaque clerus ac populus Romanus Calixti papae electionem atque consecrationem conlaudaverunt." PL, CLXX, 1151. Pandolf's account must be judged an attempt to rewrite history to the extent that he wished to show the curia as the final authority in the Roman election. If the election of Calixtus II were admitted to be valid solely on the authority of those cardinals who had accompanied Gelasius to France, then he would have to admit that, in at least one case, the minority of cardinals had elected the pope. Such an admission would be difficult within the context of the creation of the Vita Calixti. The curia itself,however, maintained the Gregorian form, for it acted as though the election of Calixtus was invalid until it had beenconfirmed by Rome. The curial position is shown in the "Confirmatio Electionis Calixti II." This letter begins: "Venerabilis episcopi et cardinalibus et clericis, ac laicis, qui cum domno Gelasio fuerunt, episcopi et cardinales et caeteri clerici sive laici fideles B. Petri, salutem in Domino....Acceptis siquidem litteris quas misistis, in altero

die apud ecclesiam Sancti Johannis de insula congregati sumus, episocpi, cardinales, presbyteri, diaconi et subdiaconi, ac reliqui clerici, judices quoque et scrinarii, ac caeteri palatii ordines, et plures Romani nobiles..." The document proceeds to approve the action taken at Cluny in terms which assume that the final word can only come from the assemblage in Rome. See Migne, PL, CLXIII, 1087-88. There are appended to this document forty-three signatures of prelates and laics of various ranks who occupy offices in or about Rome. This seems to indicate that the entire Roman clergy participated in the papal elections. Ibid., 1089-90. It is interesting to note that the pro-Innocentian Cardinal Boson, in his life of Calixtus, notes that Calixtus was elected "in Romanam pontificem secundum morem Ecclesiae sublimatus." Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 376.

[146]Ordericus Vitalis, "Hist. Eccles.," PL, CLXXXVIII, 858ff. See also March, Liber Pontificalis Dert., 197, note 4.

[147]Gelasius II is quoted by Pandolf as having said: "Quandoquidem vivere in civitate iste non possumus, fugiamus in aliam. Fugiamus Sodomam, furiamus Egyptiam, fugiamus nova iuxta verbum propheticum Babiloniam; civitatem sanguinum fugiamus." March, op. cit., 175.

[148]Only Cono of Palestrina and Lambert of Ostian were cardinal-bishops.

[149]This in spite of efforts on the part of his biographer to speak of a change in Calixtus' personality after his ascent to the papal throne. See Robert, Vie de Calixte II, 19.

[150]Gregorovius, op. cit., VII, 70.

[151]Histoire litteraire de la France, X, 503.

[152]The "Chartulario Ecclesiae Gratianopolitanae," PL, CLXVI, 1567, makes this point.

[153]Ibid.

[154]Ibid., 1567-69.

[155]Ibid., 1570.

[156]SeeGuigonis, "Vita Hugonis," PL, CLXIII, 769. Compare Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 447.

[157]Bernardus, "Epistola CXXXVI," PL, CLXXXII, 273-75.

[158]Ibid.

[159]Caspar, Meister der Politik, 184. Compare Hampe, Das Hochmittelalter, 179.

[160]Mansi, Concilia, XXI, 237.

[161]On Calixtus' close cooperation with the curia, see especially Jordan, "Das Eindringen des Lehnswesens in das Rechtsleben der römischen Kurie," 50ff.; Jordan, "Die Entstehung der romischen Kurie," 138ff.; and Eduard Eichmann, Die Kaiserkrönung im Abendland: ein Betrag zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalter (Wurzburg: Echter Verlag, 1942), 215ff.

[162]Robert, Bullaire du Calixte II, I, 1.

[163]Mansi, Concilia, XXI, 270.

[164]Pandolfus, "Vita Calixti," March, Liber Pont., 192.

[165]Ibid., 194.

[166]Ibid.

[167]Hellene Tillman, Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendung der Legation Guales (Bonn: Dissertation, 1926), 26ff.; Theodore Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Vertrage von Meersen bis zum Schisma von 1130 (Berlin: Historische Studien, 1935), 214ff.

[168]"Cortinas multas et pallia, candelabra de argento, campanas et pavimenta, fundos atque casalia beato Petro donavit." Pandolfus, "Vita Calixti," 195.

[169]See above p.

[170]Otto of Bamberg was certainly one of the more outstanding members of this group. His objections to the privileges of such monasteries as Cluny are clearly indicated in his biography. See Herbordi, "Vita Ottonis Episcopi Bambergensis," MGH, Scriptores rerum Germanicorum in usum scholarum, 19. See also the career of Bernard of Parma, who is presented as having rejected the role of the secular clergy in his early days in order to lead the people of Parma in a reform of the morals. See "Vita Prima Sancti Bernardi Episcopi Parmensis," MGH, SS, XXX, 1317ff.; "Vita Secunda Bernardi," Ibid., 1325ff. See the comments of Schreiber, Kurie und Kloster, 85.

[171]Ordericus Vitalis, "Hist. Eccles.," PL, CLXXXVIII, 879.

[172]Mansi, Concilia, XXI, 240, 238-39, 241-46. See also Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V, i, 571, and Robert, Vie de Calixte, 63.

[173]Ordericus Vitalis, op. cit., Book XII, 879.

[174]Ibid.

[175]Ibid.

[176]Ibid.

[177]Ibid.

[178]"Venerunt ad regem apud Argentinam episcopus Catalaunensis et abbas Cluniacensis, aucturi cum eo de pace et concordia inter regnum et sacerdotium." Mansi, Concilia, XXI, 225-26.

[179]Ibid., 241-42.

[180]Dempf, Sacrum Imperium, 219. Ordericus Vitalis notes how the Bishop of Macon, a friend of Bernard of Clairvaux, and the Archbishop of Lyons attacked Pontius even after this event. "Post concilium quippe Remensi in quo Pontius monasterii sui privilegia propugnaverat, Lugdunensis primas, Matisconensis episcopus, aliique plures, multas Cluniacensibus molestia et injurias intulerunt, eis auferendo res antea concessas." Ordericus, "Hist. Eccles.," PL, CLXXXVIII, 894.

[181]Smith, Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries, 236ff.

[182]Robert, Bullaire du Calixte, I, 313.

[183]Petrus Diaconus, "Chron. Cass.," MGH, SS, VII, 802ff.

[184]See Brixius, Die Mitglieder, 37.

[185]Petrus Diaconus, op. cit., 802.

[186]Ibid., 802.

[187]Ibid.

[188]Petrus Diaconus, "Chron. Cass.," 802.

[189]Ibid., 803.

[190]Ibid.

[191]Ibid., 803-804. See also the Bull of September 16, 1122, in which Calixtus lauded Monte Cassino as the mirror of monastic life. Robert, Bullaire de Calixte II, II, 56. Another bull of January 1123 confirms Oderisius as abbot. Ibid., 95. See also Ibid., 162.

[192]F. Carol, "Cluny et Citeaux: St. Bernard et Pierre le Venerable," Association Bourguignonne des Societés Savants Congress de 1927 : St. Bernard et son Temps (Dijon: Academie des Sciences, Arts et Belles Lettres de Dijon, 1928), 21.

[193]Four of Calixtus' most prominent cardinals were either Cluniac or Monte Cassino men. Peter Pierleoni was a Cluniac monk as was Giles of Tusculo. Both Pontius of Cluny and Oderisius of Monte Cassino enjoyed cardinal rank. See Brixius, Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums, 31, 37, 38.

[194]MGH, Const., I, 163, no.110.

[195]See the comments of Karl Hampe, Das Hochmittelalter, 170. There are conflicting opinions concerning the nature of the Concordat. The various schools are represented by Bernheim, Schafer and Hofmeister. Schafer argued that the Concordat of Worms bound Henry V and all of his successors, while binding the Papacy only for the lifetime of Calixtus II. Schafer based this finding upon an analysis of the available episcopal histories of the period. See Dietrich Schafer, Zur Beteilung des Wormser Konkordate, and compare the criticism of it in Gebhart, op. cit., 278-79. For the various views on the concordat, see Thompson, Feudal Germany, 159, n. 1; Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, III, 1047-49; Carlyle, op. cit., IV, 307-10; Meyer von Knonau, Heinrich IV und Heinrich V, VII, 205-14; Haller, Das Papsttums, II, 508; A. Cartellieri, Grundzuge der Weltgeschichte: Der Vorrang des Papsttums(Leipzig: Dykschen Buchhandlung, 1922), 151ff.; E. Dupre-Theseider, "Papato e impero in lotta per la supremazia," Questione di storia medievale (Milano: Carlo Marzorati Editore, n. d.), 324-26; Fliche, Histoire, VIII, 387-90.

[196]Fliche notes that the Concordate of Worms "ne definit pas comment doivent être reglés les rapports entre les deux puissances. Sur les questions soulevées par Grégoire VII dans les Dictatus Papae et les lettres a Hermann de Metz, sur la suprematie du Saint-Siège, sur la controle morale révindiqué par la paupaté a l'égard de l'administration des princes temporals, l'acte de Worms reste muet....Le pape ne rénonce à aucune de ses prétensions antériueras e l'empéreur ne s'incline pas davantage dévant ce que l'on a improprement appelé la theocratie romaine." Fliche-Martin, Histoire de l'Eglise, VIII, 388 Fliche further adds that whereas the technical question ofinvestiture was solved, "On ne saurait dire en effet que sur ce point particulier les révendications du Saint-Siège aient triomphé...Le concordate de Worms s'inscrit en réaction contre la théorie grégorienne qui avait inspiré le décret de 1075." Ibid. See also the view of Feodor Schneider who holds a similar position: "Das Wormser Konkordat bedeutet auch die Preisgabe des Widerstandes gegen das Reformpapsttum und der Angriffe auf der Kirchenstaat. Damit ist der Romgedanke als politisches Programm der Aristokratie erledigt." Rom und Romgedanke im Mittelalter, 213.

[197]Dempf, Sacrum Imperium, 219-20.

[198]"Das geschichtliche gewordene Eigenkirchenrecht des Staates war dem neuen kanonischen Recht der Kirche unterlegen. So konnte sich das Papsttum mit einer gewissen Recht doch als Sieger betrachten." Emil Gebhart, Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte, 279.

[199]Bernard's position may be summed up by reference to his diatribes against the study of Roman law in the curia. See his "De Consideratione," PL, CLXXXII, 732-33, 740-42.

[200]See Bernard's criticisms of the hierarchy under Honorius II of 1127.Bernardus, "Epistola XLVI," PL, CLXXII, 153.

[201]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 361.

[202]Mansi, Concilia, XXI, 282. See especially canons 8, 9, 11, 15, 19, 20. See the comments of Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V, i, 631-39.

[203]Ibid.; Mansi, Concilia, XXI, 282-86,

[204]Ibid., 282.

[205]Ibid., 286.

[206]"Vita Norberti," PL, CLXX, 1284-86.

[207]See Bernardus, "Epistola LVI," PL, CLXXXII, 162-63.

[208]See Hefele-Leclercq, op. cit., V, i, 490ff.

[209]On Aimerich, see especially Muhlbacher, Die streitige Papstwahl, 69-72. See the letter "Anacleti electores Lothario," Watterich, Vitae Pont. Rom., II, 186-87. Johannes Haller claims that Aimerich was the head of a "French clique" which was trying to seize control of the curia. See his Das Papsttums, III, 31-37. Cartellieri links Aimerich with Bernard. See his Der Vorrang des Papsttums, 196. Compare also the views of Bloch, "The Schism of Anacletus II and the Glanfeuil Forgeries," 166, and Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 410.

[210]Brixius, Die Mitglieder, 32.

[211]See Peter the Venerable's letter to Aimerich, "Epistola XXXIV," PL, CLXXXIX, 166ff.

[212]Bernard's correspondence, in the early days, is directed to Aimerich when he writes to the curia. See especially letters numbers XV, XX, XLVIII, LI, LII, CLX, CLXIII of St. Bernard in PL, CLXXXII.

[213]On Saxo, see Brixius, op. cit., 39ff.

[214]Ibid.

[215]See Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 387, 400, 375.

[216]Ibid., 375, 387, 400.

CHAPTER VI

THE SCHISM OF 1130: THE FIRST STAGE: THE ELECTION OF HONORIUS II, THE DEFEAT OF CURIAL LEGALISM AND THE TRIUMPH OF CHARISMATIC IDEALS IN ROME

As we have seen, the Gregorian Papacy was in its earliest period formed out of elements which were quite diverse. These elements we have placed under the general classifications of charismatic and Amtscharismatic, or sacerdotal and ascetic. We have seen also that from the time of the first triumphs of the Papacy under Urban II, this conflict within the various members of the Church hierarchy itself had gradually moved out into the open. We have seen the problem of the ideals which govern the leadership mechanism subjected to the harshest investigation in the ordeal of Paschal II after Sutri. And we have seen the curial radicals essentially reject the ideals of the mass for a policy which can be described as Realpolitik vis a vis the emperor, with a concomitant subordination of pietistic aims to immediate political ones. The curialists confirmed their victory in the elections of Gelasius II and Calixtus II, one essentially a scholar of the new type, learned in the liberal arts and rhetoric, and the other a prince-bishop type, a member of the secular

clergy with a long record of purely political activity. In the years between Paschal's fall from actual power (1112) and the death of Calixtus II (1124) the radicals in the curia, while they were able to give every outward manifestation of consolidation of power in Rome, were in reality being undercut in the provinces by criticism of their policy by men such as Bernard of Clairvaux politically and men such as Hugh of St. Victor, who subjected the presuppositions of the Gregorian hierarchy to examination in the light of the revived Augustinian metaphysic, ideologically.

Now, with the neutralization of the Emperor in 1122, pressure was removed from the Papacy for at least thirty years, that is, until the accession of Frederick I in 1152. During this period the external challenge to the Papacy was nil. As a result, the period 1122-1138 we conceive to be the period of internalization of the leadership problem in the Papacy. This means that the ideals governing the choice and evaluation of the leader shift from ideals based upon the leader's ability to direct the campaign against secular, princely interests to ideals based upon the leader's ability to organize the Church for its essentially religious role. The first phase is concerned with perpetuation of the Church in space, the second with the perpetuation of the Church in time; the first with political problems, the second with spiritual ones. But this shift of ideals is also accompanied by a corresponding shift in leadership from the sacerdotal leadership of the Gregorian era, whose goal is the conquest

and organization of society, to the ascetic leadership of the type represented by Damiani and now Bernard of Clairvaux.

Thus, we conceive of three large phases in the history of our problem. Stage one is the Gregorian Period, dating from 1059 to 1099, that is, from the Papal Election law to the death of Urban II. This period represents the mixture and resolution of the two leadership ideals which had been inherited from the first one thousand years of the Church's existence and which had been resolved into the two hierarchies of values called by Tellenbach sacerdotal and ascetic. Urban II at Clermont and Plaisance, in conjunction with his lawyers, demonstrated that the Papacy was a potent force in political affairs in western Europe. The era of peace which followed his death (from 1099 to 1107) witnessed the buildup of papal forces in France and Italy especially, but, more important, it also witnessed the buildup of the curia as a potent force within the Papacy. During these years the Papacy presented a united front to the secular power, a front in which both charismatic and Amtscharismatic elements worked against the secular power under the direction of an efficient curia which at least apparently represented both groups.

The second stage in the development of the leadership problem we conceive to exist in the period 1112-1124. In this period renewed external pressures exerted by the Emperor Henry V force the Papacy and Curia into conflict. While this conflict is resolved by the assumption of power

in the Curia by a group of radical Gregorians, at the same time it results in vigorous activity in the external enemy, the imperialist propagandists, directed into a vigorous campaign designed to woo the ascetic elements in the Church community away from the radicals by development of the theme of the unitas Christiana or corpus mysticum Church ideal, which agrees in general with the Augustinian mysticism then coming to the fore in the Church society as the basis of the new mysticism. Although the imperialists are defeated in their aim of destroying the Gregorian Papacy and its directing force, the Curia, they do succeed in forcing the definition of issues within the leadership itself. This definition results in the rejection of Paschal II as a leader because of his essentially pietistic bent. Such ideals are no longer deemed possible for the leader of the Church community.

The rejection of Paschal and the assumption of power by the Curia, which now tends to take on all of the aspects of a "court" and at the same time strengthens its hold over all aspects of the local religious life, results in the alienation of the new mass movements within the Church whose ideals, purely spiritual and religious, are based upon concepts of poverty, chastity, charity and are grounded in a concept of the Church community which closely approximates the ideas put forward by the Anonymous of York, Walram von Naumburg, and Hugh of Fleury. In sum, the new movements within the Church reject the accumulation of secular or

worldly power and support a social theory which is loose, individualistic, and otherworldly. The new orders which are the carriers of this ascetic-mysticism are led into open criticism of the Church leadership.

In the second stage of our problem, this criticism takes the form of the attack against the prime elements of curial power. The existential elements of curial power we take to be the actual power sources of the Gregorian Papacy, that is, monastic centers of the "old style" such as Cluny and Monte Cassino, the papal bureaucracy with its characteristic phenomena (legati a latere, papal revenue system, etc.), the new science of canon law, which was essentially based upon the science of dialectic, and the Roman nobility, which since 1100 had been the main source of military and financial power of the popes. We have seen that through the reign of Calixtus II all of these elements of the Gregorian power managed to hold their own with the Pope, even though they were subjected to numerous attacks by the new orders. Now, with the accession of Honorius II, we shall see each of these elements reduced in power and made the special target of new attacks from within the Papacy itself.

This change of policy on the part of the popes is the culmination of the second phase. It will bring on emergence of the schism in the body intellectual of the Church into open conflict in Rome. Honorius II plays the key role in this part of phase two, so we must pay especial attention to the conditions of his election and the development of his

policy. We shall see that by the time of his death the conflict between the Gregorian papal ideal and the ideal of the new mass movements has infiltrated into the Curia itself, that his policy is a conscious attempt to reduce the old centers of power, and that the schism of 1130 is nothing but an attempt on the part of the older Gregorians in the Curia to re-coup losses sustained in 1124-30. The period 1124-30 thus represents the institutional defeat of the older leadership ideal of the Gregory-Urban-Paschal-Calixtus period. The schism of 1130 will represent stage three: the overthrow of the Gregorian leadership ideal as an ideology.

The election of Honorius II was probably the most important single event in the history of the Papacy during the first half of the twelfth century. His election is, first of all, a radical departure from both theory and practice of papal elections as that theory and practice had developed since 1059. His reign also marked a definitive turning point in the development of typical papal institutions. The function and membership of the Curia was radically altered under Honorius. The papal bureaucracy was transformed, the papal diplomatic corps reshuffled, and a new spirit breathed into papal monastic policy. Above all, Honorius' election signaled the rise to power of Cistercian ideals. From the time of his election until 1153, the dominating figure in the life of the Church in the West is that of St. Bernard of Clairvaux.

Until March discovered the Tortosa manuscript of the Liber Pontificalis in 1914, the events surrounding Honorius'

election were known primarily through the account found in the Peter William manuscript as it had been published by Duchesne. If one follows the latter account of the election and career of Honorius, the election seems perfectly regular and the events of his reign merely an extension of the papal policy stated at the Lateran Council of 1123. Of course, it was known and admitted by Peter William that there had been at least two powerful candidates for the throne vacated by Calixtus II. One was Saxo of Anagni and the other was Lambert of Ostia, both men who had participated in the signing of the Concordat of Worms in 1122.[1] Saxo had the support of the Curia, while Lambert was supported only by the Frangipane. The election took place in the Chapel of San Pancratius in the Lateran; and the cardinals, unable to decide between the two candidates or desiring to elect the most popular cardinal in Rome, Peter Pierleoni, then absent as legate in France, settled on a compromise candidate. This compromise was the aged Theobaldo Boccadipeccora, who was canonically elected and raised to an improvised throne as Celestine II.[2] However, while the Cardinal bishop Lambert of Ostia was in the act of consecrating the new pope, members of the Frangipane family burst into the chapel, pulled Celestine from the throne, and hailed Lambert himself as pope. Lambert assumed the throne as Honorius II, in response to Frangipane demands.[3]

Now, according to Peter William, Honorius suddenly realized that his election had not been canonically validated,

and therefore after seven days, he called the cardinals together and offered to abdicate so that he might be either canonically confirmed or a new pope chosen: "Set quia electio eius Honorii minus canonice processerat, post septem dies in conspectu fratrum sponte mitram et mantum refutavit atque deposuit."[4] But the cardinals, according to Peter, refused to allow Honorius to abdicate. The following account became traditional:

> Fratres vero tam episcopi quam presbiteri et diaconi cardinales, videntes ipsius humilitatem et prospicientes in posterum ne in Romanam ecclesiam aliquam in ducerent novitatem quod perperam factum fuerat in melius reformarunt, et eundem Honorium denuo advocatnes, ad eius vestigia prociderunt et tanquam posteri suo et universali pape consuetam obedientiam sibi exhibere.[5]

Accordingly, Honorius once more took up the reins of papal government and had a peaceful and happy reign: "Unde licet maxima discordia et tumultus emerserit, tamen postea pacificatis omnibus et ad concordiam redactis in papam Honorium sublimatur."[6] This account of Honorius' election has become standard, and even as recently as 1948 an authoritative church historian could write: "le nouveau pontife avait eu, lors des incidents qui avaient entour sa désignation, une attitude des plus correctes; la bonne réputation et la prestige dont il jouissait permettaient de bien augurer de l'avenir."[7] Even though the Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis had been discovered and published thirty years earlier, this evaluation of Honorius' reign continues to enjoy popularity.

Pandolf of Pisa's original version of the election of

Honorius had suffered greatly at the hands of Peter Williams "correcting."[8] The Tortosa manuscript reveals the turbulent events surrounding Honorius' election and consecration. They are far different from those shown in the Peter William manuscript. They reveal why the Anacletan party of 1130 believed the schism to have had its origins in the events of Honorius' reign.

Most important is the role of the Papal Chancellor in the election. The Cardinal Aimerich had apparently arranged for Honorius' accession, and the Frangipane appear as merely pawns in his design. Suspicion might have been aroused even from the passage in the Peter William manuscript in which the the guard of the election procedure was revealed as a Frangipane-commanded guard. Why the Frangipane? They had been responsible for the flight of Paschal II in 1116-18 and of Gelasius II in 1118, had been the allies of the Emperor until 1122, and had been severely punished by Calixtus upon his return from France in 1120.[9] The Pierleoni family was the leading family under Calixtus, and Calixtus had gone to great pains to demonstrate that fact.[10] Why, now, do the Frangipane suddenly appear as moderators of the papal election? Klewitz holds that the fact hinges upon the rise to power of Aimerich after the Council of the Lateran in 1123.[11] The creation of cardinals of May of that year had seen Saxo of Anagni replaced by Aimerich as Papal Chancellor, and the new chancellor's relations with the pietistic orders were no secret.[12] Furthermore, the chancellor had probably had a

hand in the creation of new cardinals after 1123, cardinals who were loyal to new reform ideals.[13] In the papal election process the chancellor assumed direct responsibility for the convention and guarding of the electors, so we must assume that Aimerich employed the Frangipane for service in the guard. The captain of this guard was, furthermore, Cencius Frangipane, the attacker of Gelasius![14] In such a situation, the Papal Chancellor was inviting trouble. Now we may understand the account of Pandolf of Pisa as it appears in the Tortosa manuscript.

Pandolf states that a three-day period of preparation for the new election was declared and that the cardinals were sworn not to use these three days to campaign for their favorite candidates. But Lambert of Ostia had his men working for him. Leo Frangipane, another of the brothers of that family, moved among the cardinals speaking on Lambert's behalf.[15] Then, while the consecration of Theobaldo was in process, Robert Frangipane burst into the room and deposed Celestine, hailing Lambert of Ostia as Pope Honorius. Lambert had been prepared, for he had papal vestments on under his cardinal's robes.[16] The cardinals themselves fled the scene, and Pandolf makes it quite clear that Lambert's election was the work solely of the lay soldiers under Robert Frangipane's command: "Levant Lambertum laici, undique coniurati discurrunt; fugitur a presbiteris, diaconi acclerici plurimi sine caligis, quare dicerem pellibus? vix enses ac macheras evadunt. Ascendunt in palatium papam hoc ordine acclamatum."[17] Petrus Leo, forced

from the chamber, rushed to inform the other nobility, while the cardinals fled for their lives from Frangipane swords.[18] Celestine II, the deposed Pope, immediately died, and probably thereby saved the city from a schism.[19]

On the next day, according to Pandolf, the cardinals were called before Honorius and told that if they did not approve his election he would dismiss them.[20] Approval of a sort was given,[21] but Pandolf stresses that the cardinals showed their disapproval by immediately boycotting the new Pope:

> Et sic irati omnes a curia recesserunt. Altera autem die conveniunt intra insulam Lycaoniam maiores ac minores, episcopi, cardinales et clerici. Solus Petrus Pisanus, qui non tardi post ab eodem penituit, pape in amicum remansit. Inibent Petrus Portuensis et omnes cardinales Honorio ut de papatu se nullatenus intromittat, sed aecclesie Dei, cui fidelitatem iuraverat, inpace sineret haberi pastorem.[22]

The election of Honorius was thus a coup de main, in which the leading role is played by Aimerich, who will also play the leading role in the election of Innocent II in 1130.[23] That it was uncanonical there can be no doubt.

But then the question arises as to the motives behind Aimerich's move. Was he willing to risk the whole of the Gregorian concept of the papal office in order to raise Lambert of Ostia to the papal throne? Possessed of the same reforming spirit as his friends Bernard of Clairvaux, Norbert of Magdeburg, Peter the Venerable, and Matthew of Rheims, there seems to be no reason not to assume that Aimerich was not in the least interested in the formal, legal aspects of his acts.[24] As we have seen, the central tenet of Bernard's

view of religion is its insistence upon a knowledge surpassing legal and theological subtleties. To men of Aimerich's generation the conditions which had necessitated the formation of the great canon law corpus by Gregorian lawyers were a thing of the past. After Worms, the Empire was in no condition to take advantage of the break in canonical procedures in the papal elections to force its will upon the Curia in Rome. But the older generation, the generation of Peter of Porto and Petrus Leo, had an abiding respect for canonical procedure, as we have seen in our accounts of the elections of Gelasius and Calixtus and their defense of canonical concepts in the revolt against Paschal II. This respect, together with the psychology of combat which fifty years of struggle with the Empire produced, may have in fact worked against the desire for a quick reaction on the part of the offended cardinals. Men such as Petrus Leo would be loath to lead an armed revolt against a pope who, after the death of Celestine II, had no opponent. Henry V still lived; he did not expire until five months later, and who could tell if he would not take advantage of a schism in Rome in order to force his will upon the city and the Papacy? Furthermore, the Concordat of Worms seems to have been an agreement which might have expired upon the death of either of the negotiating parties,[25] Calixtus II or Henry V, so an open revolt in Rome might have been an invitation for Henry V to come to that city to set things in order. The radical Gregorian psychology could not permit such a situation to arise.

But to the new men in the Curia, men such as Aimerich, John of Ostia, and older men devoted to the new ideals (Conrad of Sabine and Gregory of St. Angelo), the lack of canonical procedure was more than balanced by the rise to power of a man who would reform the Church completely. A weak pawn of the Curia, such as Theobaldo is certain to have been, was not to their liking. Honorius thus came to the throne, as Peter the Deacon at Monte Cassino noted, "verum quia fortior et potior pars cum Honorio erat,"[26] and his coming signalled a new age in the Papacy. No attempt was made to give his election the dignity of canonical legality. The Peter William account of the election was composed in 1143, that is, after the schism of 1130 had thrown into bold relief the problem of what exactly constituted a legally elected pope. Honorius' first epistle, unlike the first bull of Calixtus II, does not speak of his being elected by the clergy and people of Rome.[27] He was the representative of a small group in the Curia sworn to destroy the last remnants of a past era. He was well chosen.

Lambert of Ostia was not a Gregorian type by any means. He was from a poverty-stricken family of the lower nobility which had its seat in or around Bologna. He had risen in the Curia largely through his learning, but he lacked both the nobility and the monastic connections which traditional Gregorian popes had boasted.[28] His close associations with the new reform orders, his constant patronage of them, and his systematic attacks upon traditional centers of Gregorian

strength such as Monte Cassino and Cluny marked him as a man of a new era.

In the Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis, Pandolf of Pisa makes much of Honorius' humble birth and places it in obvious contrast to the nobility of Paschal, Gelasius, and Calixtus. Pandolf even goes so far as to cast aspersions upon the learning for which Honorius was so famous. Peter William corrected Pandolf's leanings in 1143, but the two versions stand as testimonials to the ideals which the two parties in the Curia championed.

Anacletan version of the Vita Honorii by Pandolf of Pisa:
Hic de vili plebe comitatus Bononiensium genitus, litteratus tamen, homo porcini moris et specie bubalus, quoniam videbatur aliquando rigidus in iustitia, a domno papa Pascali receptus est et in episcopum Bellietrensum promotus, siquidem episcopus habitur videbatur. Sed quamvis subdole fecerit exitus approbavit.[29]

Innocentian version of the Vita Honorii by Peter William:
Hic de mediocri plebe comitatus Bononiensium genitus, bene tamen litteratus, a domno papa Pascali receptus est, et in episcopum Bellietrensem promotus.[30]

Pandolf's entire work had been subjected to his kind of editing at the hands of Peter William. Pandolf had wished to make the point that Honorius had nothing to recommend him, none of the traditional virtues which one had found in the great popes of the Gregorian era. He did not realize that, in all probability, these very humble origins of Honorius worked in the new Pope's favor, at least in the eyes of the new reform orders which eulogized poverty, ignorance, and humility. In his one hundred and ninth epistle, St. Bernard developed the theme out of Scripture that "Non multos nobiles, non multos sapientes, non multos potentes elegit Deus" and

argued: "Sapientia mundi stultitia judicatur; non acquiescitur carni et sanguini; parentum et carorum renuntiatur affectibus; favores et honores, et dignitates reputantur ut stercora, ut Christus lucrifiat."[31] That Honorius found favor with the new orders may be seen in the letter which Bernard sent to the new Pope which began: "Aiunt apud vos plus valere pauperis precem, quam potentis vultum."[32] Thus is seen how completely the Curialists misunderstood the nature of their opposition and the revolution in religious life which they were witnessing.

Instead of counterattacking, the curia chose to withdraw from the battle and wait out Honorius' term. Perhaps they thought that the papal machine would collapse without their steady hands upon the controls. But here again Honorius had different ends in view. It was not his purpose to institute a reform such as that championed by Urban II. He was not interested in the increase of papal power as such. He was interested pre-eminently in reform of the moral life of the clergy, and for such work he had adequate and zealous helpers in Norbert of Magdeburg, Hugh of Grenoble, Matthew of Albano, Bernard of Clairvaux, Bruno of Cologne, and Aimerich. These did not need, nor were they interested in, diplomatic adroitness. They were interested in correcting Curial abuses, raising the general moral tone of society, and removing the Papacy from competition with the Empire for control of secular goods. Men like Geroh of Reichersberg were fervent defenders of the Church's right to the <u>regalia</u>, but Geroh's

defense of that right sprang from his inherent belief in the necessity of independent Church power, and significantly, Geroh stands alone in his generation as the only major Church thinker to concern himself with the retention of the regalia.[33] The election of Honorius, by force or not, made the Cistercian Weltanschauung the official view of the Papacy and brought that body abreast of the times. It was the institutional manifestation of the same phenomenon which saw the defeat of Abelard at the hands of Bernard of Clairvaux.

Honorius came to power on 21 December, 1124. Throughout the whole of the following year we find evidence of a retrenchment by the new forces in the Curia. The new cardinals who were created by Honorius were strict party men, so much so that of the twelve created by him who were still alive in 1130, nine supported the Chancellor Aimerich when he made his bid to install Innocent II in the same manner in which he installed Honorius.[34] Furthermore, real efforts were made to placate the secular power, insofar as such placation could be accomplished within the reform aims of the new Curia. Especially important in this program was the conscious relaxation of the centralized power which had been created under the Gregorians. Over the six-year period in which Honorius ruled the legati a latere were called back to Rome and were replaced by local prelates who served as permanent legates of the Holy See.[35] Men such as Gerard of Angouleme, Gregorian standbys, were relieved of their duties. Such an act could not but impress the Cistercians

as well as show the new men's goodwill vis à vis the princes.[36] When legati a latere were sent out, it was usually for the purpose of reform of the morality of some wayward abbot or bishop, never as a means of building up papal power for itself, as had been the case in the heyday of the Gregorians with such legates as Hugh of Lyons, Hugo Candidus, and Odo of Ostia.[37] Occasionally, the king might be asked to aid the legate in his work of reform, a practice unthinkable under strict Gregorian administration.[38] Such a policy testified to Honorius' desire to "spiritualize" the Papacy, and as a result his reign was marked by the most amiable relations between himself and all of the princes of the continent.[39] The new emperor, Lothar von Supplinburg, received his authority from the Pope and acted as the papal shieldholder on more than one occasion.[40] Such goodwill created by the Aimerich Curia was well invested in, for in 1130, when the schism broke out between the supporters of the chancellor and the older Gregorians in the Curia, not one significant secular prince in all of Christendom supported Anacletus II, although his was clearly the legal right to the papal throne.[41]

In the realm of papal interests in southern Italy, always a trouble spot for the Popes, Honorius suffered his only defeat. It was here that Honorius undertook a campaign against Roger of Sicily in an effort to secure the tempting plum of Beneventum, which had been eluding the popes since Leo IX's unsuccessful campaign in the 1040's. Domestic troubles within the region prompted Honorius to cast an

envious eye in that direction.[42] So desirous was he of establishing papal power there that he fell into the old Gregorian trick of preaching a crusade against a Christian prince.[43] His effort was so half-hearted that he was easily defeated by Roger, and like Leo IX, Honorius was forced to grant the land to Roger, retaining only titular overlordship.[44] More energy was displayed in the reduction of the hill towns around Rome, but such energy was probably a result of the necessity of reducing Pierleoni strongholds or of satiating the Frangipane desire for booty.[45] Despite this activity, Honorius' reign was on the whole not characterized by a desire for power as such.

His otherworldliness is demonstrated in the rigorous monastic policy which the new Pope pursued. It is in this field that the Curia of Honorius achieved lasting results, for they succeeded in leveling the most important centers of Gregorian strength.[46] Honorius, "vis gravis et severus," and his own grey eminence, Aimerich, followed a consistent policy of reform. Council after council was held under John of Cremona or Matthew of Albano.[47] Monasteries were granted privileges under conditions quite different from those power moves which characterized Gregorian activities.[48] Corrupt bishops were removed from office; and when one, the Bishop of Verdun, succeeded in bribing the Curia for a favorable verdict, there was Bernard of Clairvaux to find him out and force his resignation.[49] Similarly, Norbert of Magdeburg saw a reversal of his prohibition to preach, formed his own

order at Premontre, was created Archbishop of Magdeburg, amd was the curial arm in Germany.[50] It is he who sways Lothar von Supplinburg to the Innocentian camp in 1130, just as Bernard sways the kings of England and France.

The new men in the curia were building for the future. In their construction of power against Gregorian ideas of papal rule the two institutions hardest hit were Cluny and Monte Cassino. For practical purposes, the real decline of these two houses began the day that Honorius II assumed the papal throne. This attack against Gregorian strongholds was part of a general policy the first part of which had been the elimination of the Roman nobility from a real part in the papal elections. For men of the new orders the pope was not the "Roman" pope; he was "orbis episcopus" and "vicarius Christi."[51] If Romgedanke had brought the Papacy to Rome, the reconstitution of the unitas Christiana at the hands of the men of the new orders would seek to return it to the entire Church. From Honorius' death in 1130 until Alexander III's triumphant return from exile in 1177, the Papacy was the property, not of the Roman people, but of the entire Church community. The destruction of Gregorian curial strength in Cluny and Monte Cassino was the beginning of open Cistercian revolt against the Romanity of the Papacy as it had developed since Urban II.

The reduction of these two centers signalled the fact that Honorius was no longer interested in maintaining the traditional bases of papal power nor the intellectual

justification of that power in its traditional light. At the same time, it signalled the failure of the new learning in the curia, for with the fall of these two centers of culture the "humanism" of the Gregorian "renaissance" would have no entry into the Papacy. When learning as such would once more become an acceptable virtue for the curia, this need would be supplied by the canon law centers in the north.[52] Without Cluny and Monte Cassino and their empires, the Gregorian-type pope was inconceivable. Without their trained rhetoricians and bureaucrats, the papal offensive as it had been known for fifty years was impossible, the papal bureaucracy unthinkable. And, of course, without the papal bureaucracy and canon law, the empire created by the Gregorians was impossible. Honorius and his men were willing to accept the consequences of this action.

However, it is our task to point out that the transition from the martial law of Gelasius and Calixtus to the reform of the moral life of the clergy was not accomplished without violent efforts on the part of the new reformers. One cannot assume that the war party in the curia easily shifted from its wartime psychology to a new pietism the inauguration of which was marked by the Lateran Council of 1123. To see the development of the Papacy thus is to assume a kind of teleological development which did not exist. Fliche has argued that the war curia of the early twelfth century had never lost sight of the primary aim of the Gregorian revolution--that is, moral reform--but he is

wrong.[53] The cessation of hostilities between Church and State could not eradicate the psychology of fifty years of war in the curia. The transition from men of war to men of peace, from men dominated by the desire to dominate this world to men dominated by a passionate desire for a purely other-worldly reward, was not accomplished in the curia without a revolution which saw every aspect of the Papacy brought under examination. This process of revolution began with Honorius' election in 1124, continued through his monastic policy, and with his death in 1130, precipitated an open schism in Rome. In 1130, as in 1112, the curia fought out the fight in terms of the betrayal of the Gregorian leadership ideal, but in 1130 they did not win. One of the many reasons for their failure is to be found in the destruction of Monte Cassino and Cluny as centers of Curial strength.

As noted above, Cluny had been attacked at the Council of Rheims in 1119 and Monte Cassino at the Council of the Lateran in 1123. Criticism had continued through Calixtus' reign, but nothing had come of it.[54] Nothing had come of it because both orders were an integral part of Calixtus' concept of the nature of papal power. Both orders were, in effect, direct extensions of papal power into the provinces and storehouses of papal reserves, both material and intellectual. As we have noted, there is no evidence, save that of the extremist Bernard, of decline at Cluny under Pontius. But with the accession of Honorius the Papacy was diverted from its Gregorian path, and Honorius' men desired a radical reform of the intellectual as well as the practical life at

Cluny. The situation at that monastery at the time of Honorius' election lent itself well to reform.

The reign of Pontius of Cluny (1109-1122) has generally been identified with the period which French historians have labeled "la crise clunisienne." The attitude of Fliche is typical: "L'ordre a eu de la peine á se remettre de la crise qui avait suivi la mort de saint Hugues et dont l'abbé Pons de Melgueil est, pour une large part, responsable."[55] As we have seen, the decline of Cluny was probably real only in the minds of bishops who were envious of its privileged position and in the puritanical reform psychology of St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Fliche, relying upon Bernard's testimony, concludes: "En quelques années, Cluny avait failli a l'idéal bénédictin."[56] Fliche sees Peter the Venerable as the restorer of Benedictine ideals at Cluny, although he is at a loss to explain why St. Bernard continued to criticise Cluny even after Peter the Venerable had replaced Pontius; but he concludes that:

> En réalité, l'opposition des deux ordres était celle de deux conceptions différentes de la vie monastique: Citeaux incline vers l'ascetisme et outrepasserait plutot les prescriptions de la regle bénédictine, que Cluny, par un souci tres accentué de culture intellectuelle, cherche au contraire a attenuer, la faim et le froid constituant des obstacles au travail de l'ésprit.[57]

If one is allowed to make this distinction relative to the life at Cluny under Peter the Venerable, why is it not equally valid for the life at Cluny under Pontius? Cluny under Pontius had been hailed as the mirror of monastic life in the west by three popes who were firmly within the reform

tradition.[58] Pontius himself had been called the special son of the Papacy by Paschal, Gelasius, and Calixtus, and the latter had given him the dignity of cardinal.[59] On the other hand, Pontius died a schismatic and excommunicate, and such an end did not in the middle ages lend itself to the erection of a good reputation at the hands of the chroniclers. Furthermore, Pontius has ranged against him the names of Bernard and Peter the Venerable, two favorites of the medieval period. It is difficult for an excommunicate abbot to stand up against such opposition. But in the light of Honorius' coup de main and the bases of that revolution in the Papacy, it seems not unlikely that Pontius has been dealt with unfairly. For if our suppositions are correct concerning the nature of Honorius' accession to power, if it is true that he comes to power and is sustained solely on the basis of a program of reform of monastic life after the Cistercian ideal, then certain parts of the corpus of evidence ranged against Pontius must stand the test of re-evaluation in the light of this fact.

There are three major sources for the story of Pontius' fall from grace with the Papacy. These are (in descending order of trustworthiness) Ordericus Vitalis' Historia Ecclesiastica, the De Miraculis and the letters of Peter the Venerable, and the papal bulls of Honorius II. Ordericus Vitalis comes closest to disinterestedness. Peter the Venerable was, of course, the abbot who supplanted Pontius, the man driven from Cluny by Pontius' seizure of that abbey

by force. The letters which emanate from the chancery of Honorius II are the most suspect of all. Let us remember that Aimerich, the chancellor, is an avid reformer, a friend of St. Bernard, the man willing to go to any lengths, including armed rebellion against the curia, to achieve his goals. Let us remember that his friend, Matthew of Albano, Prior of St. Martin des Champs in Paris, is likewise a friend of Bernard, is possessed of the same reform spirit, is a personal friend of Peter the Venerable, and acts as papal prosecutor at Pontius' trial.[60] It was at this trial that bulls supposedly written by Calixtus II against Pontius -- bulls of which the originals do not exist -- were produced by the Papal Chancellor and used by the papal prosecution to secure the conviction of Pontius for the crimes of which he is accused by Peter the Venerable. The Pope Honorius, before whom the trial is held, is in league with the chancellor and the prosecutor; indeed, his very power depends upon them. Are the documents which he quotes in his bulls and attributes to Calixtus II, documents of which Pontius professes to have no knowledge, trustworthy? Knowing what we now know, from the Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis, of the manner in which Honorius achieved his power, can we any longer relegate to the obscurity of a footnote[61] the opinion of Geoffrey of Vigeois and Pandolf of Pisa that Pontius was never even heard in Rome? Indeed, it is more than possible that the fall of Pontius of Cluny was less attributable to the "crise clunisienne" than to the new regime in Rome in

which the hand of Bernard of Clairvaux is ubiquitous in all its manifestations. Bernard, strangely enough, was silent during the time of Pontius' execution. That is most unlike him, unless he was playing a part which he did not care to have made public. That Bernard was not above such behind-the-scenes activity is attested by John of Salisbury in his account of the trial of Gilbert de la Porree. Thus envisaged, who can read the account of Pontius' trial and not remember the injunction hurled at him and the Curia in Bernard's first epistle:

> Veniet, veniet qui male iudicata reiudicabit, illicite iurata confutabit; qui faciet iudicium iniuriam patientibus, qui iudicabit in iustitia paupers, et arguet in aequitate pro mansuetis terrae.... Veniet, inquam, veniet dies judicii: ubi plus valebunt pura corda, quam astuta verba; et conscientia bona, quam marsupia plena...[63]

Pontius was the aristocratic type of Gregorian churchman, the abbot well calculated to lead the order which was characterized by Karl Bosl as the carrier of the new ideals of the late eleventh century.[64] Ordericus Vitalis describes him at the Countil of Rheims (1119) with admiration:

> Aetate quidem juvenis, et statura mediocris, sed a pueritia docilis, et in virtutibus stabilis, et coessentibus alacritate affabilis; candida vero facie decorus, moribus et genere, ut dictum est, conspicuus regum et imperatorem consanguinitate proximus, religione ac pentia litterarum praeditus...[65]

Such a man was the equal of Calixtus II and much the same type in breeding and training. Both were from the upper nobility. Both knew the life at court, and neither could be expected to entertain the concept of papa nudus, or for matter abbas nudus, which the new orders considered ideal.

Pontius answered the charges brought against him by the Bishop of Macon with the pride which marked his rule at Cluny, pride born of contact with the most cultivated men of his time, and self-confidence based on his own awareness of Cluny's place in Calixtus' scheme of papal power. At Rheims he had heard the Pope himself confirm all of the special privileges which Cluny had enjoyed under the reform popes, and a few months later Pontius himself was made an official sustainer of papal power by being invested with the red cap as Cardinal-deacon of Santa Caecelia.[66]

The year 1112 carried a prophetic quality with it for Cluny. Pontius arranged himself with Guy of Vienne and the radicals in the Curia who rejected the pietism of Paschal II. Here Cluny came to be identified with forces which were on the wane, as was Monte Cassino. As long as the radical Gregorians retained control, however, Cluny and Pontius were safe. This feeling of security, this feeling of being a necessary part of the papal scheme, may account for Pontius' decision to override papal permission to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. In any event, this trip was the source of Pontius' first conflict with Calixtus and led to his ultimate downfall.

Tradition has it that Pontius asked for this trip to Jerusalem as relief from the duties at Cluny. It will be remembered that he had been responsible for the election of Calixtus II at Cluny, had undergone attack at Rheims, and had served as one of the negotiators in the Worms pre-

liminaries.[67] Ordericus Vitalis says that after the close of the Council of Rheims the Archbishop of Lyons and the Bishop of Macon continued their attacks upon Pontius.[68] Criticism was made directly to the Pope in Rome, criticisms of monastic life at Cluny, which supposedly angered the Pope with Pontius.[69] Pontius asked for permission to travel to the Holy Land at this point, but he was denied this permission by the Pope. The refusal was, in itself, unimportant. Calixtus, in the midst of concluding negotiations for the settlement of Worms (this is in the spring of 1122), could hardly afford to have the abbot of the most important order in Europe absent. In any event, Pontius left, without the papal blessing, and according to Ordericus, the Pope ordered the election of a new abbot to replace him.[70] Ordericus says nothing about Pontius' desire to be relieved of his position; that is a part of the story which comes from Peter the Venerable.[71]

Now, as of 9 January, 1122, Pontius was still in the papal favor, Calixtus dispatching a bull from Rome on that date recalling his close personal relations with the abbot, how he had, as Archbishop of Vienne, consecrated Pontius abbot and how he had become pope at that abbey.[72] It is in this document that Cluny is hailed as "religionis monastice modernis temporibus speculum."[73] In May of the same year the aged Hugh of Marcigny was elected Abbot of Cluny, although there exists no record of any bull of Calixtus confirming this election.[74] Pontius, meanwhile, was received with great

honor in the Holy Land: "Poncius vero abbas in Judaea magnae opinionis habitus est, ac fama religionis ejus et sumlimitates inter etiam gentes divulgata est."[75] It is told that he was given the honor of carrying the Holy Lance in a sortie outside the walls of Jerusalem against the infidel.[76] Mabillon, who had access to documents which since may have been destroyed, says that Pontius' fame was so great at this time that he was approaching sainthood.[77]

Back in France, Hugh of Marcigny expired after having ruled for only three months, and in his place was elected Peter the Venerable (23 August, 1122).[78] At this point, our knowledge of the chain of events becomes irregular and confused. On 21 October, 1122, one month after the signing of the Concordat of Worms, Calixtus sent a bull of approbation to Peter the Venerable.[79] On the same day he sent a bull to the monks of Cluny ordering them to desist from the claim that Pontius had not ceded his abbacy and to accept Peter the Venerable as their abbot.[80] This fact is important, for at this time Pontius was still in Jerusalem, and it demonstrates that the monks at Cluny were opposed to the advent of Peter the Venerable (as the representative of a different tradition?) before Pontius returned to seize the abbey by force.

Pontius returned to France in 1124 but apparently remained silent, settling in the neighborhood but making no attempt to act against either Rome or Cluny. His activities in this period are lost to our sources. It is known, how-

ever, that he did not attempt a forceful recovery of his lost office until after the death of Calixtus II (13 December, 1124). In the spring of the following year, while Peter the Venerable was on a tour of Cluniac priories, Pontius acted. With the aid of some of the monks at Cluny and surrounding peasants and burgers Pontius seized the abbey and its environs and held it by force.[81] Peter the Venerable appealed to Pope Honorius in Rome, we must suppose with the aid of Matthew of Albano, his friend.[82] All of this in February-March of 1125.

Now the situation in Rome which was facing Honorius, as outlined by Pandolf of Pisa in the Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis, explains why Honorius did not act immediately against Pontius. It is to be supposed that Honorius was in the thick of his fight with the Pierleoni and the cardinals over the brashness of his own coup de main for seizing the pontifical authority. On 2 April 1125, Honorius dispatched a bull to the Abbot of St. Aegidius, a Cluniac monastery, stating that Peter the Venerable had been duly constituted by Calixtus II as Abbot of Cluny.[83] There is no evidence of further action being taken throughout the rest of the year 1125. During the whole of 1125 Honorius was busy subduing cities in the Roman Campagna, according to the Chronicon of Fossa Nuova, and, we must surmise, establishing his own authority in Rome.[84]

On April 24, 1126, thirteen days after Oderisius, Abbot of Monte Cassino, had been excommunicated,[85] Honorius II sent

his legate, Peter, to expell Pontius from Cluny. Cluny was laid under anathema, and Pontius immediately presented himself in Rome for trial.[86] From the month of April, 1126, we may therefore date the full attainment of Honorius' power. The fact that he was able, within two weeks, to excommunicate the leaders of the two most important religious orders in Europe, the two most important traditional centers of Gregorian strength, signals the rise to full power in the Papacy of the Cistercian ideals as well. Monasticism of the old style was clearly on the wane, as was the whole Gregorian concept of the papal office.

The fact that Pontius submitted to Rome's judgment immediately is significant on two accounts. It means that in all probability Calixtus II had not reprimanded him, as the Honorian lawyers claimed at his trial. It also means that he thought that he had a fairly good case for himself, a case that might be won under fair judication. A large contingent of monks followed Pontius to Rome from Cluny and made his case theirs, suffering his punishment with him.[87] It is not enough to contend that Pontius was suddenly seized with megalomania and madness, and fell because he considered himself superior to papal authority.[88] To accept such a testimony is to uncritically accept the side of the story told by his enemies and to ignore the whole of Pontius' background.

The trial in Rome has all of the appearances of being staged. Peter the Venerable states that Pontius was tried before the entire Curia, but what constituted the "entire

Curia"?[89] Was the old guard faction still estranged from the Pope? The events of 1130 suggest that they remained estranged throughout the whole of Honorius pontificate, as does the history of their removal from a major role in the papal diplomatic corps. Indeed, there is on record the existence of a bull subscribed by the entire Curia condemning Pontius,[90] but how far are we to trust the chancery headed by Aimerich? If he was not above engineering a completely unconstitutional election, he was certainly not above forging documents necessary for the removal of a thorn in the side of new reform ideals. If a false election was maneuvered so adroitly, how much less difficult was the mere condemnation of the Abbot Pontius! This is, of course, speculation, but it is important in focusing attention on the conditions under which Pontius was tried. For if the good faith of Honorius' court is jeopardized by the tainted election and his obvious animosity to the policy of his Gregorian predecessors, documents emanating from that court can no longer carry the authority in the case of Pontius which they once carried. At least two other sources state that Pontius was not tried or that he was tried in secrecy, and one of those sources is the spokesman for the disinherited old guard of the Curia itself. Considered in this light, how much more weight must be given to the meager evidence we have concerning the nature of Pontius' defense at Rome.

Pontius' monks claimed that he had never ceded his

office as Abbot of Cluny.[91] Indeed, according to the capitularies of Cluny, the abbot once elected, ruled for life, and could not be deposed.[92] Could the Abbot of Cluny be deposed by the Pope? The close relations which existed between Cluny and Rome had never allowed such a question to arise. Undoubtedly, under the terms of Gregorian canon law and the concept of juridical authority there developed, the Pope could depose any abbot, bishop, or archbishop.[93] But even under these conditions, the deposed abbot might appeal to Rome. Why had Pontius not appealed to Calixtus? The answer to that question is not known, but it is apparent that Pontius thought he had a good case for himself, at least until he finally stood before Honorius. It was then that he argued that only St. Peter himself might judge the Abbot of Cluny.[94] Madness? Megalomania? The assertion, stated as it was in one sentence in Peter the Venerable's De Miraculis, certainly evokes the image of a power-made Pontius hurling a challenge in the face of the Papacy. But is the assertion so strange when one considers the relation holding between Cluny and the Gregorian Papacy? The jurisdictional libertas of Cluny was certainly an accomplished fact before Gregory VII played a variation on the theme and began his campaign for the libertas ecclesiae. Pontius himself had been called abbas abbatium by the Pope Calixtus, and that certainly placed him, along with the Abbot of Monte Cassino, outside the realm of jurisdiction as applied to ordinary bishops. Cluny was pre-eminently the order devoted to St. Peter, as

attested by the magnificence of the abbey church dedicated to that saint, just as Monte Cassino was considered to have been founded, not by the will of Rome, but by Jesus Christ Himself. It is therefore not unusual to find him arguing that he was not legally deposed, had not ceded his office, and was still abbot, and that Peter the Venerable's election was not legal. But Honorius was not Gregory VII, nor Urban II, nor Paschal, nor Gelasius, nor Calixtus. Such a claim signified to him only the madness of the abbot, and for so claiming Pontius was branded heretic and schismatic.[95]

Nonetheless, according to Peter the Venerable, Pontius was doing rather well for himself at his trial until the Intervention of the Chancellor Aimerich. Honorius, writing to Peter the Venerable a few months after Pontius' trial, notes that the Curia was being favorably impressed by Ponius' arguments, when the "viri apostolici," Aimerich and Matthew of Albano, produced the registers of Calixtus II and exhibited a bull in which that Pope specifically stated that Pontius must reject all claims to Cluny.[96] Supposedly Calixtus II had written: "Tibi praecipimus ut ab hujusmodi desistas, et quam in manu nostra sine recuperationis spe refutasti Cluniacensem abbatiam nullatenus molestare praesumas."[97] It seems worthwhile to note that the only record of such a bull being issued by Calixtus II is to be found precisely in this letter of Honorius II to Peter the Venerable. No other record of its existence survives. The Papal Chancellor and Matthew of Albano had once more triumphed. Pontius was

incarcerated in Rome; his monks, refusing to renounce their belief in his innocence, were put to death; and Pontius of Cluny himself expired a few months later, in December 1126.[98] To Honorius, Pontius was "an enemy of St. Benedict," words smacking strongly of a Bernardine flavor.[99] If Pontius had committed no other crime, his pride would have been enough to destroy him in the eyes of men such as Matthew of Alban, who, by the way, was raised to his cardinalcy immediately after the close of the Pontian affair.[100]

Oderisius, Abbot of Monte Cassino, came under fire at about the same time as did Pontius. It is strange that the deposition of this abbot has not found a historian to delve into it more thoroughly. It will be recalled that Bruno of Segni had resigned from the abbacy of Monte Cassino in 1112 under pressure from Paschal II, although presumably Bruno had the choice of abdicating either his abbacy or his episcopacy, since Paschal's injunction was that no single individual might hold both offices at once.[101] Paschal is said to have remarked that Bruno's power as abbot and bishop constituted a threat to the papal power itself.[102] That remark was merely another indication of the general recognition by the Gregorian Papacy of the role which abbeys such as Monte Cassino and Cluny played in the scheme of papal power erected in the eleventh century. Honorius II derived his actual power, as he did his ideology, from other sources. His new departure was signalled not only by his irregular election and his defeat of Ponius of Cluny; he followed those victories with the reduction of the power and intellectual activities of

the most powerful Gregorian center in the south, Monte Cassino, through the deposition of its abbot, Oderisius II.

Oderisius had been a monk under Oderisius I at Monte Cassino, had entered the papal civil service at the Lateran Palace under Paschal, and had been created cardinal in 1116.[103] In January 1123 he had been elected Abbot of Monte Cassino, had come to Rome for his consecration at the Lateran Council of that year, and there had come under the attack of those bishops and archbishops who criticized the secular regalia amassed by his monastery.[104] Like Pontius of Cluny, he had weathered this storm, and he had heard his monastery acclaimed by Calixtus: "Casinensis ecclesia non ab hominibus, neque per hominem, sed per Iesum Christum fundata est."[105] This according to Peter the Deacon.

In the split which developed in the Curia over the election of Honorius, there can be little doubt which side was supported by Oderisius. He was in Monte Cassino when Calixtus died and apparently had not been called to Rome for the election of the new pope, since Peter the Deacon affirms that he received the news of Honorius' accession at the abbey.[106] We are of course hindered in our analysis of the difficulties which arose between Oderisius and Honorius by our lack of objective source material. Peter the Deacon and Honorius' chancery are the major sources, and neither can be called disinterested. Peter the Deacon went into exile with Oderisius, it is true, and he supported Anacletus II in 1130-38, returning to Monte Cassino after the close of the

schism.[107] But he served as a forger in Anacletus' cause, and shifted back to the other side when it seemed on the verge of victory.[108] He is most cautious when discussing the fight between his abbey and Honorius II, and we must be as cautious in evaluating his testimony.

The Abbey of Monte Cassino was a natural enemy of the new order in Rome. The luxury and pomp which characterized the abbatial court there was unequaled in Italy, possibly in all Europe. It was a great intellectual center of the new learning, but it was then in its mellow autumn. We can only assume that Honorius was antagonistic to Oderisius because he was opposed to the way of life which was led there, because Monte Cassino represented a relic of the age he wished to destroy in the Papacy, and because Oderisius was loyal to his curial compatriots in Rome who had been disinherited by Honorius' coup. Certainly Monte Cassino would have served as the papal base for Honorius' reduction of opposition in the south had this not been true. However, we find the attack beginning against Monte Cassino in the winter of 1125-26 with actions on the part of the Pope well calculated to induce rebellion on Oderisius' part.

In 1125, Honorius ordered Oderisius to contribute money to the papal campaigns in southern Italy against the Counts of Ceccano,[109] a family related to the abbot. Oderisius' refusal was taken as a sign of his ill will in Rome. In the spring of the following year Honorius visited the Abbey of Monte Cassino, and while there he publicly denounced

Oderisius for his secular ways, stating that he was "more of a soldier than an abbot."[110] It was a strange charge to be leveled by a pope, then engaged in a field campaign against the Normans, at an abbot who had refused to contribute funds for the same military campaign. Returning to Rome, Honorius dispatched a certain Count Aedilio, a personal enemy of Oderisius, to Monte Cassino with orders for the abbot to report to Rome to stand trial on charges of insubordination.[111] Oderisius refused to present himself for trial before a hostile Curia, thus demonstrating that he apparently understood the direction of the wind in Rome better than Pontius of Cluny, and as a result of such sagacity he was solemnly excommunicated by the Pope on 11 April, 1126.[112] Oderisius' action was taken with the full consent of his monks, and for safety's sake he withdrew to the protection of his ancestral castle.[113]

A papal legate was dispatched from Rome to supervise the election of a new abbot. This legate was Gregory, Cardinal-priest of SS. Apostoli, under whose direction the monks of Monte Cassino elected one Nicholas abbot of the monastery.[114] But this election was not accomplished without some difficulty. The monks of Monte Cassino wished to know by what right the Pope dared interfere in the election of their abbot, in the freedom from external control which had been their traditional right under previous popes.[115] The legate's answer is interesting as an indication of the new psychology now dominant in Rome:

> Quae autem ecclesia vel abbatia a Romanae sedis iugo extranea repperitur, cuius arbitrio ipsum caelum ligitur et solvitur? omnes namque ecclesiae a pontificibus, imperatoribus, et regibus, vel quibusque fidelibus fundatae sunt, Romanam vero sedem solus Filius Dei fundavit, et super Petri apostoli fidem erexit, cui etiam terreni simul et coelestis imperii iura commisit, et illud Verbum, quod condidit coelum et terrem, Romanam fundavit ecclesiam..."Tu es Petrus, etc." [116]

Honorius' legate, on orders from Rome, argued that since Monte Cassino had fallen from grace and had been reformed to the rule by Rome, it had fallen under the special protection and jurisdiction of the Holy See:

> Cum ergo huius coenobii fundatores ex Romanae ecclesiae prodidierint disciplina, eiusque restauratores Romani pontifices fuerint, conveniens est iusta sanctorum patrum statuta, ut ecclesia Romana mater et domina, Casinensis eius specialis, singularis iure dicatur et filia. Revolvite Casinensis coenobii munimina, eiusdem libros perscrutate, et id unde nunc sermo agitur poteritis invenire: si vero non potestis, mendacii arguite; sinautem potestis, nolite veritate resistere, nolite Romanae ecclesiae repugnare, nolite eius iussionibus contraire: sed ex cuius uberibus fidei salutem suxistis, eius iussionibus studete in omnibus abtemporare.[117]

The election of Nicholas, however, did not meet with approval in Rome. The Pope immediately deposed Nicholas and sent another legate, Conrad, Cardinal bishop of Sabine, to supervise a new election.[118] Now the monks were really in a rebellious mood, and as a result Nicholas and his followers, presumably loyal to Oderisius, were, in the words of Peter the Deacon, removed from the grounds of the abbey while the new election took place.[119] Still the monks hesitated. Over a year had passed since Oderisius' excommunication, and still no suitable abbot had been found to serve as the pawn of Rome. This situation was ameliorated with the arrival of

Matthew, Cardinal-bishop of Albano, and friend of Bernard, who had none of the respect for the orders of the old style which Conrad of Sabine had shown in his handling of the matter.[120] Under Matthew's firm hand one Seniorectus, a man who might easily be controlled from Rome, was elected abbot, on 12 July, 1127.[121] In 1130, when Anacletus raised the flag of revolt against the Honorian clique, Monte Cassino was among the first to join his cause. Seniorectus was deposed, and Oderisius was restored to his position as abbot and as cardinal.[122] Monte Cassino had not been as well reformed as had Cluny, and it served as a stronghold of Anacletan forces until the death of that pope.

Thus, the reign of Honorius established a new direction for the Papacy. Ideologically, it had challenged and conquered the traditional concept of the papal election process, at least on a practical plane. Honorius II was seated by a strong willed minority in the Curia led by Aimerich and supported by the arms of the Frangipane. The radical Gregorians were excluded from participation in rule. Their hesitance in forcing an open revolt was no doubt caused partly by Celestine II's untimely death and their own unwillingness to give Henry V an opportunity to intervene in Roman affairs. Their withdrawal from active work in the Curia as a protest move allowed Honorius to consolidate his position. This he did by the creation of new cardinals who supported his reform ideals, establishment of his military power around Rome, and reduction of what might have served as points of Curial strength such as Cluny and Monte Cassino.

The two abbots in Europe who stood for Gregorian Curialism were excommunicated and their abbeys placed under the supervision of new abbots whose offices were ultimately dependent upon the Aimerich faction in the Curia. The case of Pontius is more unusual than that of Oderisius, but it is not of a different nature. Both abbeys had a tendency to acquire secular regalia to an excessive extent under the Gregorian popes, and once the balance of power was redressed in favor of the ascetic element they were predestined to suffer. The decline of these two abbeys as intellectual centers coincides with the accession to power of the new reform in Rome. "La crise clunisienne" was less a manifestation of the need for reform than an indication that reform had taken a new direction. The extinction of Cluny and Monte Cassino as centers of learning sprang less from the decadence of the rule at those houses than from the application of the ideals of St. Bernard of Clairvaux by Honorius II in Rome. Brute force had been necessary to seat those ideals in the person of Honorius II. It would take an eight-year schism to make those ideals the official Church policy. The ideals themselves were destined to die with the death of Bernard's protege on the pontifical throne, Eugene III. The schism on the horizon was clearly discernible in Honorius' time. Pandolf of Pisa concluded his life of that Pope thus:

> Et timeo plus dicere: eodem quo intraverat, imo longe magis ac magis deteriori ordine, et de papatu exiit et vita fere omnibus fugiendam turpi morte finivit. Nam, qui eum viderant per manus tantum laicis in papam primo portatum, viderant ipsum postea intus per urbem

mediam per ante Frangipanum domos a quibusdam vilissimis ⟨apparitionibus⟩, nec vertitum in antiquo, preter bracas solummodo et cum camisia, quantum misere! in feretro nudis certe s⟨indo⟩inibus, quod dolendo dicimus, hinc vel inde relatum. Queque sequunter deinceps, ille, qui navit omnia, antequam mundus transeat, iudicet ac discernat.[123]

NOTES FOR CHAPTER VI

[1]See March, Liber Pontificalis, 203. See also Romualdus, "Chronicon," R. I. S., VIII, 183ff.; Bosone, "Vita Honorii," in Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 379; Petrus Diaconus, "Chron. Cass.,"MGH, SS, VII, 804; Ekkehardus, "Chronicon," MGH, SS, VI, 263; Ordericus Vitalis, "Historia Ecclesiastica," PL, CLXXIII, 911; Sicardi,"Chronicon," PL, CCXIII, 509.

[2]March, op. cit., 204.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Duchesne, op. cit., II, 379.

[5]Ibid., 379.

[6]Ibid., 327.

[7]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, IX, 43.

[8]As early as 1909 Meyer had suspected that the "Vita Honorii" had been changed by a copyist. The discovery of the Tortosa MS by March in 1914 confirmed Meyer's suspicions. See above Ch. V,note 83. Peter William did not know the cursus, a fact which may be confirmed by reference to an extant work of his, the "De Miraculorum Sancti Aegedii," MGH, SS, XII, 316ff. Thus, when he came to make changes in the life of Honorius, he made gross stylistic errors. See especially March's discussion of this in his edition of the Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis, 47ff.

[9]Ibid., 194-95.

[10]See above, p. 337-39.

[11]Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums,"401.

[12]See March, Liber Pontificalis, 194.

[13]Gerard of Bologna, Cardinal-priest of Santa Croce; William, Cardinal-bishop of Palestrina; Gregory of SS. Sergius and Bacchus; Cardinal Hubert, and Aimerich, all assumed their offices after the Lateran Council of 1123. See Brixius, Die Mitglieder, 17ff.

[14]March, Liber Pontificalis, 204-205.

[15]Ibid., 203.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Ibid., 204.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid., 205.

[20]"Conveniunt in crastinum cardinales ante quorum presentiam papa stetit et dixit: "Quod de me factum est, quia non de ratione processit, si omnes vos bene vultis, dimittam,' et accepit per lacina mantum." Ibid., 205.

[21]Saxo of Anagni is said to have addressed the Pope thus: "A temetipso, inquid, hoc dicis, an alii tibi dixerunt? Ita Deus ti adiuvet, sicut tu vera dicis. Ad haec ille respondit: 'Care, si nulla dixe, peniteo; ego vibiscum sentio, vos videbitis." Ibid.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Klewitz evaluates Honorius' victory thus: "So konnte tags darauf, en einem Sonntag, sieben Tage nach dem Tode Calixts, Honorius II. gekronte werden, nicht als Geschopf der Frangipane, sondern als Schildhalter fur die Ziele seines Kanzlers; der als Diakon non S. Maria Nuova leichte Gelegenheit gehabt mochte, mit der Frangipane anzuknupfen." Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 403. Compare the view of Fliche, Histoire, IX, 43-44, and Palumbo, Lo scisma del MCXXX, 154ff.

[24]The relationship between Matthew of Albano and Peter the Venerable is shown in the latter's "De Miraculis," PL, CLXXXIX, Chs. IV, VII, VIII, IX, X, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI.

[25]Gebhart, op. cit., 279-80; Fliche, Histoire, VIII, 389; Hauck, op. cit., III, 912-23, 1049.

[26]Petrus Diaconus, "Chron. Cass.," PL, CLXXIII, 907.

[27]Honorius II, "Epistola I," PL, CLXVI, 1219.

[28]Francesco Livrani, Il pontificato di Lamberto da Fiagnano che sedette col nome di Onorio II nel secolo XII, Vol. III, Pt. 2 of Opera di Livrani (4 vols.; Macerata: Alessandro Mancini, 91ff.

[29]March, Liber Pontificalis, 203.

[30]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 327.

[31]Bernardus, "Epistola CIX," PL, CLXXII, 251-53.

[32]Bernardus, "Epistola XIII," Ibid.,116-17.

[33]Irene Ott, "Der Regalienbegriff im 12. Jahrhundert," ZRG, KA, XXXV (1948), 303ff.

[34]Brixius, Die Mitglieder, 17ff., and Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 375ff.

[35]In England especially the relations with the secular power improved considerably as a result of these moves. Henry I had not allowed a legate into the country since 1120, except for Peter Pierleoni in 1121. See Tillman, op. cit., 24-27. In 1123, Honorius II appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury as permanent legate to England. Ibid., 31. See also Honorius II, "Epistola LVII," PL, CLXVI, 1272. On the relations between the Church and the State in England, see Austin Lane Poole, From Doomsday Book to Magna Charta (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1951), 184ff. See also Brook, op. cit., 169ff.; Schieffer, op. cit., 218-19; Fliche-Martin, Histoire, IX, 47-48; Bernhardi, Lothar von Supplinburg, 52ff.; and Hauck, op. cit., IV, 130-33.

[36]See Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 376ff. Gerard of Angouleme was removed from office by Innocent II. See Bernardus, "Epistola CXXVI," PL, CLXXXII, 273-74. For an account of the feud which arose between Gerard of Angouleme and Geoffrey of Vendome in 1129, see Sackur, "Zur Chronologie der Streitschriften des Gottfried von Vendome," Neues Archiv, XVII (1892), 327-47.

[37]This was especially the case with two major legates employed by Honorius II. John of Cremona and Matthew of Albano were usually sent to handle affairs of moral reform nature. See L'Abbe, Concilia, XII, 1391-92. There was a similar council held in 1128 at Rouen and at Chalons in 1129. Ibid., 1392-94. Seealso the Council of St. Germain du Pres in 1129. Ibid., 1393. The Council of Nantes of 1127, under the direction of Hildebert of Lavardin, concerned itself wholly with problems of priestly continence. Ibid., 1367-69. At the Council of

Troyes in 1128, Matthew of Albano gave formal recognition to the Knights Templars. Ibid., 1373. See also Kehr, Italia Pontificia, VI, 145, no. 8; p. 150, no. 5; VII, p. 61, no. 112; VII, p. 92, no. 19.

[38]See the letter of Honorius II to Henry I in PL, CLXVI, 1230.

[39]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, IX, 47-48.

[40]Ibid., 46-47.

[41]The only exceptions were William of Acquitaine and Roger of Sicily.

[42]See Falconis, "Chronicon," PL, CLXXIII, 1200-1201; Romualdus, "Chronicon," R. I. S., VIII, 215-17; March, Liber Pontificalis, 206; Otto Vehse, "Benevent als Territorium des Kirchenstaates bis zum Beginn der Avignonesische Epoche," Quellen und Forschungen, XXII (1930-31), 133; Cartelliere, op. cit., 174-78; Chalandon, Histoire de la domination normande en Italie, I, 352ff.

[43]Falconis, op. cit., 1200.

[44]See note 42. Compare also Gregorovius, Storia della citta di Roma, VII, 86-88.

[45]Ibid. See also the account of the "Chronicon Fossae Novae," Watterich, Vitae Pont. Rom., II, 160.

[46]Sugerius, "Vita Ludovici," Bouquet, Recueil, XII, 49.

[47]See note 37.

[48]See Honorius II, "Epistola XXXVII," PL, CLXVI, 1249; "Epistola XCIX," Ibid., 1303; "Epistola I," Ibid., 1219. The Abbey of Farfa was reformed in a manner characteristic of Honorius. See Balzani, ed., Reg. Farfensis, 323-24.

[49]See the "Historia Verodunensis," L'Abbe, Concilia, XII, 1391-94. See also Honorius II, "Epistola XX," PL, CLXVI, 1237, and "Epistola LXXXVIII," PL, CLXVI, 1292. Bernard was apparently criticized for his role in the affair, to which criticism he replied in his "Epistola XLVIII," PL, CLXXXII, 154-57.

[50]Honorius II, "Epistola XXXVII," PL, CLXVI, 1249; Baronius, Annales Ecclesiastici, XII, 208ff. On Norbert's close relations

with Honorius, see "Vita Norberti," PL, CLXX, 1323.

[51]See Bernardus, "Epistola CCXL," PL, CLXXXII, 432-33.

[52]See Schneider, Rom und Romgedanke, 213, where it is argued that the Concordat of Worms marked the end of "Romgedanke" as part of the papal program.

[53]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, VIII, 391.

[54]See above p. 339-44.

[55]Fliche-Martin, Histoire, IX, 114ff. See also the typically biased account of Joan Evans, Monastic Life at Cluny, 910-1167, 37-41. Evans' interpretation is no doubt derived from the same sources as those used by Vacandard, La vie de St. Bernard, I, 282.

[56]Fliche, op. cit., 114-15.

[57]Ibid.

[58]Robert, Bullaire, I, 209, 206.

[59]Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V, i, 557; Histoire littéraire de la France, XI, 20-26.

[60]See Brixius, Die Mitglieder, 37; Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 380ff. The prime source for Matthew's life is Peter the Venerable, "De Miraculis," Bk. II, PL, CLXXXIX, 913ff. See also "Ex Gestis Abbatum Lobiensum," Bouquet, Recueil, XIV, 416. While he was a cardinal, Matthew was often asked for aid by St. Bernard. See the latter's "Epistola XXI," PL, CLXXXII, 123-24.

[61]"Jussu Pontii...sine audientia captes in turre quae dicitur Septem salas, usque ad obitum...in custodia tentus est: sepultus vero quassi pauper in captivus apud S. Andream qui optime per quatuordecim annos Cluniacense monasterium rexerat olim." "Chronicon Vosiensis," PL, CLXVI, 840.

[62]John of Salisbury relates how St. Bernard of Clairvaux, impatient with the working of the Roman Curia in judging Gilbert de la Porree, called a meeting of a large number of French bishops and drew his own condemnation of the philosopher. The Curia was furious, fearing a separatist movement, and angry with Bernard for taking unilateral action. See Reginald L. Poole, Ioannis Saresberiensis Historiae Pontificalis quae supersunt (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1927), xlii-xliv.

[63]See above, p. 305.

[64]Gebhart, Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte, I, 636.

[65]Ordericus Vitalis,"Historia Ecclesiatica," PL, CLXXXVIII, 879.

[66]See Smith, Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries, 277-79; Histoire litteraire de la France, XI, 22ff.

[67]See above, p. 337.

[68]Ordericus Vitalis,"Hist. Eccles.," PL, CLXXXVIII, 894, and Robert, Bullaire, II, 263, no. 450.

[69]Ordericus Vitalis, op. cit., 894.

[70]Ibid.

[71]Petrus Venerabilis, "De Miraculis," II, 12, PL, CLXXXIX, 923. Peter the Venerable is largely responsible for the idea that Pontius had gone insane. Ibid., 924-25.

[72]Bruel, Recueil des chartes de l'abbey de Cluny, 312, no. 3952; Robert, Bullaire, I, 313, no. 214.

[73]Robert, Bullaire, 313-14.

[74]Petrus Venerabilis, op. cit., 923; Bruel, op. cit., 312-22.

[75]Ordericus Vitalis, "Historia Ecclesiastica," 894.

[76]Anselmus Gemblacensis, "Chronicon," PL, CLX, 246-47; Mabillon, Ann. Ben., VI, 117.

[77]Ibid.

[78]Robert, op. cit., II, 71, no. 318; Bruel, Recueil, 321, no. 3961.

[79]Ibid.

[80]Robert, Bullaire, II,72-3, no. 319.

[81]Ordericus Vitalis, op. cit., 894-95; Petrus Venerabilis, "De Miraculis," 924.

[82]Petrus Venerabilis, "De Miraculis," PL, CLXXXIX, 924.

[83]Honorius II, "EPistola VII," PL, CLXVI, 1228; "Epistola VI," in Ibid., 1225-26.

[84]See above, note 45.

[85]Petrus Diaconus, "Chron. Cass.," MGH, SS, VII, 806; Kehr, Italia Pont., VIII, 171-72.

[86]Petrus Venerabilis, "De Miraculis," 924; Honorius, "Epistola XLIV," PL, CLXVI, 1258-59; Ordericus Vitalis, "Hist. Eccles.," 895-96.

[87]Ibid.

[88]Evans, op. cit., 37-41.

[89]Petrus Venerabilis, op. cit., 925.

[90]Honorius II, "Epistola XLVIII," PL, CLXVI, 1268.

[91]Ibid., 1267.

[92]See above, p. 298-99.

[93]See above, p. 131.

[94]Petrus Venerabilis, op. cit., 925.

[95]Ibid.

[96]Honorius II, loc. cit.

[97]Ibid.

[98]Ordericus Vitalis, loc. cit.; Petrus Venerabilis, loc. cit.; Honorius II, "Epistola LV," PL, CLXVI, 1272. Compare the accounts of Pontius' imprisonment found in the "Vita Honorii" of Petrus William, Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 327, and that found in the uncorrupted version of Pandolf in March, Liber Pontificalis, 207.

[99]Honorius II, "Epistola XLVIII," PL, CLXVI, 1266.

[100]Brixius, Die Mitglieder, 37.

[101]See above, p. 250, n. 245.

[102]Petrus Diaconus, "Chron. Cass.," MGH, SS, VII, 783.

[103]Ibid., 802.

[104]See above, p. 342-44.

[105]Petrus Diaconus, op. cit., 802-803.

[106]Ibid., 807.

[107]See Bloch, "The Schism of Anacletus II and the Glanfeuil Forgeries," 182.

[108]Ibid.,

[109]Petrus Diaconus, op. cit., 804.

[110]Ibid., 805.

[111]Ibid., 806.

[112]Ibid., 806.

[113]Ibid., 807.

[114]Ibid., 808.

[115]Ibid.

[116]Ibid.

[117]Ibid.

[118]Kehr, Italia Pontificia, VIII, 173, no. 226.

[119]Petrus Diaconus, op. cit., 809.

[120]Ibid.

[121]Ibid.; Kehr, op. cit., VIII, 174, no. 229.

[122]Brixius, op. cit., 37. [123]March, Liber Pontificalis, 208

CHAPTER VII

THE SCHISM OF 1130

The schism of 1130 was the institutional expression of the ideological split which had existed in the curia from the time of Honorius' accession. A vigorous, young minority, with new leadership ideals and new concepts of Church organization, had seized the leadership mechanism in Rome. The young minority, if not anti-Gregorian, at least did not consider the problems with which the Gregorians had been concerned as important. This opposition to Gregorian ideals was manifested particularly in the removal from office of all of the old Gregorian curialists during Honorius' reign. It is this disgruntled "old guard" which forms the basis of the Anacletan party in the schism of 1130. Their opposition to the young minority in the curia and their profound determination to protect the position which they had earned in the Church government welded these "old guard" elements in the curia into a dedicated party, a party which forced the Innocentians to schism in 1130.

The schism in the curia was, however, only the institutional expression of an ideological schism in the Church which ran much deeper into the spiritual life of the time. The revolt of the minority under Honorius was a sort of advanced guard action heralding the shift in leadership ideals which had transpired in the Church after c. 1100. The monkish-

ascetic mentality was fundamentally opposed to many of the Gregorian practices which had made the Papacy the all-pervasive, ubiquitous force that it was in the social life of the time. The individualism, the localism, which the Cistercian revival fostered was a direct outgrowth of the ideology of monasticism. Monkish-ascetic ideals, given institutional expression, were a threat to the psychological make up of the Gregorian leadership ideal as well. For if the Gregorian concept of the papal office hinged upon certain legal realities, the Bernardine one hinged upon moral ones. Put in its simplest terms, the issue, insofar as leadership ideals were concerned, revolved around the definition of office in terms of an individual's moral worth. If the Gregorian program had advocated moral purity as a prerequisite for office in the lower orders, they had eliminated the Papacy from such considerations. The Bernardines in the curia were determined to subject even the papal office to the same rigid moral standards that they had imposed upon the French episcopacy.[1]

Seen in terms of the individuals who participated in the schism, the events of the years 1130-38 have another significance. It was during the course of the schism that St. Bernard of Clairvaux assumed a dominant role in Church affairs that he was to maintain for nearly twenty-five years.[2] At the Council of Etampes, it was he who was to define the prerequisites for papal office that were to hold as valid until canon law was restored to its honored place in Rome under Alexander III. The ideals of papal leadership to which Bernard gave

official sanction in 1130 completely swept away the whole legal corpus which had been erected by the Gregorians. After the Council of Etampes, there were effectively two centers of authority in the Christian community: an official one at Rome and vested in the Pope and an unofficial one in Citeaux vested in St. Bernard himself. Prior to that time the Gregorians in Rome (or in the curia) had been able to maintain real as well as official leadership of the Christian community. With the schism of 1130, however, the leadership mechanism was split in half. Whereas in the first stage of Gregorian development, Gregory VII had succeeded in wielding official and charismatic power, and whereas in the second stage of that development, the curia had effectively wielded real power while the popes had only official power, after 1130, papal power was further disseminated. After this date, the Papacy will become little more than the extension of the Cistercian revival in Rome and will remain such until the time of Alexander III. It is in this light, that the schism of 1130 assumes its true proportion in ecclesiastical history and for this reason that its study is deemed necessary in this paper.

At the close of the second week in February, 1130, Honorius II fell ill. The Chancellor Aimerich, fearing that the Pope was near death, had him removed to the monastery of St. Gregory (or St. Andrea) on the Coelian Hill.[3] This monastery was located between two strongholds of the Frangipane, that which stood in the Coliseum and another which had been

erected on the Palatine.[4] The very movement of the body of Honorius II suggests either that the Chancellor had in mind another coup such as that of 1124 or suggests that Aimerich feared a Pierleoni attack upon him. Pro-Anacletan sources naturally suggest the former,[5] while pro-Innocentian sources suggest the latter view.[6] Indications are that both parties were acting cautiously, because a few days after Honorius had been moved to St. Gregory, Aimerich assembled the College of Cardinals in order to consider a compromise solution which would allow a peaceful transition from the reign of Honorius II to that of his successor.[7]

On 11 February, 1130, the College of Cardinals, meeting in the monastery of St. Gregory, agreed to surrender the electoral power to a committee of eight to be chosen from the three orders in the College. The committee was to be vested with full power, its decision was to be final if unanimous, and its choice of a pope was to be accepted by all under threat of anathema for failure to comply with the committee's decision.[8] The committee was to consist of two cardinal-bishops, three cardinal-priests, and three cardinal-deacons.[9] At this time the College of Cardinals consisted of forty-two members, of which six were cardinal-bishops, twenty-three were cardinal-priests, and thirteen were cardinal-deacons.[10] The ratio of representation on the committee of election was therefore for the three orders: 2:6, 3:23, 3:13. This would seem to indicate that the cardinal-bishops held superior dignity in the College of Cardinals, since one-third of their entire

membership made up one-fourth of the committee.[11] On the other hand, one may note that such an assumption must take into account the ratio of representation for the other two orders. The cardinal-priests were given exactly the same number of representatives as the cardinal-deacons although they were nearly twice as large in number and were of superior dignity to the cardinal-bishops.[12] It therefore seems that we must look somewhere else for the reason behind the composition of the electoral committee.

The members of the committee were favorable to Aimerich. Of the eight members, only three supported Pierleoni when the schism actually broke. The eight members of the committee were: William, Cardinal-bishop of Palestrina; Conrad, Cardinal-bishop of Sabine; Peter Pierleoni, Cardinal-priest of St. Calixtus; Peter of Pisa, Cardinal-priest of St. Susanna; Peter Rufus, Cardinal-priest of St. Martino; Gregory, Cardinal-deacon of St. Angelo; Jonathon, Cardinal-deacon of SS. Cosmos and Damian; and Chancellor Aimerich.[13] Of this group, William of Palestrina, Conrad of Sabine, Peter Rufus, Gregory of St. Angelo, and Aimerich were of like mind, belonging to the minority party in the curia. Peter Pierleoni, Peter of Pisa, and Jonathon formed the second group, the kernel of the future Anacletan party. It has been argued that Peter of Pisa was neutral, serving neither party, but this argument does not seem profitable in the light of the now known events.[14] Whatever were Peter of Pisa's loyalties, the fact remains that

in the College of Cardinals where Pierleoni could ultimately claim a clear majority, the Pierleonists had agreed to surrender that majority to a committee of eight members of which five were the men of the Chancellor Aimerich. This seems to indicate that the Pierleonists, the "old guard" in the curia, were acting from motives which were honorable in the formation of the electoral committee itself.

We are further led to the conclusion that the old guard acted from motives of good faith by an examination of the constitution of the electoral committee in terms of the length of service in the curia of which its members could boast. Here seems to be the real key to the compromise of 1130. The eight members of the committee may be distributed on the seniority scale in the following manner:

Name	Date Created Cardinal	By
Peter Pierleoni	1113	Paschal II.[15]
Peter of Pisa	1113	" ".[16]
Conrad of Sabine	1114	" ".[17]
Gregory of St. Angelo	1116	" ".[18]
Peter Rufus	1118	Gelasius II.[19]
Jonathon	1120	Calixtus II.[20]
William of Palestrina	1123	" ".[21]
Aimerich	1123	" ".[22]

It will be noted that five of the eight members of the committee dated from the time of either Paschal II or Gelasius II. Three come from the time of Calixtus II. None date from the

turbulent rule of Honorius II. This would seem to suggest that the compromise at which the curia had arrived two days before Honorius' death consisted in giving the older members of the College the right of electing the new pope. Apparently, the committee members who dated from the reign of Paschal II were to mollify the "old guard" still smarting from the coup of 1124. The fact that none of Honorius' cardinals served on the committee was to be a further salve for their offended dignity. The Aimerich faction was probably satisfied by being allowed to place two of its representatives in the important posts of the cardinal-bishop representatives on the committee. In any event, both parties had received some concessions in the compromise, and it seemed possible that a calm transition might be effected after Honorius' death. The committee had ruled that for three days after Honorius' death there was to be no convassing for votes. The three days were to be set aside for the obsequies of Honorius, and after the Pope had been properly entombed, the election was to proceed.[23] It was necessary only to choose a place for the election to be held.

The Chancellor Aimerich suggested that the election be held in St. Adriano, the church which had been built on the site of the ancient Roman Curia building. This church stood on the edge of the Forum just below the Capitoline, at the border of Frangipane territory. There were two Frangipane towers commanding this church, however, and the College of

Cardinals agreed to hold the election here only on the condition that these two towers were turned over to representatives of the College of Cardinals. Aimerich's guile was shown in the events which followed. The College of Cardinals elected two of its members to take command of the towers and dispatched its envoys to the towers, but when they arrived, they found them already in the hands of two of Aimerich's party, the Cardinal-bishop Matthew of Alban and the Cardinal-bishop John of Ostia.[24] Both of these men were powerful members of the curia who had come to Honorius to enforce the new reform program undertaken by that Pope. Both were completely distrusted by the "old guard" and both were completely ruthless in attempting to control the curia for their own and Aimerich's aims. The two cardinals who had been sent by the College of Cardinals returned to St. Gregory, informed the College of what had transpired, and the "old guard" then withdrew from the monastery and contact with Aimerich. Peter of Pisa, writing to Diego of Compostella, explained the action of the old guard thus: "Quod utique fratres nostri malae mentis esse indicium attendentes, pars maior et sanior ad praedictum monasterium non sunt amplius ausi redire."[25]

The cardinals who withdrew from the monastery numbered twenty-six men, a clear majority of the total forty-two in the College. Aimerich and his party numbered sixteen. Yet it must be noted that even though the majority withdrew from the monastery, they did not attempt any armed uprising against the minority. They acted as they had done in 1124; they

merely retired from the presence of the Chancellor. These considerations somewhat modify the conclusions of Vacandard, who argued that the Pierleonists were in schism from the duly constituted authority at the time of their withdrawal,[26] for, since the "old guard" was the majority of the College and since they attempted no action at all until after the Pope was known to be dead, one must ask exactly where qualified authority resided in the College of Cardinals. Did authority reside in the minority led by Aimerich or in the majority of the cardinals which was composed of the oldest members of the curia? This issue became existentially important for the entire Church community on 13 February, 1130 when Honorius finally expired.

The cardinals withdrew from St. Gregory's monastery on the evening of 12 February. The following day a rumour had passed about Rome that the Pope was already dead. Since Aimerich had blockaded the monastery so that no one might pass in or out, this was most natural.[27] In any event, it is believed that a mob gathered near the monastery on the 13th,[28] and Hubert of Lucca, an Innocentian partisan who was not an eye witness of the events, states that this mob was led by Peter Pierleoni. The mob was about to launch its attack upon the monastery, according to Hubert of Lucca, when the Pope (or someone dressed in the papal vestments) showed himself in a high window of the monastery. On seeing that the pope was apparently still alive, the mob dispersed. Hubert

of Lucca states that had Honorius not presented himself at the window, "the antichrist (Peter Pierleoni) would have shown himself before his time."[29] It is nonetheless important to note that whether the mob was an historical fact or not, not even Hubert of Lucca is willing to assert that the Pierleonists were willing to resort to arms in order to enforce their rights in the election while Honorius II still lived.

However, Honorius II did die sometime during the night of 13-14 February, 1130, probably immediately after sundown.[30] Aimerich did not give out this news. Instead, he convened the cardinals loyal to him, of which only five of the electoral committee may be counted, and proceeded with preparations for the election. Neither Peter Pierleoni, Peter of Pisa, nor Jonathon were informed of the electoral plans. A semblance of legality was maintained, however, in the pro forma burial of Pope Honorius. Immediately after the Pope's death (while the body was still warm according to the Pierleonists), a grave was hastily improvised in the cloister of St. Gregory's, the Pope's body placed in it, and the necessary offices were read.[31] Once this was done, Aimerich began the election process. At this point in the proceedings, Peter of Pisa returned to the monastery. He protested the illegality of the election process. When he was ignored by the Aimerich faction, he hurried away to warn the "old guard" of what was occurring.[32] Meanwhile, Aimerich completed his plan. The Cardinal-deacon of St. Angelo, Gregory Papareschi, a relative of the Frangipane, was nominated and elected by the

the cardinals there assembled. His election was supported by five members of the electoral committee and eleven other cardinals, of which nine dated from the time of Honorius II, four from the time of Calixtus II, one from the time of Gelasius, and only two from the time of Paschal II.[33] The order of cardinal-bishops stood by the newly elected pope by a majority of four to two. The cardinal-priests supported the Pierleonists, and the cardinal-deacons were about evenly split. The important thing to note is that the minority was composed primarily of cardinals who had been introduced under Aimerich's hegemony during the pontificate of Honorius II. These men were the extension of the pietistic reform movement's power in the curia. Their seizure of power represented the end of the Gregorian Papacy.[34]

On 14 February, 1130, the new Pope left the monastery of St. Gregory for the Lateran in a procession guarded by the Frangipane. Here he was placed on the papal-episcopal seat in the apse of the basilica and hailed as Innocent II.[35] This ceremony being finished, the procession returned to the monastery where the new Pope was invested with the papal insignia at the hands of John, Cardinal-bishop of Ostia.[36] The rest of the morning of the 14th was quiet.

By noon of the same day, however, the Pierleonists had assembled in the Church of San Marco (now incorporated into the Palazzo Venezia) in order to elect their pope. Peter of Pisa notes that they would not proceed with the election until they had been certain that Honorius had been entombed.[37]

This was according to the conditions of election. After having announced to all Rome that the election would be held that day, the cardinals and clergy of Rome assembled. Here they condemned the summary actions taken by the Chancellor Aimerich, declared the election of Innocent II as invalid, and elected Peter Pierleoni as Pope Anacletus II.[38] The election decree of this Pope was signed by two cardinal-bishops, thirteen cardinal-priests, and nine cardinal-deacons. To these two names were added those of the Bishops of Sutri and Segni, three abbots of monasteries in or near Rome, several archpriests and all of the Roman nobility with the exception of the Frangipane.[39] After waiting for three days for the Innocentians to capitulate, the Anacletans attacked the Lateran Basilica and succeeded in taking it.[40] A few days after that, St. Peter's Basilica fell to the Anacletans. By the end of April, 1130, the Frangipane had been bribed into surrendering to the Anacletans, and Innocent, fearing for his life, fled Rome for Pisa, leaving only Conrad of Sabine to represent him in the city.[41] With Innocent's flight, the die was cast. The schism was a fact.

Both of the popes claimed unanimous election by the College of Cardinals, and although neither pope mentioned the other in his election decree, it is apparent that each considered the other's party as schismatic.[42] For the hierarchy of Europe (and the crusading kingdoms of the East), the situation was most difficult. For the most part they were content to wait, confirming neither party and hoping that the schism would solve itself in Rome. That is, everyone decided to wait except some of the religious leaders directly connected to the Aimerich party in the curia. Hugh of Grenoble, Peter of Cluny, and Bernard of Clairvaux were pro-Innocentian from the start, so much so that one suspects that they may have been privy to the coup of Aimerich even before the event itself.[43] Louis VI of France, Henry I of England, and Lothar remained impassive, watching warily but neither confirming nor denying either party's claim, although Norbert of Magdeburg was working for Innocent in Germany while Bernard and his men were working for him in France and England.[44] The issue between the two popes was first posed in the relatively simple terms of deciding which pope's electoral process confirmed more closely to the prescribed electoral canons.

It is apparent that the papal election decree of 1059 was not universally recognized as valid in 1130. Vacandard, in what has since become a standard monograph on the double election of 1130, has argued that the electoral decree was still fully valid when the schism occurred.[45] Accepting the

version of the decree which gave the power of papal election to the cardinal-bishops in the College, he argued that since Innocent could claim four of the six votes of the cardinal-bishops Bernard had acted rightly in confirming his election at the Council of Etampes in 1130.[46] Wilhelm Martens, however, has shown in a study which he appended to his Die Besetzung des päpstlichen Stuhls unter den Kaisern Heinrich III und Heinrich IV that in all probability the papal electoral law of 1059 had fallen as a result of intensive demands on the part of the lower orders in the College for electoral rights equal to those of the bishops.[47] The latest studies, those of Kuttner, Michels, and others, tend to confirm Martens' conclusions.[48] It is therefore strange to find two of the most recent works which deal with the schism following Vacandard in this matter.[49] For purposes of clarification we shall here set forth what we consider to have been the electoral situation prior to the outbreak of the schism of 1130.

In such a discussion three factors must be taken under consideration. These three factors are the law of the statutes (that is, the electoral law as known through the canonists of the time), the actual practice of election as known under Paschal II, Gelasius II, Calixtus II, and Honorius II, and the ideology of leadership which (ideally) governed the choice of the papal leader of the Church community.

The electoral decrees which the Gregorian canonists included in their collections had been confused by the existence

of two versions of the electoral decree of Nicholas II. It is now supposed that the original version of Nicholas (the decree of 1059 authored by Humbert of Silva-Candida) granted the right of papal election to the cardinal-bishops and the right of approval to the cardinal-priests.[50] The choice of the cardinal-bishops was to have been unanimous, so far as is known; and after the cardinal-priests had given their approval to the election, the new pope was to be presented to the people of his diocese, the people of Rome, for the acclamatio.[51] It must be borne in mind, however, that the process of election set forth by Humbert in Nicholas' name was tempered by other subsidiary considerations. One of these considerations was the end which the decree had in mind. It was set forth primarily for the purpose of eliminating imperial interference in the papal election.[52] There is nothing in the decree to indicate that Humbert did not wish the participation (real and theoretical) of the entire clergy and people of Rome. As we have seen in our analysis of the Gregorian propaganda, the clergy and people of Rome constituted the lever which would remove the election from imperial hands by treating the papal election as merely another episcopal election.[53] Only if we assume this can we explain the readiness with which another version of the electoral decree, the so-called "imperial" version, was accepted by such canonists as Deusdedit and Anselm of Lucca. This variant version of the electoral decree placed the right of election in the hands of the entire College of Cardinals, giving no special privileges to the bishops and

making the people and clergy of Rome as important in the total picture as they had been in the first decree.[54] We have seen also that the imperial version was used by the lower orders of the College of Cardinals in asserting their rights in papal elections as well as by imperial antipopes who sought to seize the papal power from legitimate holders of that power, and that in fact it was the imperial version which had become official in the canonical collections of the time of Urban II.[55]

Historically, the long reign of Paschal II served to deaden any clear-cut definition of the papal election procedure by simple disuse of the power. Furthermore, the eighteen years in which Paschal was pope were marked by the full assumption of power in Rome by the total curia, not by any one faction. By the time of Paschal's death few cardinals remained who could remember papal elections as a fact; they were therefore dependent upon the interpretation of the electoral decree of 1059 which was to be found in the most important canonical collections of the time, those of Deusdedit and Anselm of Lucca, together with the Polycarpus -- all three of which accepted the imperial version as valid.[56]

The theoretical idea of election and the practical political situation in the curia were augmented by a whole ideology of papal leadership which had grown out of 1) the Gregorian struggle with the Emperor and 2) the intra-curial struggle between the pope and his court. We have found that the choice of the pope depended in the final analysis upon how well any

given candidate could conform to the ideals of Gregorian leadership, ideals formed under conditions which made the archetype of the leader a warrior-administrator above all. Nowhere was this ideal to be found more completely expressed than in the Liber Pontificalis, in which papal elections after Paschal II are described as being held "in communi communiter et singulariter singuli." The chaotic conditions which marked the elections of Gelasius II, Calixtus II, and Honorius II would tend only to confuse the issue of what exactly constituted papal election itself. However, it will be noted that even though all three elections were held at times of seige, exile, and revolution one fiction was maintained -- that the right of election was the province of the clergy and people of Rome which acted through their representative, the entire Roman Curia.[57] Therefore, it is not enough that scholars such as Vacandard, Zöpfell, and Williams look into the canons to decide which election was valid in 1130. As Gratian had argued, tradition was as much a part of law as statute.[58] We must, as a result, bear in mind that for at least thirty years preceding the election of 1130 there had been no fixed electoral practice or theory which did not grant to the curia as a whole the right of election; we must seek to explain the ideologies of the two parties of that year in terms of their historical context. If we do this, we shall be forced to admit that the attack launched against the Gregorian papal leadership ideal by imperialists such as Walram von Naumburg and the Anonymous of York was essentially the same as that of the

pietists wooed by Bernard of Clairvaux and his party in the curia. Thus envisaged, it becomes possible to see that the election of 1130 was not the result of party strife in Rome but that party strife in Rome was the result of a fundamental fissure in leadership ideals and that the two parties of the schism represent different ideologies, different concepts of the values which determine the right to leadership in the Christian community.

Having noted the historical background for the formation of the parties, we may now indicate how some of the facts concerning the events immediately preceding the schism bear upon our interpretation of the electoral process. We may begin with a consideration of the importance of the formation of the electoral committee in 1130. The committee was formed while both parties were still ostensibly at peace,[59] which indicates that the formation of the committee was looked upon as a compromise solution which was purely legal insofar as the entire curia was concerned. It is, therefore, important that during this time of compromise both parties of the curia agreed 1) to surrender the electoral right to a committee, 2) that this surrender was made by the cardinal-bishops as well as the cardinal-priests, and 3) that the cardinal-deacons were given a place on the committee equal to that of the cardinal-priests and superior to the cardinal-bishops considered numerically. This means that the cardinal-bishops did not consider the right of election exclusively theirs in 1130. It also means that Pandolf of Pisa's account of papal elections

in the period which followed Paschal II was essentially correct: that the entire curia elected the pope and that this body included the cardinal-deacons as an effective part. As Peter of Porto put it in his letter to the cardinal-bishops who supported Innocent: "After the formation of the committee, it was not ours to elect a pope but only to approve or disapprove what had been done by them."[60] This comment reveals another striking feature of the formation of the committee: it reveals that even here the entire curia had not relinquished the right of approbation of the pope selected by the committee -- that in all probability the new pope was to have been selected by the committee and presented to the curia as a whole, and that they were to approve or disapprove him according to majority rule.

We must now inquire into another aspect of the events of 13-14 February. We must ask exactly where the authority of election was to be found after the majority of the College of Cardinals had withdrawn from the monastery upon discovering that Aimerich "was acting in bad faith." Since a part of the compromise had consisted of the turning over of the towers commanding the place of election to the representatives of the entire College, one must conclude that when the majority discovered Aimerich's "bad faith" and withdrew they renounced the contract for the compromise. This was, in fact, the Anacletan position on the matter as expressed by Peter of Pisa.[61] Hubert of Lucca saw the matter differently, arguing that the withdrawal of the Anacletans constituted schism,

that the power of election still resided in the electoral committee which exercised that power by a majority of 5 to 3.[62] It was Hubert who inserted the idea that the committee should be governed by the decision of "the saner part" of the committee,[63] a concept which has later adopted by the Innocentians in arguing that they were the "Catholic" part of the curia, that is, the orthodox part,[64] while the Anacletans were schismatics. The same concept will be exploited by Bernard of Clairvaux at Etampes in arguing that the Innocentians represent the only morally suitable element in the curia and that therefore it is they who must have the right of electing the leader of the Christian community.[65] Needless to note, however, no matter how much one may sympathize with the motives governing the formation of the arguments of Hubert of Lucca and Bernard, the fact remains that under no circumstances could the election of Innocent II be regarded as canonically valid, either in the light of the canon law of the time or the tradition of papal election which preceded it. He was supported by a minority of the cardinals. These cardinals had not adhered to either the form of the electoral committee rules or the traditional forms of papal election: that is, they had not waited three days for the burial of the pope and the proclamation of the new election. They had not informed the senior members of the curia or even the majority of the curia. In fact, they had not even informed all of the six cardinal-bishops. Canonically, therefore, Innocent II had no chance in the schism of 1130. However, canon law had fallen upon evil days in

the Church of his time, and new standards of evaluation had been set forth and accepted as valid in the choosing of the leader of the Church community.

Compared to the Innocentian claims, those of the Anacletans seem more canonically valid. There is no evidence of force having been used while the Pope Honorius was still alive. They did not proceed with the election until after they had heard that Honorius was dead and had been entombed. They had assembled the entire clergy and people of Rome through their representatives at the Church of San Marco in the full light of day and had debated the issue of election before the assembled crowd.[66] Peter of Porto, the most honored member of the curia, presided over the meeting, and it seems probable that the Innocentians were offered the opportunity to join in these proceedings.[67] Here Peter Pierleoni, who certainly manifested many of the characteristics of the ideal Gregorian leader, was elected pope. Upon this adherence to the traditional procedure the Anacletans were to base their claims. The fact that they had closely adhered to the law of papal election was to be their arguing point. The moral ability of their candidate or of the electors they considered less important than the adherence to the letter of the law. By so arguing, the Anacletans demonstrated that they fully endorsed the Amtscharismatic concept of the papal leadership ideal upon which Gregorianism had been built.

In a sense, we are given an indication of the lines along which the struggle for the leadership of the Church will be

fought in the names which the two candidates for the papal power chose to indicate the proposed character of their reigns. The names of the two popes symbolized the administrative ideals of the men who held them. It must be borne in mind that the first conflict within the curia had broken out a short time after the conclusion of the struggle between Papacy and Empire by the Concordat of Worms. The mild terms of the Concordat, terms which have been described above as a retreat from the administrative ideals of the Gregorian Reform,[68] seem to have been the result of pressure exerted by a peace party in the curia.[69] Gregory of St. Angelo (Innocent II) and Conrad of Sabine (Anastasius IV) were both members of the papal party which signed the Concordat of Worms as well as key men in the reform movement under Honorius II. There can be little doubt that the mild policy vis a vis the secular power which Honorius' policy meant more local power for the episcopacy and therefore (in the Gregorian view) more opportunities for the princes to encroach upon the ecclesiastical power on the local level. I think (in the light of these considerations) that the names of the two popes somehow symbolize the administrative policy which each embraced in 1130 just as the names of Urban II, Gelasius II, and Calixtus II had been meant to do.

The two most important sources (insofar as we know) for the ideological significance which names of the popes would have had in the twelfth century are the Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae and the contemporary editions of the Liber Pontificalis. In both of these works the name and figure of Innocent I

stood for the same attention to the spiritual life of the Church and conciliation with the secular power which the names of Honorius I and Paschal I had assumed.[70] During the reign of Innocent I (401-17), Rome, the civitas gentium, had fallen to the barbarians, and St. Augustine, one of Innocent's bishops, had eloquently argued that the fall of this earthly city was a metaphysical necessity for the transition to the new Jerusalem, the civitas Dei. In the popular ideology the transition from the Roman Empire to the time of the barbarian states had been a time in which the Church had been divested of a fearsome load, the necessity of supporting a state which had interests purely secular. Under Innocent I, the Church had given itself to its own spiritualization. Heretics had been purged, churches and monasteries rebuilt, and pagans converted.[71] It was to this Church that Peter Damiani had appealed as an ideal in his Disceptatio Synodalis.[72] It was being appealed to now by new Damianies, by Bernard of Clairvaux, Otto of Freising, Norbert of Magdeburg, and others.[73]

The decretals of Innocent I which are to be found in the Decretales of the Pseudo-Isidore complement the vision of that pope which may be found in the Liber Pontificalis. In these letters there is hardly any indication that the State exists at all. One after another of the decretals deals with the reorganization of the mores of the time, the necessity of reform for the spiritual life, and the definition of doctrine.[74] In particular, the long epistle Ad Victorium Rotomagensem Episcopum might serve as an index to the avowed aims of the new Innocentian party in 1130.[75] This and the letters to

St. Augustine found in the Decretales might be used by the Innocentians to publicize their cause, for in their view the Church of 1130 was in a far more precarious state than it had been under Innocent I, so dangerous, in fact, that revolution had been necessary.[76]

Anacletus I, on the other hand, was considered to be a pope of the apostolic period, a martyr-pope, who had suffered from the persecution of the Church by the Roman State.[77] It is more than likely that in twelfth century versions of the Liber Pontificalis the personality of this pope had become confused with another, that of Cletus I, the friend and successor but one to St. Peter.[78] This Cletus was known for his devotion to St. Peter, the key iconographical figure in the Gregorian ideology, and had in fact been buried beside the founder of the papal power in the Vatican tomb of the first pope.[79] Anacletus I was a Greek who had succeeded to the Roman episcopate near the end of the first century.[80] The similarity of names (Cletus and Anacletus) and the proximity in time had allowed the copiests to transform the two names into one and the two popes into the same. By the twelfth century, therefore, Anacletus I was thought to have been a Greek who had been a friend and devotee to the memory of St. Peter, had suffered martyrdom at the hands of the State, and had set forth one of the most important pronouncements on the Roman primacy to be found in the Decretales of Pseudo-Isidore.

There are three decretals attributed to Anacletus I in the Decretales, of which the first was the most important for the Gregorian canonists. This decretal had been used to refute ideas such as those advocated by Walram von Naumburg and the Anonymous of York which affirmed that the power to bind and loose had been given to all of the Apostles, not only to Peter. According to the Pseudo-Anacletus, the Church of Rome was not founded by the Apostles, but by Christ himself: "Haec vero sacrosancta Romana apostolica ecclesia non ab apostolis, sed ab ipso domino salvatore nostro primatum optinuit...."[81] This decretal had headed the arguments on primacy put forth by Anselm of Lucca and was a key concept in the war waged with the secular power for the libertas ecclesiae.[82] Similarly, Anacletus I had proclaimed the See of Rome as the source of all law and made the dispensation of justice its primary role.[83] He was in a sense the patron saint of the Roman canon lawyers; and when combined with the legends which surrounded his predecessor, Cletus I, the devotee of St. Peter, the role which he assumed in the Liber Pontificalis and the Decretales was a perfect ideologue for the canon law party in the curia of 1130. We speculate that these considerations were at work when Anacletus II chose the name which was to symbolize the nature of his reign. In like manner, the names are an index to the character of the two men.

Anacletus II was a perfect representative of the Gregorian leadership type. Some sources even go so far as to posit a

blood relationship between his family and that of Gregory VII, which, true or not does indicate somewhat the extent to which the Pierleoni family had been incorporated into the papal plans of the early twelfth century.[84] Whether Peter Pierleoni was the nephew of Gregory VII, as Fedele argued at one time, is impossible to say with certainty.[85] We are certain that he was the great grandson of one Benedict the Christian, a rich Jewish merchant of Rome who had been converted to Christianity under Leo IX.[86] If Pierleoni could not boast of the antiquity of his nobility, he could at least boast of the alliance between his family and the Gregorian Papacy which had become so strong by the time of Urban II that in practical terms one was unthinkable without the other.[87] Under the grandson of Benedict the Christian, Petrus Leo, the Pierleoni family reached its apogee in Rome. Effectively, the Pierleoni were the Roman nobility insofar as the Papacy was concerned. Until the time of Petrus Leo's death in 1128 the Pierleoni were the most important force in the laity who were enrolled in the pro-papal cause.[88] But as for so many of the Gregorian institutions -- Cluny, Monte Cassino, Milano -- the coming of Honorius signalled decline also for the Pierleoni.

In the first decade of the twelfth century, however, the Pierleoni were at the height of their power, and the third son of Petrus Leo was sent to Paris for study.[89] It is not known whether Peter Pierleoni frequented the lectures of Abelard in Paris or not. It is certain, however, that St. Bernard of Clairvaux considered Peter Pierleoni as Anacletus II a part

of the general complex which included Abelard and Abelard's student, Arnold of Brescia.[90]

Having finished his studies in Paris Peter Pierleoni betook himself to Cluny, where he took monkish vows under the cultured and powerful Pontius.[91] He was recalled to Rome in 1113, immediately after the affair of Sutri, and was created a cardinal-deacon, titular SS Cosmos and Damian. His subscriptio first appears upon extant papal bulls on 16 October, 1113.[92] In 1116 it was Peter Pierleoni who probably commanded the militia of the city in the defense of Pope Paschal in his flight to the south. When Gelasius II fled the city of Rome in 1118 Pierleoni accompanied him to Cluny and assisted in the election of his successor, Calixtus II. In the following year, when Calistus II returned to Rome, Peter Pierleoni was with him and shared in the honors which the Pierleoni family received from that Pope by accepting promotion to the rank of cardinal-priest, titular St. Calixtus.[93] From 1120 to 1124 he was legate to France, England, and Scotland, sometimes sharing that honor with his future rival, Gregory of St. Angelo.[94] He had been recalled by Honorius II, however, when that Pope had begun his systematic reduction of "old guard" strength in the curia; and after 1125, except for one instance, his name disappears from all papal documents.[95] He was, nonetheless, the most powerful man, both financially and politically among the "old guard" in the curia.[96] He was learned. He had connections with Cluny. His ties in Rome made him a natural selection for a party desirous of stopping

what they considered to be the wholesale reduction of the centralized power which had been erected in the course of the Gregorian Reform.

The rival of Peter Pierleoni, Gregory of St. Angelo, was a less sensational figure in the curia. He had been introduced into the papal civil service by the antipope Clement III.[97] Urban II and Paschal II had kept him on, however, after they had assumed full command in Rome. In 1116 he was created Cardinal-deacon of St. Angelo by Paschal II, a position which he occupied until his election to the Papacy in 1130.[98] As noted above, he accompanied Saxo of Anagni and Conrad of Sabine to Worms in 1122, and his name appears as one of the signers of that document for Calixtus II.[99] His sporadic legateships into France have little apparent interest, although it was probably here that he made those contacts with the carriers of the new reform which were to stand him in such good stead in his fight for the papal power. He supported Honorius II and Aimerich in their coup of 1124, and from this time we must look upon him as a renegade against the "old guard." He was, unlike Peter Pierleoni, not particularly wealthy, although his family, the Papareschi, a branch of the Frangipane, could trace its history as far back as the eleventh century in Roman history.[100] This was the man who was to be hailed as the saviour of the mores of the Roman court against the Pierleoni faction.

Our knowledge of the Anacletan propaganda is limited. A few letters of Anacletus were conserved in a 14th century codex at Monte Cassino.[101] A 17th century sketch of a mosaic in which that antipope was shown to be the successor of the great reform popes tells us something of the psychology of his party. The three lives of the popes written by Pandolf of Pisa tell us something of how that party regarded the ideal pope. Finally, the two letters from which we derive our knowledge of the events of the two elections, those of Peter of Pisa and Peter of Porto, may also be considered indices of the Anacletan view of office upon which that party sought to build its claim to the papal power.

From these sources we receive only a partial view of Anacletan awareness of the issues of the schism. In all probability the "old guard" party did not conceive of itself so much as the defender of a concept of office as defender of the only possible concept of the papal office. It is characteristic in revolutionary movements that the party being ousted from power is completely unable to analyze the source of power from which the revolutionaries act. In all probability the Anacletans were incapable of perceiving that in brushing aside the Gregorian concept of the papal leader, the Innocentians had hit upon the propaganda formula which would give them support in the mass. The Anacletans, in addition to realizing that the Innocentian revolution would deprive them of actual power in the curia, seemed to feel further that the whole of the Gregorian heritage was

under attack. They therefore cast themselves in the role of defenders of that heritage, and in so doing destroyed any possibility of victory for themselves.

We need not here recapitulate the Gregorian concept of the papal office. This has been done in our study of the **Amtscharismatic** theorization of the early Gregorian (the period of Humbert, Gregory himself, and Urban) and the victory of that ideal under Paschal II's reign. We may note, however, for purposes of reference, that this concept of office was grounded upon six basic tenets. Of these six tenets, three had been established by written law and tradition, while the other three had become real only through a short tradition. 1) That the papal power was absolute was established both by law and practice. 2) To this concept had been added the idea that the Curia participated directly in that power, and this too had been given not only practical but theoretical form. 3) That the pope himself was not subject to correction on moral counts by his inferiors but only by God had received the same two types of ratification. These three attributes of the papal power were generally recognized during and after the reign of Gregory VII. They were central to the libertas ecclesiae in that they vested full power in Rome and prohibited interference from any quarter outside the Curia itself. The other three attributes of the Gregorian concept of office had arisen only through practice, through tradition. They were not anywhere written down, but they were effective

forces recognized as official when the problem of choosing a pope arose in the post-Gregorian era. These three attributes of the papal office had grown out of a particular situation: the conflict between Church and State. It was held that: (1) the election of the pope was a legal process and that the papal power was conferred only upon complete and minute attention to the process of election, confirmation, and consecration of the new pope; (2) that the papal role was essentially administrative, that the pope exercised his leadership by administration of the great hierocracy of which he became absolute leader after he had completed the legal process of election; and (3) that all of these considerations were based upon the tacit assumption that the whole of the Church community was held together by a series of objectified, legalistic relationships which culminated in the papal office itself. These relationships could be studied and interpreted only by a staff of experts learned in the sciences required for their analysis. The two sciences which took first rank in this field were canon law and logic.

That the Anacletans considered themselves the "Gregorian" party we know by two important bodies of fact. One is the composition of the party itself. The nucleus of the Anacletan party was essentially the same as the group in the Curia which in 1112 had rebelled against Paschal II in defense of the Gregorian concept of the papal office. The group was essentially "Roman", and it boasted the complete

adherence of the great civil service organization in Rome in the Lateran Palace. This is important, for it seems to indicate that even during the stringent reforms of Honorius II the Lateran civil service had managed to keep its semi-autonomous state. This body, it will be recalled, had been the training ground for the Gregorian administrative Leviathan and the first stage in the career of a prospective cardinal in many instances. That the majority of the cardinals and the bureaucracy as well should give their support to Anacletus seems to suggest that at least in Rome he was looked upon as a proper successor to the Gregorians in his concepts of papal administration.

To the bureaucracy and Curia we may add the Roman nobility, who stood by Anacletus to a man. Even the Frangipane had ultimately deserted their kinsman for Anacletus. It is of course readily apparent that the Gregorian Papacy was existentially dependent upon the idea of Rome as "caput et cardo" of the world. Rome had come to be under the Gregorian popes what it could never have hoped to be under the emperors. Gregorian rule meant home rule for the Romans and wealth which would be used in Rome. Petrus Leo had given voice to his belief in that idea in his verses composed on the occasion of Urban II's death.[103] Now, no doubt, his son would attempt to carry on the tradition. The issue between Innocent II and Anacletus II might well have been stated (as it was stated by Bernard of Clairvaux) as the conflict between two concepts of ecclesiology in which the central

question was whether the power of God was given to the Church as a whole and then to the Pope or whether it was given to Rome and then to the Church.[104] However much Bernard might modify his stand in the interests of harmony, nonetheless it is apparent that the Innocentian party had its strength and in fact recognized the authority which came from the Church of the provinces.

We may further note that not one significant canonist supported the Innocentian cause. It is true that Hildebert of Lavardin finally was convinced of the rightness of Innocent's cause through the work of Bernard, but even here it was charisma and not legal argumentation which carried the day.[105] Peter of Porto and Peter of Pisa, the two outstanding canonists of the Curia, supported Anacletus. Gerard of Angouleme was in his camp, and Geoffrey of Vendome would probably have been there had he and Gerard not been in violent conflict at the time of the schism.[106]

Finally, Monte Cassino went with the new Gregorian leader to a man, convinced that here it would regain some of the honor it had lost since the rise of the new reform movement with its new ideals of the nature of the monkish life.[107] It seems that Anacletus had also depended upon that other Gregorian stronghold, Cluny; however, his plans were destroyed through the action of Peter the Venerable, who in fact held his power there only through the very men whom Anacletus opposed. But in two other traditionally Gregorian camps, in Sicily and in Milan, Anacletus was recognized as

109
the legitimate pope. Here the central issue had been the same as it had been under Gregorian leadership, opposition to the Holy Roman Empire. It is significant, however, that these two sources of Gregorian strength should stand by Anacletus, for it suggests that they considered him the expression of the Gregorian idea-world.

Aside from consideration of the composition of the Anacletan party, there is another piece of evidence which we may call forth for our case. This is the 17th century sketch of a mosaic which stood in the little Chapel of St. Nicholas in the Lateran Basilica. This sketch reproduces the general outlines of a mosaic begun by Calixtus II and completed by Anacletus II which shows that the latter considered himself as the culmination of the great Gregorian Reform era. The mosaic itself was destroyed in the 17th century, but the sketch which is left it sufficiently clear to make our point in this matter.

The mosaic was to stand in a chapel dedicated to St. Nicholas and was to consist of two sections, a lower gallery in the form of a rectangle and an upper shaped like a modified semi-circle, to set into the arc created by the
110
juncture of a barrel vault with a wall. The upper section of the mosaic dominates the whole. It consists of the representation of a huge enthroned Madonna, flanked by angels, crowned, and representing the three persons of the Trinity fused into one through her giving birth of the child, which is seated on her lap. Two saints flank the Virgin and the

111

angels; these are Saints Sylvester (on the Virgin's right hand) and St. Anastasius. At the feet of the Virgin are two figures who are crowned with square nimbuses, indicating that they were still alive when the work was in progress. The figure at the right foot of the Virgin is a representation of Calixtus II and on her left is the figure of Anacletus II.

In the lower gallery, the central figure, standing on a slightly raised platform, is a representation of St. Nicholas, to whom the chapel is dedicated. On his right are shown four popes, Gelasius II, Pacalis II, Urbanus II, and Leo I. On his left are represented four more: Gregory I, Alexander II, Gregory VII, and Victor III. Immediately under the figure of the Virgin is the inscription: "Presidet etheris pia virgo Maria choreis." Another inscription notes that the work was begun by Calixtus II and completed by Anacletus.

The mosaic was quite apparently to have been a lasting monument to the Gregorian Reform, and to the popes who made that reform possible and was to signal the victory of the reform under Calixtus II. If the sketch which we have of it may be taken as reliable this work seems to have outstripped in size and conception of monumentality anything of the period of which we are aware today. The two great figures of the Patristic Age are there: Gregory I and Leo I. Then all of the popes from Alexander II (not Nicholas II, it will be noted) to Anacletus II are represented (The

figure of St. Anastasius was probably originally Anacletus I.)[112] Of all the popes, only the figure of Honorius II is missing. Supposedly, one was to receive the impression upon viewing this monument that the Gregorian era had been consummated in Calixtus II, and after a short interruption it had been continued under Anacletus II. Here was an apparent rebuke of the Honorian pontificate with its new reform leadership. At the same time, the mosaic suggests that the Anacletans considered themselves well rid of the Honorian faction supporting Innocent II. Now they could return to real Gregorianism. This monument coupled with what we know of the party that supported Anacletus II therefore seems to indicate that the Anacletans considered themselves a continuation of Gregorianism and an incarnation of the concept of papal power which Gregorianism represented.

It is within this context that we may discuss the Liber Pontificalis as a propaganda work. We have already used it as a source for the revelation of the true nature of Honorius II's pontificate, as containing the broad outlines of the struggles in the curia which characterized that pontificate. However, the three lives written by Pandolf, if coupled with the Vita Paschalis (which was written by Peter of Pisa if not by Anacletus II himself),[113] can give us a fairly complete idea of exactly what constituted the Anacletan leadership ideal. Since we have already used the source extensively for our account of the Papacy from 1100 to 1124, we shall content ourselves here

with merely a brief outline of the ideological aspects of the work.

Pandolf wrote the Vita Gelasii sometime after 1132, the Vita Calixti after 1132 and before 1139, and the Vita Honorii between 1133 and 1138.[114] Most of the Vita Paschalis, whether we consider the author to be Peter of Pisa, Pandolf, or Peter Pierleoni, was written after 1116.[115] Thus we have four works which came from pro-Anacletan sources, three of which were composed during the schism itself and may therefore be taken as good examples of the Anacletan view of the papal leader and an index to the nature of the papal office. In all four lives both the papal office and the personality of the ideal man who will fill it conform to strict Gregorian concepts and are directly opposed to the ideal papal leader as envisioned by Bernard of Clairvaux, the real leader of the Innocentian forces, and Innocent II himself, the official leader.

In all four of the lives mentioned the ideal leader is conceived to have been noble. Pandolf notes that this was especially true of Calixtus and Gelasius, and, as we have seen, he is especially contemptuous of Honorius (plebe comitatus Bononiensium, ...litteratus tamen, homo porcini moris et in specie bubalus).[116] Furthermore, the ideal pope is seen as learned, especially in the liberal arts. Gelasius II becomes a paragon of this particular quality as opposed to the anti-Gregorian Honorius, who is described as "litteratus tamen."[117] The ideal pope is also an administrator above

all, a man of action, not of contemplation. This is seen especially to have been the case of Calixtus II, who directed the Papacy as though it had been a kingdom. In other words, the pope is worldly; although he is supposed to be a religious man, his religiosity is that of the sacerdote, not of the monk. This consideration leads us to posit a fourth aspect of the ideal pope. That is his relation to the great traditional centers of the Gregorian Reform movement. Cluny and Monte Cassino, as we have shown above, played important roles in the Gregorian Reform, and that Paschal, Gelasius, and Calixtus should have come from these centers of learning was most important to Pandolf. Again, there is the contrasting situation of Honorius, who had not even been a monk (so far as is known) but had become allied with the new fanatical religious orders. Since the new orders were the very life force of the Innocentian party, they can hardly have been viewed as a healthy force in the Church by the Anacletans.

Apart from the education in the liberal arts which Pandolf envisions for his ideal leader, a further training is looked upon as desirable. This is training in the Curia, either as a cardinal or as a member of the bureaucracy housed in the Lateran Palace. It is true that Calixtus did not fulfill the latter requirement and that Honorius did, so we cannot insist that Pandolf made this an iron rule. But it will be noted that of the numerous cardinal creations which he mentions the greater part are emanations from the

service of the Papacy. Furthermore, he is especially kind in his handling of Gelasius II and notes with particular emphasis that this pope, remembering his own service among the notarii et scrinarii of the Curia, raised a good number to the purple after he became pope.[118]

After Pandolf's ideal pope has been trained, either in the schools or (as Calixtus II) in the practical field of episcopal administration, he then is considered fit to occupy the papal office. But the occupation of that office hinges upon the acceptance by the pope of certain ideological precepts as well as certain political ones. Both of these groups of precepts are further dependent upon the nature of the pontifical office itself. Pandolf conceives of the papal office in pure Humbertine terms. It is for this reason that the lives of the popes which he wrote are little more than descriptions of ceremonies of election, consecration, cardinal creations, etc., or (in the case of Honorius II) of the lack of such phenomena.[119] Viewed in their broadest lines, the three pontificates about which Pandolf writes were merely a series of ceremonies in which a representative of the Roman Curia directed the destinies of the Church through the proper functioning of certain prescribed ceremonies. Particularly important to Pandolf is the ceremony of papal election, for it is by this ceremony and this alone that a pope becomes leader of the Church community.

It is in the papal election ceremony that the pope, the leader of the Christian community, is vested with the

power which resides permanently in the clergy and people of Rome. One might recall the irregular election of Calixtus II, Pandolf notes that Calixtus immediately notified "Peter of Porto and all the cardinals and people of Rome."[120] It is this body which meets and gives Calixtus the real power of Church leadership: "per domnum Petrum episcopum, per domnum Petrum Leonis, per cardinales omnes."[121] Gelasius II takes his power from the same source: "Paschalis papa defuncto,... Petrus Portuensis episcopus qui primatum post papam per longa iam diutius tempora detinuerat, cumque eo omnes presbiteri ac diaconi cardinales de eligendo pontifice, et in commune communiter et singulariter singuli pertractare ceperunt...." The unanimity and harmony of these elections, the spontaneous character which Pandolf ascribes to them, stand in violent contrast to the "Bernardine" pope, Honorius II, who had been "elevated by the laity."[123] In the Vita Paschalis we have seen a similar representation. The electors of Paschal II are described as "patres cardinalis et episcopi, diaconi, primoresque Urbis, primiscrinii, et scribae regionarii...."[124] and the pastoral care is given Paschal by the "populus Urbis, te elegit clerus, te collaudant patres...."[125] Finally, Paschal is pictured as dying "inter manus cardinalium, filiorum suorum...."[126] In sum, so far as Pandolf and the author of the Vita Paschalis are concerned the papal power resides in the clergy and people of Rome and it can be acquired only through the consent of that group, acting through the entire Curia.

This concept of the papal office is complemented by another concept, the idea of Rome as the real as well as ideal capital of Christianity. As we have seen, Romgedanke had taken root with the Gregorian Reform and had been nourished by it. Over the years, this ideological current had come to be symbolized by an extensive literary tradition, the effective administrative centralization which distinguished the Gregorian Reform, and the close co-operation between the Papacy and the Pierleoni. In the Liber Pontificalis of Pandolf and in the Vita Paschalis of Peter of Pisa (or Peter Pierleoni) the connections between the Pierleoni family and the Papacy are stressed to an excessive degree. The three ideal popes are shown to have been saved time after time by this family, while the villain pope, Honorius II, is shown to have betrayed the same family.[127] One is left to draw one's own conclusion about which group is the defender of Gregorian papal ideals after a comparison of the vitae of Paschal, Gelasius, and Calixtus with that of Honorius.

In a similar manner, Peter of Porto is given a central role in the Papacy of the first quarter of the twelfth century. As papal vicar of Rome he is vested with the highest dignity of the city after the pope himself.[128] Obviously, here was an attempt on the part of Pandolf to cast Peter of Porto in a key role so that his confirmation of the election of Anacletus might carry more weight.

Now Pandolf's effort is not without merit. His

propaganda was so skillfully handled that generations of historians have gone to him for information concerning papal election ceremonies unaware that the picture presented by Pandolf was possibly marred by the interest which that writer had in making his candidate's case in the election of 1130 appear more valid than that of Innocent II. For essentially what we have in the work of Pandolf when he describes papal elections is possibly a description of papal election in 1130 over and over with only the characters changed. Let us note how easily Peter Pierleoni fits into the roles assigned to Paschal, Gelasius, and Calixtus.

In the first place, Peter Pierleoni is noble. He is not only from a noble Roman family, he is from a noble Roman family which has distinguished itself in the cause of the papacy for nearly seventy years. He was educated in the liberal arts, just as was Gelasius, having been sent to Paris by a cultivated father to receive the highest training in the liberal arts. Like Paschal and Calixtus, Peter Pierleoni had been intimately associated with Cluny in its most brilliant cultural period and, incidentally, in the period in which that monastery embraced unreservedly the papal policy. Then Peter Pierleoni had been a cardinal-deacon in the Curia for eight years and a cardinal-priest for ten. In the first period he had commanded troops in the defense of Paschal II and in the second he had distinguished himself as Calixtus' legate in France, England, and Scotland. Finally, it had been his family who had been

martyred by what the Anacletans conceived to have been the fanatical zeal of Honorius II. Yet in the interests of unity and Church harmony Peter Pierleoni had stayed the power of arms at his command and awaited his election to the Papacy in the ordinary way. Now, Peter Pierleoni claims the papal power which has been vested in him in the same way in which that power had been vested in his Gregorian predecessors. That this is true will be seen in the two pamphlets written by Peter of Porto and Peter of Pisa on Anacletus' behalf.

The letters of Peter of Porto and Peter of Pisa are the fundamental sources for the factual narrative of the events of the schism because both of these writers represent to an ultimate degree the ideals of the Anacletan party. Both men are canonists. Both therefore believe that the papal power can be conferred only by correct procedure and ceremony. For them the leadership power in the Christian community is pre-eminently Amtscharismatic, official. As a result, both men, ardently believing in their cause, attempt to set forth the process by which Anacletus II came into power. They omit no detail which is pertinent, and they seem to have a fervent belief that all that is necessary is to show that Innocent II and his supporters did not act by either the spirit or the letter of the papal electoral law and that their candidate did. This accomplished, they are content to wait and have all Christendom flock to their standard. Their view of the papal office is based upon the

assumption that leadership is conferred in a series of formal ceremonies. The failure of the Anacletan cause lies in the fact that his adherents were unable to see that the mass, now made articulate through the new reform movement, no longer recognized such a concept of leadership. The mass and the new reform recognized only charismatic, exemplary leadership, and under their scheme of values leadership in the religious community was obtained only through the possession of the highest moral life.

Consider the epistle of Peter of Pisa to Diego of Compostella. The basic assumptions upon which Peter erects his arguments are easily seen. It is interesting to note that he does not state exactly where the right of election lay prior to the formation of the electoral committee on 12 February, 1130. However, he does state that the entire College of Cardinals had been convened to consider the question: "communi cardinalium et episcoporum consilio statutum est,..."[129] This would seem to indicate that papal election in 1130 was the province of the entire College and therefore depended upon the majority principle. He notes that the formation of the committee was extra-legal, but that this action was taken in the interests of peace.[130] He then formally accuses Aimerich of bad faith in the matter of control of the Frangipane towers which dominated the proposed place of election and draws the scene of the cardinals withdrawing from the monastery of St. Gregory as a protest of Aimerich's breach of canonical procedure. He then

specifically states that the election committee had ceased to function.[131] This meant that in Peter of Pisa's view the absolute power which that committee had assumed once more reverted to the College of Cardinals as a whole and that the greater part of that body had withdrawn to await in peace the death of the pope.

The description of Honorius' death and the ensuing election conducted by Aimerich is merely an account of the rupture of every law of electoral procedure known to the Curia. It is Peter of Pisa's view that this is exactly what happened, and he assumes that once the facts are made known his candidate's claim to the papal power will be recognized. In the process of his narration, he specifically states that the four cardinal-bishops who supported Aimerich and his candidate did not possess the right of election either.[132] Nowhere is there an attack upon Innocent's personality or moral worth, simply because as a canonist of the Gregorian era Peter of Pisa did not consider this a pertinent fact. The only personage in the whole of the Innocentian party to come under such attack is Aimerich, who is attacked because he is the disruptor of canonical process.[133]

After the Innocentian election has been described Peter of Pisa enters upon a justification of that of Anacletus II. He had already termed the cardinals who had withdrawn from the monastery of St. Gregory the "maior et sanior pars" of the College of Cardinals.[134] What did he mean by this term? In Peter's context the meaning was easily comprehended (it

is only with the Innocentians that it becomes vague and confused). The Anacletan cardinals were "maior" in that they were a numerical majority of the College of Cardinals. They were also the oldest members of the Curia in terms of service. Whether this made them "sanior" or not to Peter of Pisa is difficult to say. More probably Peter meant to imply by the use of the term "sanior" (sane, rational, discreet, sound) that the cardinals who had withdrawn were acting without guile, in a spirit of the law, in a spirit of fair play. The very fact that they had chosen the way of passive resistance (as they had in response to Honorius' coup in 1124) seems to indicate the preference of this meaning. If the term meant "more holy", that is, more sound doctrinally, as it did for the Innocentians, it could mean this to Peter only because the cardinals of the majority group were acting with complete faith in canon law procedure.

In any event, it is this "maior et sanior pars" of the Curia to which is given the right of election, and in the election they are merely exercising their traditional right, a right which the Innocentians have forfeited by acting in bad faith and against canon law procedure. After hearing that Honorius has been buried, they proceed to the election. The election of Anacletus II is, in Gregorian fashion, "deliberatio consilio, expetente populo cum honoratorum consensu pari et communi voto..."[135] and it is described further as "unanimiter, concorditer, feliciter."[136] The consecration is described in the same terms, always keeping in mind the

way in which tradition is being served:

> et ad beati Petri apostoli basilicam in hymnis et laudibus, sicut consuetudo ecclesiae est, per viam sacram deduxerunt atque sacratissimam eius cathedram imponentes secunda dominica quadragesima venerabilis senex Petrus Portuensis... eum in Romanum Pontificem ad altari beati Petri celeberrime consecrarunt. Unde secundum antiquam Romani ordinis normam coronata est civitas, laetitia fuit clero, exultatio in populo, miseris et oppressis dulce solamen.[137]

And then Peter summarizes his letter thus:

> Hunc itaque Papam canonice electum, regulariter substitutum, ecclesia Romana cognoscit, alium nescit, alium prorsus reprobat et abdicat.[138]

The issue is thus set squarely upon the canonicity of Anacletus' election. The Anacletans, with their faith in the efficacy of a logical, legal, objective argument, rested here. They did not realize that to Bernard of Clairvaux and his followers the epistemological assumptions upon which such an argument rested had been overthrown.

The letter of Peter of Porto to his brother bishops does not tell us much more about the election itself, but it is also an excellent index of the psychology of the Anacletan party and once more eloquently demonstrates the lack of color (if canonical soundness) which their case presented. The letter also shows that Vacandard's evaluation of Peter of Porto as "senile" is hardly well delivered, for in this letter the aged bishop shows surprising acuteness in discerning the real nature of the Innocentian propaganda offensive and the desire of the Innocentians to avoid a showdown on the question of canonical legality of their candidate's claim.

Peter of Porto begins his epistle with a castigation of the personal vituperation in which the Innocentians are indulging. As a Gregorian canonist he looks upon such activity as quite beside the point. He asks them rather to consider the questions involved.

> De commendation seu vituperatione personarum et quibus nunc sermonum varietas agitatur, non est hujus temporis judicare, est qui quaerat et judicet....Abstinere vos potius convenit a sermonibus otiosis et verbis praecipitationis: si de rumobibus agitur, longe se aliter habet res quam vestrae apud me litterae protestantur.[139]

Then Peter of Porto, like Peter of Pisa, invites the opposition to a consideration of what has transpired in the "light of reason," in consideration of the canonical procedure of election.

> Ad haec, si verba quae posuistia, si ordinis rationem attenditis, (ut, salva reverentia vestra, loquar) factionem illam vestram qua confidentia, qua fronte electionem vocare praesumitis?[140]

Here then Peter of Porto has laid the matter firmly on the base of canonical legality, formal leadership ideas. He criticises the Innocentian election process in the same terms as had Peter of Pisa:

> Cur illum vestrum dicitis ordinatum, cum prorsus in causa ejus ordo non fuerit? Siccine dididistis papam eligere? in angulo, in abscondito, in tenebrosis et umbra mortis? Si mortuo papa vivum succedere volebatis, cur mortuum vivere praedicabatis? multo melius erat mortuo humanitatem impendere, et sic de vive solatio cogitare. Sed ecce, dum de mortuo solatium vivo requiritis, et vivum et mortuum pariter suffocastis.[141]

Then Peter of Porto gives his idea of the process of papal election, criticizing the four cardinal-bishops for assuming

the power of election as they have done: "Postremo, nec vestrum, sicut nec meum, fuit eligere, sed potius electum a fratribus spernere vel approbare."[142] This means that Peter of Porto, a cardinal-bishop, specifically denied that the order of cardinal-bishops had the right of election as an order. It also means that in his view the papal election decree of 1059, in the "papal" version, was not the recognized canon governing papal elections in 1130. He further criticizes his brother cardinal-bishops for ignoring the legal process of election once they have assumed the power of electing the pope:

> Quod igitur, neglecto ordine, contempto canone, spreto etiam ipso a vobis, condito anathemate, me inconsulto priore vestro, inconsultis etiam fratribus majoribus et prioribus, nec etiam vocatis aut expectatis, cum essetis novitii et in numero brevi paucissimi, facere praesumpsistis, pro infecto habendum esse, et nihil omnino existere, ex ipsa vestra aestimatione potestis advertere....Redite, iam redite ad cor: nolite schisma in ecclesiae facere.[143]

After this warning, Peter of Porto then cites the authority by which Anacletus II has assumed the papal power. This authority is described in the same terms used by Peter of Pisa and Pandolf:

> ...cardinales, quorum praecipua est in electione potestas, cum clero in universo expetente populo, cum honoratorum consensu, in luce, in manifesto, unanimi voto et desiderio, elegerunt dominum Petrum cardinalem in Romanum pontificem Anacletum. Hanc ego electionem canonicem celebratem conspexi et auctore Deo confirmavi.[144]

Once more the appeal to tradition. The cardinals hold the right of election, the people participate, and the leader

is unanimously chosen. The last sentence sums up as well as any could the whole of the Anacletan position. It is as simple as that: "I saw that this election was held according to canon law and I confirmed it with the sanction of God." This was the Anacletan position.

The electoral decree of Anacletus and the announcement of his election by the cardinals both assume that the papal power resided in the College of Cardinals as a whole. These two epistles are typical of the whole corpus of Anacletan official documents. In Anacletus' announcement of election we find: "Cardinales et omnis clerus Romanus expetente omni populo...me licet indignum in papam Anacletum unanimiter elegerunt."[145] In the same epistle one finds the idea of participation of the entire Roman clergy and populace: "cardinales ecclesiae Romanae presbyteri et diacones et subdiacones, primicerius cum omni schola et ordinibus palatii ...expetente omni populo cum honoratorum devotissimo assensu ...me licet indignum in papam Anacletum unanimiter elegerunt..."[146] The Anacletan "electors" contain the same diverse factions of the Roman clergy: "nos omnes cardinales presbyteri et diacones cum subdiaconibus, primicerio cum omni schola palatii in basilica b. Marci concordi voluntate convenimus!"[147] Then, announcing the election: "Cui rei se impotentem frater ille cognoscens communi omnium nostrum consilio, communi consensu, expetente populo, consentientibus honoratis eundem d. papam nobiscum communiter elegit."[148] On the other hand the election of Innocent II is described

as "non petitione populi, non spontanes cleri electione, nec honoratorum consensu iuxta synodales regulas et antiquas patrum nostrorum traditiones ad apostolatus culmen assumptum, sed vi parentum, potentia fratrum, fustibus et sanguine nobisque nolentibus subrogatrum?"[149] Thus, for the Anacletans, the issues were clearly discernable: Anacletus II had adhered to the Roman electoral tradition, in which the pope assumed his power by the will of the clergy and people of Rome acting through their representative, the entire College of Cardinals and the Curia. The constant inclusion of the civil service staff of the Lateran in the electoral decrees seems to indicate that Anacletus looked upon the Curia as such as a source of power. Here he acted purely within the tradition of Bruno of Segni, Guy of Vienne, and Gerard of Angouleme--in sum, in the tradition of radical Gregorian thought in the Curia.

Therefore, for the Anacletans, the issue of the double election was to be settled by an appeal to law, to, as Peter of Porto said, reason. In their eyes the tradition of election was sufficiently clear and it was easy to see that their candidate followed the tradition. Since Peter Pierleoni had been <u>legally</u> elected and formally vested with papal authority, he was the rightful leader of the Christian community. For the Anacletans personality did not enter into the picture. John of Cremona and Aimerich were castigated, but because they had broken the law, not because they had committed a morally reprehensible crime which had

contained essentially the same formulary as that sent out by Anacletus. Innocent claimed unanimous election: "Quod ego dignus non fui episcopi et catholici cardinales me licet invitum et renitentem in Romanum pontificem unanimiter elegerunt."[150] It will be noted that a qualifying adjective has been inserted before the term "cardinales" and that this word is "catholici". The cardinals who elected Innocent II are "Catholic", i.e., "orthodox", cardinals.[151] Before any word has been given of the schism itself, the Innocentians have prepared their followers in the provinces for the shock. They are cast in the role as defenders of orthodoxy, not of tradition, but of faith. Secondly, it was not immediately apparent whether Innocent had been elected by the cardinal-bishops and the rest of the cardinals, or by only the cardinal-bishops. The manifesto of the electors of Innocent states: "Nos episcopi et cardinales Gregorium...in summum pontificem elegimus."[152] One thing was certain, however, Innocent did not attempt to base his election upon the support of the clergy and people of Rome or the whole of the Curia. His position on this question was confirmed at the Lateran Council of 1139, when he held that from that time on papal elections would be the province solely of the College of Cardinals.

However, by April, 1130, after it had become apparent that the Anacletans were winning in Rome, Innocent II sent epistles to Lothar III, asking him for aid in quelling the revolt of Pierleoni and his conspirators. Here Pierleoni

deprived the Anacletans of office in the Church hierarchy. The Innocentians, on the other hand, saw the situation in an entirely different light.

To the Innocentians the crisis in the Church was such as to justify the extraordinary measures taken by them in electing Innocent II. In their view the pope still had to be elected by the cardinals, but the group of cardinals who possessed the power of election was now strictly delineated. With a kind of logic which is common among fanatical theologians, the Innocentians argued in effect that the group of cardinals which possessed the power of election of the pope was determined by their ability to perceive the nature of the crisis which existed in the Church community and their willingness to take the kind of action necessary to repair the situation. In fact, the "sanior pars" of the Curia is that group which is actively engaged in cleansing the Church. This is the whole of the qualification required. One needs no official status. One is a member of the "sanior pars" of the College of Cardinals if he is willing to commit himself to Innocent's cause. This is what "sanior pars" means; it means the ability to discern the moral issues at stake in the double election. With the acceptance of such a view the whole of the Gregorian legal structure is threatened, and we are on the verge of the leadership revolution which will replace it with charismatic ideals.

Let us consider the official position taken by the Innocentian party. Innocent's letter announcing his election

was compared to Judas in that both had tried to plunge the world into a darkness from which it could never be saved. It is in these attempts to enlist the aid of the temporal powers that the Innocentian position and interpretation of the papal office bagan to become apparent. The first overtures of Hubert of Lucca to Norbert of Magdeburg reveal the development of the Innocentian position.

Hubert of Lucca had a double purpose. He wanted to show that his candidate had been legally elected and he wanted to demonstrate that his candidate was also superior to Anacletus II morally. The former end he hoped to achieve by showing the development of what he considered the Anacletan conspiracy. The formation of the electoral committee is his point of departure. He notes that the electoral committee decided that it would be governed by a unanimous vote (communiter) or by the part of the committee which was of sounder counsel ("vel a parte sanioris consilii").[153] He portrays Peter Pierleoni as swearing to the terms of the committee's formation so as to better demonstrate what a rebel he is. The oath stated that "should anyone attempt to elect another pontiff, what he might do would be taken as not done and he himself allowed no longer to hold office in the Church."[154] By having the Anacletans swear to such an oath, Hubert sought to construct a situation wherein the Anacletans would be shown to be devoid of any authority whatsoever. In his subsequent narration of the withdrawal of Peter Pierleoni from the assembly and of the double election, Hubert

does in fact so argue. It is Innocent's cardinals who are the "Catholic" cardinals, not the Anacletans. These latter do not even hold office in the Church any longer. Of course, Peter of Pisa argued that Aimerich had "by his bad faith" caused the ill will which had resulted in the withdrawal of the "maior et sanior pars" of the College of Cardinals. Hubert does not mention the withdrawal of the cardinals. He implies that Peter Pierleoni and Jonathon withdrew in order to organize the attack upon the monastery of St. Gregory which occurred on the following day. The withdrawal and the attack automatically deprived the Anacletan cardinals of their office in the Church, by the terms of the electoral committee procedural rules. This is why Hubert of Lucca then discusses the death and burial of the Pope Honorius, saying that the obsequies were held "as time and place would allow, yet in quite due form, considering that a disturbance was imminent."[155] The Anacletans were already in schism as far as Hubert was concerned.

Hubert's whole thesis thus depends upon the assumption that the electoral committee was still the governing body of the election. If this was not true, then he could not argue that the Anacletans had forfeited their offices. This is also why he implies that the committee was assembled after Honorius had been buried: "de octo personis ad electionem electis, Praenestinus, Sabinensis, B. Rufus, A. Cancellarius, quintus Gregorium cardinalium...invitum et omnibus modis renitentem, cum religiosis viris episcopis,

cardinalibus presbyteris, diaconibus, et subdiaconibus, in summum pontificem elegerunt, cum Petro Leonis, qui erat octavius, P. Pisano sexto et Jonathon septimo remanentibus."[156] Here Hubert wishes to imply that the committee had chosen Innocent II and his election had been approved by all of the Curia, a claim which Innocent had not been willing to make before. As we shall see, they will soon abandon this position. The germs of the change to come are here, however, for in the qualification "religiosis viris episcopis, etc..." we have a variation upon the "Catholic" party theme and a step in the direction of the full acceptance of the "sanior et melior pars" concept of rank.

Underlying the letter of Hubert is the assumption that the two parties are split along lines other than legal. Somehow the Innocentians consider themselves as carriers of a mission. They are the young but "good" men in the Curia who are opposed by the ambitious and avaricious men of the Curia who are led by Pierleoni. Peter Pierleoni's role is seen as the epitome of everything bad which St. Bernard had found in the Curia. His seeking of the papal office, it is implied, is only for secular ends. He has assumed the cappa rubea through force, through conspiracy, through simony.[157] Innocent II, who is pure, will cleanse the Church of the injustices wrought by men of this stamp.

It is the good men versus bad men theme that we find in the letter of Walter of Ravenna to Norbert of Magdeburg. In this letter all pretense at regarding legal procedure as

important has been dropped and the issue is put squarely on a moralistic basis. Walter merely states that Innocent II was "unanimously" elected by the four cardinal-bishops in the College and that his election was approved by the remainder of the "Catholic" cardinals.[158] In a similar letter to Conrad of Salzburg, Walter even left out the qualifying "Catholic": "Statim summo mane...a IV episcopis necnon a maiori parte cardinalium electionem apostolicam de d. Gregorio...factum fuisse."[159] Thus, he argued that a clear majority of the cardinals elected Innocent, a statement which was true only if he assumed that the rules of the electoral committee's formation had been abrogated. But if he had assumed this he would not have had to use the term "major part", for all of the remaining cardinals had elected Innocent. Of course, all of this confusion only serves to document our thesis that the Innocentians were not interested in presenting a closely reasoned legal brief to mystics such as Norbert. Rather they were interested in showing that an Antichrist had seized Rome and that this Antichrist was being opposed by Innocent, who was a "vir sobrium, prudentem, castum, mansuetum, humilem, omnique morum honestate"[160] and who had been elected "by the grace of the Holy Spirit."[161] At the same time, Pierleoni's Jewish background is exhumed.[162] With Walter of Ravenna's letter from Rome, the Innocentian propaganda takes a line which is consummated in the Council of Etampes.

At the Coundil of Etampes St. Bernard of Clairvaux

officially joined the Innocentian party and defined its program. For six months after the schism had first been apparent the kings of Christendom refused to recognize either claimant to the papal power. Innocent had lost Rome in April, 1130, and this seriously hurt him in terms of prestige.[163] In the spring of 1130, as soon as it had become apparent that the schism would not be healed in Rome, Louis VI of France had called for a council to be convened for the purpose of deciding which of the claimants should be supported by the churches of France.[164] Louis was a personal friend of both Pierleoni and his father and was loathe to judge against him. We must suppose, on the other hand, that Suger of St. Denis, the king's minister, who was a fast friend now of St. Bernard,[165] was using his influence for Bernard's candidate. We do not know why the council was not convened in the spring as had been originally planned although, since any delay worked in Innocent's favour, we must assume that Suger and possibly Bernard had something to do with this. Innocent was now on his way to France from Pisa. In August 1130 he was in Genoa. By September 1130 he was a guest at the monastery of St. Aegidius.[166] It was not until August-September 1130 that the council finally did convene to consider the claims of the rival popes.

Details of this council are lacking. We must suppose, however, that Aimerich, or at least his agents, were there. The French king was not alone in his reluctance to settle

the issue between the two popes; he was joined in this recalcitrance by Henry of England and Lothar.[167] We do know that the council was heavily attended, with all of the leading ecclesiastical lights of France present.[168] This means that Innocent's group was already a favorite, for both Matthew of Albano and Aimerich had been influential and respected members of the French clergy before their promotion to the cardinalcy. In fact, of the French cardinals in the Curia only one, Giles of Tusculo, did not oppose Anacletus.[169] All of the others went with Matthew and Aimerich.

Now, although the great names of the French clergy were present at Etampes, men such as Hildebert of Lavardin and Gerard of Angouleme were not given the role of deciding which of the popes' claims were legal. Instead, the official ecclesiastical hierarchy and the temporal princes assembled at Etampes deferred their judgement to Bernard of Clairvaux.[170] His judgement was to be definitive. Friends of Bernard have noted this as a tribute to the holiness of the saint.[171] But in their exultation they have neglected to observe that such action sounded the death-knell of the Gregorian legalistic-administrative complex. Now a simple abbot, without any other official position in the Church, is to step forward and decide which of two claimants to the Roman See will have it. The distance between Rome and Etampes was measured in more than kilometers. Innocent II, in traveling the path between the two cities, formally recognized the victory of a new ideology in the Church.

He also admitted openly that there were now at least two sources of authority in the Church and thus two sources of leadership for the Christian community.

The Council of Etampes is the close of a cycle which began when Peter Damiani was sent by Hildebrand and Alexander II to treat with the antipope Cadalus and the German clergy and nobility at the Assembly of Augusburg in 1062. Damiani's mission, for which he had prepared his Disceptatio Synodalis, was, as we have seen above, a failure in Hildebrand's eyes, for it granted too much to the secular power. Damiani's concept of the papal power was not that of Gregory. The difference was the difference between a politician and a mystic. The Disceptatio had been left to rust from lack of use in the Gregorian ideological armory, and the Gregorians had gone on to the formulation of revolutionary new concepts of Church and State relations. Creative leaders had been recruited for the leadership of the Church which had made the loss of men such as Damiani unimportant. But now the power on the extremities of the Church society was once more in balance with that in the center. The real power of the Church community, as a religious community was now in France. When Saint Bernard was given the task of conferring official leadership on one of two claimants to the papal chair, he was in fact himself vested with the real leadership of that community. For the first time since Gregory VII it was officially admitted that the official power in the Church and the charismatic power were not

vested in the same person.

The calling of an abbot to decide such an issue is unthinkable in Gregorian terms. A Gregorian pope would not even countenance the convocation of such a council, and no doubt Anacletus II did ignore it. Innocent II, on the other hand, waited in Cluny, waited for the word from the real power sources of the Christian community to confer his authority upon him definitively.[172] Let us review the events of the council and note the psychology of which they are a part.

In the first place, we must see Bernard of Clairvaux in his relation to the Papacy and see the Council of Etampes in relation to the career of the saint. Prior to 1130 Bernard had been critic of the Church par excellence. From the time of his first epistle in 1119, decrying the decadence of the Roman Curia and promising a day of judgement to his judges, until 1124, Bernard shared little in the triumphs of the official Church. In these years the Curia brought the anti-imperial war to a successful close. In 1124, after Honorius' accession, Bernard suddenly became a warm friend of the Papacy, a fact due to his own rising prestige, which no official leader of the Church could afford to ignore, as well as to his close relations with certain mystical members of the Curia itself, especially those new men whom Honorius had introduced into the Curia to direct his monastic reform, Aimerich, Matthew of Albano, et al. During this period, Bernard was still a critic of

abuses in the Church at large and in the Curia, but he had become a friendly critic, pointing out places where the eye of the Pope and his legates had overlooked abuses which needed correction. In 1130, Bernard emerges as master of the Papacy, and the Pope and the Curia from this time on (in the word's of Bloch) shrink to mere figureheads for the exercise of Bernard's iron will. Now he embraces wholeheartedly the program of the Innocentians in the Curia; he can judge the same group which had ruled against him and in favor of Pontius in 1119. And, ironically enough, after 1130 and until 1153, it seems not an exaggeration to state that although formally any one pope was all-powerful in the Church, each one of them were dependent in no small sense upon the support of Bernard. For the twenty years following the Council of Etampes the real power of the Church is held by a mystic, a monk without official power, a true charismatic leader.

Bernard had little if any knowledge of canon law. We need not discuss his intellectual background, since it is unimportant here, but it is obvious from only a brief perusal of his writings that the Old and New Testaments are the basis of his intellectual élan. His role as critic of the Church was justified in his own mind, more than likely, by his reading of the acts of the Old Testament prophets; at least, this is the impress one receives after reading the accounts of his actions at the Council of Etampes.

Bernard appeared at Etampes to decide the issue between

Innocent and Anacletus. Bernard did not "read up" on canon law in preparation for his trying the case. He prepared himself as an Old Testament prophet might have done. In the biography of Bernard written by his friend and student, Ernald of Bonnevale, one is aware of a conscious imitation of the Old Testament prophet ideal. Ernald describes Bernard's entrance into the council thus:

> Non mediocriter pavidus et tremebundus advenit, periculum quippe et pondus negotii non ignorans. In itinere tamen consolatus est eum Deus, ostendens ei in visu noctis Ecclesiam magnam concorditer in Dei laudibus concinentem; unde speravit pacem sine dubio proventuram. Ubi vero ad locum ventum est, celebrato jejunio, et precibus ad Deum fusis, cum de eodem verbo tractaturi Rex et episcopi cum principibus consedissent, unum omnium consilium fuit, una sententia, ut negotium Dei, Dei famulo imponeretur, et ex ore ejus causa tota penderet.[173]

Here is the prophet ideal expressed in perfect terms: "God's servant should be charged with God's business"--no council, no lawyers, no kings. The charismatic ideal had triumphed. One is reminded of Elijah, of Amos, Hosea, or even St. Anthony who came from the desert and in a a fury born of "divine ignorance" defeated the "wise men and philosophers" of the cities. In his debate with Abelard at Sens St Bernard had apparently been similarly inspired. He tells of his preparation for the debate with the great dialectician in one of his letters. Here again was charisma in action:

> Occurri ad locum et diem, imparatus quidem et immun-immunitus, nisi quod illud mente volvebam, 'Nolite praemeditari, qualiter respondeatis: dabitur enim vobis in illa hora quid loquamini' et illud, 'Dominus mihi adjutor, non timebo quid faciat mihi homo.'[174]

Thus it was the prophet who dominated the Council of Etampes. The nobility, the higher clergy, princes, all awaited his word on the matter of the schism. The Anacletans, canonists that they were, had based their case upon the form, the process of the election. Here they rested. But according to William of Malmesbury this question was not even raised at the council.[175] Suger of St. Denis notes with satis-satisfaction that all such considerations as these were brushed aside and that the discussion of the double election "turned rather upon the character of the person elected than upon the election itself."[176] Ernald, Bernard's biographer, cites three reasons for his master's choice of Innocent II: order of election, the merit of the electors, and the lives and reputations of the elected (electionis ordinem, electorum merita, vitam famamque prioris electi).[177] It is interesting to note that in the life of Peter the Venerable of Cluny the right of the council to weigh the matter was denied.[178] But there was little need for worry on the part of Peter and Innocent; Bernard had the situation well in hand. In fact, Ernald gives us a clue concerning Bernard's predilection for the Innocentian cause. He notes that the men who supported Innocent were "plures numero et saniores consilio, vita probabiles, viri virtutum, presbyteri, diaconi, episcopi, Innocentium elegerunt, cujus vita, et fama, et aetas, et scientia digna summo sacerdotio habebantur."[179]

Bernard's rationalization for his choice of Innocent can be found in a number of letters written between 1130 and

1138 and directed to a number of prelates and nobles who were not willing to accept the saint's authority as final in the matter at hand. Such prelates as Hildebert of Lavardin and Gerard of Angouleme were not certain that the facts merited Bernard's decisions. Gerard of Angouleme had taken all of Acquitaine with him into schism, and he was firmly backed by his lay lord William. The Emperor Lothar was not convinced, and King Henry of England entertained the most serious doubts concerning the legality of Innocent's claims. The King of Scotland and the Scottish clergy remained loyal to Anacletus until the time of his death in 1138. The city of Milan was loyal to Innocent's opponent, and Roger II of Sicily supported his cause.[180]

The most important letter in the Bernardine corpus is that written to the clergy of Acquitaine attempting to sway them from Gerard's leadership. The first seven chapters are spent trying to destroy Gerard's character. After this had been accomplished to Bernard's satisfaction, the attack was mounted against Anacletus II. Here we see the Bernardine propaganda machine at its efficient best and the formal appeal to the ascetic hierarchy of values which characterizes Bernard's position. Bernard states that Anacletus has invaded the Church "by fire, by the sword, and by money, but not by the merit of his virtue(Invasit, inquam, invasit armis, igne, pecunia, non vitae merito vel virtutum)."[181] It will be noted that Bernard's chief objection to Anacletus is the fact that he has attained to the papal office in a way which does not hinge upon his personal morality. He seeks to lead the

Christian community by formal symbols of office--not by the merit of his personal life. Bernard has completely ignored the canonical process involved. He assumed that the key to office in the Church is and should be morality. Leadership in the Church must be won; it was not to be merely conferred. Ignoring Anacletus' claim to having the majority of the College of Cardinals behind him, Bernard writes to the clergy of Acquitaine: "Nam illa quam jactat juratorum suorum non electio sed factio, umbra tantum fuit, et occasio, et velamentum malitiae."[182] Here Bernard shows that he either accepted the account of the election set forth by men like Hubert of Lucca, or (what was more likely the case) he was in the confidence of the Innocentian party in Rome from the beginning. Bernard's work is, in sum, little more than that of Hubert of Lucca: propaganda designed to undercut the concept of legality of election upon which the Anacletans were basing their case.

The weakest of the Bernardine arguments is presented as an argument from the canons. Bernard argues that according to the canons there is one principle "authentic and incontestable" and that is that after the first election there can be no second.[183] He is even willing to admit that Innocent's election was perhaps "conducted with too little solemnity; and not sufficiently according to the ordinary formalities, as the enemies of unity contend (Nam etsi quid minus forte solemniter, minusve ordinabiliter processit in ea quae praecessit, ut hostes unitatis contendunt)," but he argues that

this gives little justification for entering upon a schism before the first election had been properly evaluated.[184] This, of course, states the matter in such a way as to completely ignore the Anacletan arguement that an election "conducted with too little solemnity and not according to the ordinary formalities" was no election at all. One of the bulls of Anacletus had, in fact, stated the position of that party when noting that Innocent or any pope had to be elected "non in angulo, vel latibulo, sed in luce et in manifesto, ab universo Urbis clero et populo, ex deliberatio fratrum consilio, ex communi assensu et unanimi desiderio."[185]

In fact, the Anacletans had apparently made a request for a general council in which the dispute could be mediated, but Bernard would nothing of this proposal, looking upon his decision as final.[186] All doors were being closed; the old guard was to be exterminated, and the new order was to prevail in the Church. Of the Anacletan proposal for a general council, Bernard warns:

> Caeterum jam Deus judicavit quod sero repetit homo: judicavit autem operis evidentia, non decreti sententia. Numquid Dei judicium audeat humana temeritas retractare? Quid si causetur et clamet per prophetam Deus, Tulerunt homines a me judicium? Non est consilium contra consilium Domini: velociter currit sermo ejus, in conveniendo populus in unum et reges, ut domino papae Innocentio serviant et obediant.[187]

It will be noted that Bernard's judgment has been equated with the judgment of God in this passage. The prophet had spoken and God had revealed His will through the prophet: "Is it possible that human rashness would dare interpose an appeal from the judgment of God?"

Having equated his own judgment with the judgment of God, Bernard then took another tack, a tack which again had no bearing upon the canonical issues involved in the double election. He argues that the merit of the lives who support Innocent testifies to the rightness of Innocent's claim. Here, again, we are confronted with the ascetic concept of values. He writes:

> Dei esse judicium senserunt et consenserunt Gualterius Ravennas, Hildegarius Terraconensis, Norbertus Magdeburgensis, Conrad Salseburgensis, archiepiscopi. Dei esse judicium cognoverunt et acquiverunt episcopi, Equipertus Monasteriensis, Hildebrandus Pictoriensis, Bernardus Papiensis, Landulfus Astensis, Huog Gratianopolitanus, Bernardus Parmensis. Horum gloria specialis et praecipua sanctitas, et auctoritas etiam hostibus reverenda, facile nobis, qui minorem et meriti et officii tenemus locum, aut errare secum, aut sapere persuasit.[188]

Here again one is struck by the authority to which Bernard appeals in order to make his case. He appeals to the sanctity of the lives of the men supporting Innocent, the implication being that the holy man can do no wrong even if he does go in opposition to the canons. He implies (an implication given full force in his De Consideratione) that sanctity brings wisdom of a higher order. The whole of the Humbertine tradition has been swept away in these few sentences. Bernard states that it is unimportant whether these men know science, philosophy, or law. He writes:

> Hi omnes unanimes, non conducti pecunia non seducti fallacia, non illecti privato carnis vel cognationis amore, non timore compulsi potentiae saecularis, sed Dei procul dubio voluntatem, sicut non ignorantes, ita nec dissimulantes, Petrum Leonis ingenue refutaverunt, ac secure Gregorium in papam Innocentium susceperunt.[189]

In enumerating the supporters of Innocent's cause, Bernard did not ignore the prestige which support by the ascetic elements

of the Christian community could bring. He notes with especial emphasis that he should not pass over those holy men who, though dead to the world, live a better life in God; whose lives are hid in Christ and His glory, are consecrated solely to the search for the will of God, and submit themselves to that will with manifest zeal.[190] If the monks were to a man devoted to the cause of Innocent, what better testimony could there be to the holiness and righteousness of Innocent's cause? The ascetics are made the final court of appeal in Bernard's system, because, since they live apart from the world, it is they above all who are eminently qualified to judge the world. All of the reformed orders support Innocent: Cluny, Citeaux, Vallombrosa, the Calmaldoli, Chartreuse. What support could be more holy? Or, as Bernard put it: "Quis tot sanctorum millibus persuadere sufficiat, quod prius aedificaverunt,...Universae quippe Ecclesiae negotium est, non unius causa personae."[191]

As a variation on the theme, Bernard asked hypothetically:

> Sed esto. Mutet consilium suum Deus (secundem hominem dico), revocet sententiam, convocet a finibus terrae concilium; judicare bis in idipsum, quod ipse non facit, patiatur: quosnam, quaeso, dabunt judices sibi?[192]

If "the matter which He has judged be submitted to a second judgment...whom will they give Him for judges?" There could be but one answer--not the Curia in Rome--but the holy men of the Church as a whole.

In the last chapter of the epistle, Bernard musters his forces for a final attack upon the position held by the old guard. He ends his work with an evaluation of the morality

of the two men and the nature of the two elections:

> Duo itaque sunt de quibus contenditur, quisnam eorum rectius videatur esse Papa. Quorum primo quidem, si personas compares, ut neutri sane derogare videar, vel adulari, dicam quod dici passim reperies, et neminem arbitror diffiteri: quia videlicet Innocentii nostri vita vel fama nec aemulum timet, cum alterius nec ab amico tuta sit. Dehinc si electionis discutias, nostri itidem mox occurrit et promotione purior, et ratione probabilior, et prior tempore. Porro de tempore constat: reliqua duo merita probant, et dignitas eligentium. Hanc enim, ni fallior, partem saniorem invenies, tam episcopos, quam cardinales diaconos sive presbyteros, et quorum maxime interest de electione summi pontificis, et quanti in eligendo juxta patrum scita sufficiant. Quid et in consecratione? Nonne Ostiensem, ad quem specialiter utique spectat, habemus? Cum igitur et electus dignior, et electio sanior, et actio ordinabilior teneatur; qua isti ratione, imo qua contentione, contra jus et fas et vota omnium bonorum, invitae et renitenti Dei Ecclesiae praeficere alium, et illum deponere tentant?[194]

Note here that Bernard does not appeal to the that concept of papal election which grants the power of electing the pope to the cardinal-bishops. He argues that Innocent has the support of all three orders of the College of Cardinals"in sufficient number" to merit the title of pope. Such an assertion was false. In arguing that the Cardinal-bishop of Ostia had the special privilege of consecrating the pope[195] Bernard also stretched a point. And, finally, in arguing that his candidate was"more worthy of election" he had merely returned to his first position: that Innocent was more acceptable to the "holy men" of France, Germany, and Italy.

In the letters which followed that sent to the clergy of Acquitaine Bernard became more open in his reasons for supporting Innocent. In a letter to William of Acquitaine we find him listing the reasons for Innocent's claims being supported (and one notes the order in which they appear) as: a blameless

life, an unblemished character, and his canonical election.[197]

But men such as Hildebert of Lavardin were not eager to embrace a cause founded upon such shaky arguments.[198] Hildebert was a humanist and a canonist who had been a close friend of Pontius of Cluny.[199] Bernard did not attack him as he did Gerard of Angouleme, for Hildebert was not in schism. In his letter to the learned prelate, Bernard chose his words more carefully but nonetheless with his usual forcefulness of expression. To Hildebert he wrote that those who were of God gladly joined themselves to Innocent, but those of the opposite part were either of Antichrist or were Antichrist.[200] At the same time, Bernard managed an aside concerning the Roman people whom he thoroughly detesed.[201] He notes with glee that Innocent has thrown off the yoke of Romanity which had enslaved the Papacy for so long:"Driven from the city, he is welcomed by the world."[202] Here Bernard was heralding the fall of Romgedanke as the keystone of papal policy. And he ends his letter to Hildebert (an open admirer of the classical Roman tradition) by asserting that the threefold cord of the choice of the better sort, the assent of the majority, and "what is more important and effective in these matters," the witness of a pure life, commend Innocent to all, and "establish him as chief pontiff (summum confirmant pontificem)."[203]

In a similar letter written to one Magister Geoffrey of Loreto, Bernard likened Anacletus to the beast of the Apocalypse and affirmed that the Church was right in honoring Innocent "whose repubation is discovered to be the more honorable, and whose election is discovered to be the more sound and regular,

having the advantage as well by the merit as by the number of the electors."[204] There can be no doubt of the nature of Innocent's claim to the papal office. A revolution had been effected in the Church body social. The leader was now chosen by his moral worth, by the merit of personal life, and he held his power only so long as he maintained his superior morality. This was the fact of the schism of 1130--no matter how modern apologists try to make Bernard into some sort of canonist with just a different slant. The power of Innocent II ultimately depended upon the charismatic power of men such as Bernard of Clairvaux. The power of the leader of the Church was no longer the impersonal, administrative thing which the Gregorians had created. The power of the Papacy from 1130 to 1153 rested upon the ability of Bernard of Clairvaux and his like to sway the masses on any particular issue by the force of their personalities. Nowhere was this force shown to better advantage than in Bernard's relations with Henry I of England.

Henry I had been reluctant to accept Innocent II--not because of political reasons apparently, for by this time there were no issues between the English king and the popes. Henry, in sum, was not satisfied that the law of the Church had been satisfied either in the election at Rome or the confirmation of the election at Etampes. Our knowledge of Henry's position is derived solely from Bernard's letter to him. Here it becomes apparent that a moral issue was at stake. Bernard heard of Henry's fear of sinning in accepting

Innocent. His letter to the king is short and to the point, but it is a unique document--a document which shows the power that Bernard felt was his. To the king he asked,"Quid times? Times peccatum incurrere, si obedias Innocentio? Cogita quomodo de aliis peccatis tuis respondeas Deo; istud mihi relinque, in me sit hoc peccatum."[205] "Are you afraid of sinning by accepting Innocent?...Leave this one to me; I will answer for it!" Here Bernard had entered completely into the prophet psychology; and note that he does pardon Henry for his sins (as the priest would do); but he takes the sins of Henry upon his own head (as the monk does). This statement to Henry was the highpoint of the Innocentian offensive Not only does it show the degree to which the hierarchy had fallen under the sway of the monk. Now the holy man controls such prestige that by his offer to accept any sin incurred upon his own head the whole of the English hierarchy comes to the support of Innocent II. Nor were the English the only ones to fall before Bernard's zeal. Ernald states that Bernard used this argument on many occasions and always with success.[206] Innocent's victory, finally attained in 1138, was a result completely of Bernard's activity. The cardinals and bishops who adhered to Innocent could not even win Italy until Bernard descended upon that country like an angel of wrath.

In Milan the Archbishop Anselm had been a supporter of Anacletus and had succeeded in maintaining his power in that city even though a Cistercian monastery there had actively opposed him.[207] But the Cistercian agitation soon began to show results. There was a mass uprising in which Anselm was deposed

and a new archibishop appointed. The Council of Pisa, then in session and chaired by Innocent, supported the action of the mob and confirmed the archbishop.[208] The support given by Innocent II to the action of the mob was significant, for, although Anselm was a sympathizer of Anacletus, he had taken no overt action against Innocent. Innocent, in supporting the action of the mob, merely gave his approval to irregular actions in choosing one of the highest members of the hierarchy.

But here again Bernard had taken a direct part in the deposition of Anselm. It was he who was sent from Pisa by Innocent to give force to the papal ruling.[209] His entry into the city was a scene of nightmare proportions. He was hailed as a saint, his clothing torn to shreds for relics, and he was asked to heal the sick and dying. At one point. the Milanese attempted to make Bernard their archbishop, an honor which Bernard declined.[210] The final outcome of Bernard's visit was the confirmation of Roboald as Archbishop of Milan. In giving his decision on the matter, however, Bernard revealed how far he regarded the papal power to extend when it was under <u>his</u> direction. He argued that Rome was able to completely reshuffle the hierarchy if it so desired.[211] This is important to note, for it indicates that the Bernardine revolution did not deprive the Papacy of its theoretical absolutism as long as that absolutism was in the service of moral reform.[212] It is possibly on the basis of such statements as these that one English scholar has called Bernard the highpoint of Gregorianism.[213]

But, as we have noted, the theory of the Gregorian hierocracy carries with it the assumption that there exists in the Church a recognizable, objective series of relationships between the various offices of the hierocracy. Bernard in fact proposes not a graduated hierarchy but a kind of duality which eliminates all intermediaries between the saint-pope and the members of his flock. Bernard's leader will, in theory, deal with each individual case himself, personally, and if he deems it necessary to turn the whole hierocracy topsy-turvy, he will feel no compunction about so doing. For Bernard's theory of leadership is derived--like his epistemology--from his own experiences. The pope must be for Bernard, as he must be for Hugh of St. Victor, a great abbot. Bernard's ideal of papal leadership, in other words, is directly dependent upon the concept of leadership accorded to the abbot-general of the Cistercian Order. He has absolute power--but only so long as the daughter houses agree that he is not misusing it.

But all was not well in Milan. After Bernard had departed and Innocent had sent orders to the Milanese, another rebellion had broken out. Anselm had been once more placed in control. Bernard returned to Milan, once more swaying the people to his cause by the eloquence of his preaching and the force of his prestige.[214] Significantly, he could write to the Milanese--in a moment in which he felt the full force of his charismatic power:"Follow my counsel; I will never lead you into error. Take the role of the humble and mild, for God communicates to the humble and the earth is given to the meek and peaceful."[215] The holy man now claimed the infallibility which had been given

only to the popes under the Gregorians!

Another example of Bernard's charismatic power may be seen in the defeat he administered to the canonists who were defending Anacletus in a debate before Roger II of Sicily. On the occasion of Lothar's second expedition into Italy Roger II had moved his troops to Beneventum, threatening the Emperor with the same force which had resulted in a defeat in 1133.[216] Roger himself was in a difficult position. It was Anacletus II who had consecrated the new king of Sicily; but Anacletus' strenght was clearly on the wain, and Roger was seeking some way of deserting the Anacletan cause without indicating that he had not genuinely believed in the cause itself.[217] In order to give the appearance of honest error, Roger proposed to hear a debate between the two sides so that he could reconsider his position. Both sides were to send debating teams to the king's camp. The Anacletans chose Peter of Pisa, the Chancellor Matthre and one Cardinal Gregory to represent them. The Innocentians sent Gerard of Bologna (later Lucius II), a canonist, the Chancellor Aimerich, and Bernard of Clairvaux.[218]

Ernald stresses the dramatic nature of the debate--faith pitted against dialectic, Augustinian "sapientia" versus "scientia." Bernard supposedly was worried upon hearing that Peter of Pisa was to represent the Anacletans, for he had heard that Peter was most eloquent and second to none in law and science of the canons.[219] But Bernard prepared himself for this debate in the same way that he had prepared himself for the debate at Etampes.

Ernald's account of the debate is unusually acute, for, either knowingly or unknowingly, he managed to catch the drama of the conflict between canonist and mystic. Peter of Pisa was foredoomed to failure; the tide had turned against the dialectician and the canonist. It was the day of the mystic, and the mystic swept all before him. Peter's defeat was merely a dramatic foreshadowing of the defeat of Abelard which was to follow Bernard's triumph at Beneventum.

Peter of Pisa opened his side of the argument first. He sought to prove that the election of his candidate had been according to the canons.[220] But Bernard refused to meet Peter on these grounds. To all such arguments Bernard replied that virtue did not reside in words or in books--an argument used often by Bernard, as we shall see in our analysis of the Vita Sancti Malachiae--but in the kingdom of God.[221] Then Bernard continued to a presentation of his client's case.

Bernard began his case by noting that he knew Peter of Pisa to be a good and devout man, learned in the canons, but blinded by his own knowledge and unable to see the truth. If, he argued, Peter would only make charitas his guide, instead of lex, he would led to the truth. Charitas, Bernard argued, was the only basis of unitas (and here we have returned to the arguments of the imperialists such as the Anonymous of York and Walram von Naumburg): "Nunc autem cogit nos charitas eloqui, quia tunicam Domini, quam in tempore passionis nec ethnicus praesumpsit scindere, nec judaeus, fautore hoc Domino, Petrus Leonis lacerat et disrumpit. Una est fides, unus Dominus, unum Baptisma." He then shifted his emphasis to the

situation in which the Church found itself at the time. He deplored the fact that the Church was now split between two popes, two baptisms, and two hierarchies.[223] He was clearly arguing ad hominem, disregarding the canonical issue at hand. The basis of the Church was unitas, he exclaimed, and the Church was suffering for the want of it. There was only one ark by which Christianity could be saved,not two. There was one faith, one tunic of Christ, one ark which had been given by God to men. If there were two, one was bound to be false: "Arca alia nuper fabricata est, et cum duae sunt, alteram necesse est esse adulteram, et in profundum demergi."[224] Bernard then proposed to examine the occupants of the two arks in order to determine which ark was to be saved and which submerged.

One of the arks was commanded by Anacletus and the other by Innocent. If, he argued, Innocent's is not the true ark, then this means that the ark which he commands is doomed and that all who adhere to him are to be lost. This means, he warned Peter of Pisa, that the Eastern Church will perish; that France, Germany and England are lost; that the Church of Spain and Italy will sink in the sea of damnation. It means that the great monastic orders have chosen the wrong ark. The Calmaldoli, the Premonstratensians, the Chartreuse, Cluniacs, and Cistercians, Bernard reiterated, are all doomed if the ark of Innocent is the false ark. "Is it possible,"he asked, "that all of these holy men will perish, and only the ambitious Pierleoni will achieve salvation?" From this moment on, Bernard

was master of the assemblage. In a dramatic part of the debate, after Peter and his men were reduced, he stretched forth his arms to the canonist and stated: "If you believe that I am right, then come, Peter, let us enter the ark together."[225]

In that one sentence the whole of the canonist tradition was defeated as the governing principle of the papal hierarchy. Innocent II was established in Rome; Peter of Pisa kissed the feet of the victorious Pope; Roger II returned to Sicily with his troops; and a few weeks later the unfortunate Anacletus II died.[226] The schism was ended.

[1]See account of these reforms given above, p. 391ff.

[2]Williams has called the year 1130 a landmark in the life of Bernard of Clairvaux, indicating that this was the time in the saint's career in which he assumed hisrole as director of the Church. See William's discussion in St. Bernard, 97. For a further handling of the same theme, see L'Abbe Vacandard, "Sr. Bernard et le schisme d'Anaclet en France," Révue des questions historiques, XLIIII (1888), 61-123, and Vacandard, La vie de St. Bernard de Clairvaux (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1927), I, 282ff.

[3]"Hubertus ad Norbertum," PL, CLXXIX, 40. The letter written by Peter of Pisa to Diego of Compostella is preserved in Didacus, Historia Compostellana, excerpts of which appear in Watterich, Vitae Pontificum Romanorum, II, 187. See also the account of the year 1130 in the "Chronicon Sancti Andreae," MGH, SS, VII, 549. The best monograph on the events of the year 1130 remains that of Mühlbacher, Die Streitige Papstwahl, 82ff. But see also Zoepfell, Die Papstwahlen, 332, and Bernhardi, Lothar von Supplinburg, 269-348.

[4]Mühlbacher, op. cit., 83.

[5]Peter of Pisa in Watterich, op. cit., II, 188.

[6]The events of the double election of 1130 are known only through the accounts of Hubert of Lucca, Peter of Pisa, Peter of Porto and Walter of Ravenna. Mühlbacher was the first historian to give himself to a critical evaluation of these sources. He concluded that the work of the two Anacletans, Peter of Pisa's letter to Diego of Compostella and Peter of Porto's letter of admonition to four Innocentian cardinal-bishops preserved in the Historiae Novellae of William of Malmesbury, was to be trusted for the most accurate rendition of the facts. Mühlbacher based his conclusions upon the fact that the two Anacletans were (1) eyewitnesses to the events, (2) had excellent reputations in the curia before the schism, and (3) were canon lawyers of note. Neither Hubert of Lucca nor Walter of Ravenna were in Rome during the time of the schism, and both were avowed propagandists of the Innocentian cause. See Mühlbacher, op. cit., 9-20. The authorship of the "Epistola ad Didacum" hinges upon the identification of the author of the "Vita Paschalis" in the Liber Pontificalis. Duchesne argued that the author of this life was Peter of Pisa, whereas March maintained that it was impossible to identify the author. See Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, I, xxxv, and March, Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis, 83-84. If March is correct, it means that no work can be definitely attributed to the hand of Peter of Pisa and that the "Epistola ad Didacum" must also be adjudged anonymous. Yet this hardly destroys the historical importance of the

epistle, since it obviously comes fromthe hand of a member of the curia of some prominence who did witness the events as they transpired. It is interesting to note that Vacandard accepts the account of Hubert of Lucca, noting "nous plaçons l'épitre de Hubert de Lucques en première ligne." Vacandard, Vie de St. Bernard, I, 285. Williams supports the view of Vacandard, accepting Hubert of Lucca's account as correct, although Hubert was nowhere near Rome while the events of 1130 transpired. Williams, St. Bernard, 100. For further discussion of the problem, see Duchesne, "Le 'Liber Pontificalis' aux mains des Guibertistes et des Pierleonistes," 189ff., and Muhlbacher, op. cit., 31-36.

[7]"ut quia Urbs multis erat odiis et inimicitiis scissa et clericorum omnium Romanorum corda plurima erant amaritudine conturbata, de substituendo, si ille deficeret, Romano deberemus Pontifice cogitare." Peter of Pisa in Watterich, op. cit., II, 187.

[8]"Visum denum fratribus omnibus est, ut personae octo eligerentur, quae de electione tractarent et sequentis deberent Pontificis personam eligere, ita tamen, quod si inter se de personam praestante Domino concordare." Ibid., 188. Hubert of Lucca, on the other hand, inserts a strong modiying clause into his summary: "Persona, quae ab eis (the committee) communis eligeretur, vel a parte sanioris consilii, ab omnibus pro domino et Romano pontifice susciperetur." "Epistola Huberti ad Norbertum," PL, CLXIX, 40. It seems highly unlikely that a group of canonists and cardinals would allow a qualifying clause of such vagueness be inserted into the compromise solution of this most delicate problem.

[9]"Hubertus ad Norbertum," loc. cit.

[10]See Brixius, Die Mitglieder, 16-17. The number of cardinals given by Brixius is forty-four. Klewitz shows that this number must be wrong, and he demonstrates that Brixius' error springs from the assumption that two cardinals appearing in the subscriptiones immediately after the election of 1130 had been created prior to 1130. See Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 373, note 1. The calculations of Zoepfell, Die Papstwahlen, 383, need not concern us here as they are based upon incomplete documents.

[11]Klewitz, op. cit., 406ff.

[12]The cardinal-priests are mentioned with the cardinal-bishops as having certain rights inthe curia as early as 1059, the time of the papal election decree of Nicholas II. See Sägmuller, Die Thätigkeit und Stellung der Cardinäle, 41ff.,

and Wilhelm Martens, Die Besetzung des päpstlichen Stuhls unter den Kaisern Heinrich III und Heinrich IV (Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1887), 323-28. For the superior position given the cardinal-priests over the cardinal-deacons, see the "Ordo Romanus" in Watterich, op. cit., I, 5-6.

[13]"Hubertus ad Norbertum," 40.

[14]Mühlbacher, op. cit., 67.

[15]Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," 219, note 4.

[16]Ibid., 376.

[17]Brixius, op. cit., 36.

[18]Ibid., 34.

[19]Ibid., 38-39.

[20]Ibid., 36.

[21]Ibid., 40.

[22]Ibid., 32.

[23]"Quod quidem consilium approbantes astruebant, iuxta sententiam canonum vivente Romano Pontifice et eo de more non sepulto, non debere de succedentis electione tractari. Cui sententiae licet fratrum pars necessitatem temporis, urbis odia, patrium studia, ecclesiae discrimina praetendentes resultarent canones temperari: tamen post haec et alia sub districto anathemate stabilitum de personae alicuius electione mentio penitus haberentur." Peter of Pisa in Watterich, op. cit., II, 187-88.

[24]"Post multa itaque inter nos condictum est, ut convocatis fratribus omnibus ad sanctum Adrianum deberemus cum electoribus convenire, si munitiones quae iuxta ipsam ecclesiam sunt, in potestatem cardinalium redderentur. Missi sunt tunc duo de cardinalibus, qui praedictas munitiones reciperent; sed cum eas iam prae manibus haberent, a quibusdam episcopis, qui dextro, immo utroque genu clandicantes in partem aliam tendebant, inhibitum est." Ibid., 188. The two cardinal-bishops must have been Matthew of Alban and John of Ostia. There were six cardinal-bishops in all at that time. Peter of Porto and Giles of Tusculo were partisans of the Pierleoni, so they are eliminated. Conrad of Sabine and William of Palestrina were serving on the electoral committee. This leaves

only Matthew of Albano and John of Ostia available.

[25]Watterich, op. cit., II, 188.

[26]Vacandard, "Le schisme," 74ff.

[27]Peter of Pisa: "Ostia omnia clausa sunt et nullus cardinalium est ad eum intrare permissus." Watterich, op. cit., II, 188.

[28]Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 406-409.

[29]"Petrus Leonis...altare maledictionis erigere satagebat. Quod nisi domnus papa Honorius, quem credebant iam mortuum, se ad finestram populo ostendisset, cum fratrum et propinquorum et obsequiis conductorum turba ministrorum praeco antichristi...ante tempus se extollisset." "Hubertus ad Norbertum," PL, CLXXIX, 40.

[30]Mühlbacher, op. cit., 86, 97-101.

[31]"Subito per laicorum manus mortuus miserabiliter defertur; non deponitur feretrum nec ulla ei obsequia fiunt, sed recto gradu sicut vilissima bestia in claustrum trahitur et in vilissimum sepulcrum immergitur...Sicque non cooperto corpore...." Peter of Pisa in Watterich, op. cit., II, 188. "Multa melius erat mortuo humanitatem impendere et sic de vivi solatio cogitare. Sed ecce, dum de mortuo solatium vivo requiritis, et vivum et mortuum pariter suffocastis." Cardinal-bishop Peter of Porto in William of Malmesbury, Historiae Novellae, MGH, SS, X, 485. Hubert of Lucca states simply: "Celebratis exequiis pro necessitate loci et temporis, non tamen ex more, sicut oportebat, cum calamitatis tempestas instaret." "Hubertus ad Norbertum," 40-41.

[32]"Cum nimia festinantia, sicut inter se condixerant, fraudulenter conveniunt non convocatis neque interrogatis fratribus contradicente cardinali Sanctae Susannae, qui tunc aderat..." Peter of Pisa in Watterich, op. cit., 188-89. "Cur illum vestrum dicitis ordinatum, cum prorsus in causa ejus ordo non fuerit? Siccine didicistis papam eligere? in angulo, in abscondito, in tenebrosis et in umbra mortis?" Peter of Porto in Historiae Novellae, MGH, SS, X, 484-85.

[33]Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 373, note 1. The original division of twenty six to sixteen was changed in 1130 when one of Anacletus' cardinals deserted to Innocent's cause. In 1132, two more of Anacletus' men deserted. See Brixius, Die Mitglieder, 26-27.

[34]Klewitz, op. cit., 373. Compare Bloch, "The Schism of Anacletus II," 161, note 6.

[35]"Et quod nimirum non est auditum et omnibus est horribile, quorundam laicorum paucitas subito de sepulcro abstractum mortuum papam ante plasmatum idolum a saepe nominato monasterio S. Gregorio diffugiens Lateranum deduxit, ita ut in basilicam salvatoris mortuus et vivus simul intrarent ibique corpore pontificis non sepulto, immo in vilis tumuli angustia sine cooperimento et obsequio male deposito fabricatum idolum ad palatia miserrima festinatione deduxit." Watterich, op. cit., II, 189. The election manifesto of Innocent's electors phrased it thus: "In ecclesiam Lateranensem constipatum catervis fidelium deduximus et in sede summa positum nos et infinita religiosorum turba honoravimus. Post hoc in palatium ascendimus et, que ex more geri solent, complevimus et omnia insignia pontificalia H. papae, Calixti papae Paschalis papae suorumque predecessorum ei tribuimus." "Epistola Electores Innocentii ad Lotharium," PL, CLXXIX, 37-38.

[36]Ibid.

[37]"Priores cardinales cum reliquis cardinalibus... cum omni Romanae urbis clero et populo, qui apud S. Marcum convenerant obitum papae expectantes, ut eum, sicuti mos est, antiquam iuxta Romani ordinis normam sepelirent, auditio quia papa Honorius iam esset mortuus et sepultus...." Watterich, op. cit., II, 189. Peter of Porto, the senior member of the College of Cardinals, directed the election. Historiae Novellae, MGH, SS, X, 485.

[38]"Cumque diutius inter nos de futuri pontificis esset electione tractatum, d. papa tunc card. presb. libere proruit in vocem et quendam de fratribus manu et voce propria assignavit. Cui rei se impotentem frater ille cognoscens communi omnium nostrum consilio, communi assensu expetente populi, consentientibus honoratis eundem domnem papam nobiscum communiter elegit." "Epistola Electores Anacleti," Watterich, op. cit., II, 185.

[39]Peter of Pisa stresses the participation of the entire Roman populace in the election of Anacletus. He writes: "Priores cardinales...cum reliquis cardinalibus...diacones cum subdiaconibus et cunctis ecclesiae Romanae ordinibus, archipresbyteri, abbates cum omni Romanae urbis clero et populo...deliberatio consilio, expetente in papam Anacletum... unanimiter, concorditer, et feliciter elegerunt." Ibid., 189. To these electors Anacletus himself added the name of the "primicerius ac omnis schola palatio." Anacletus II, "Epistola IV," PL, CLXXIX, 697. In yet another epistle one finds the names "omnes schola et ordines palatii, iudices et scrinarii."

Anacletus II, "Epistola I," Ibid., 691. This seems to indicate that the canon lawyers of the curia considered the papal election to be part of the function of the entire curia, not only of the College of Cardinals, nor even only of the cardinal-bishops. See Mühlbacher, op. cit., 114-15.

[40]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 380.

[41]Ibid., 380-81.

[42]Innocent writes in his electoral decree: "Quod ego dignus non fui, episcopi et catholici cardinales me licet invitum et renitentem in Romanum pontificem unanimiter elegerunt." Innocentius II, "Epistola IV," PL, CLXXIX, 55. Anacletus II: "Cardinales et omnis clerus Romanus expetente omni populo...me licet indignum in papam Anacletum unanimiter elegerunt." Anacletus II, "Epistola I,"PL,CLXXIX, 691. In both cases the italics are those of the present author. One notes the use of the qualifying term "catholici" in the Innocentian document. This term will soon undergo transition, emerging as "sanior pars" in the arguments of St. Bernard of Clairvaux.

[43]See Bloch, op. cit., 174.

[44]Bernhardi, Lothar von Supplinburg, 287-99; Mühlbacher, op. cit., 180ff.

[45]Vacandard, "Le schisme d'Anaclet," 67-68.

[46]Vacandard is willing to admit that "La legitime de l'election d'Innocent II n'est pas de ces verites historiques qui s'imposent a l'esprit." Ibid., 65. Nonetheless, he feels that Bernard acted rightly in choosing Innocent, for "Placee en regard de sa vie (that of Anacletus), la vie d'Innocent II formait un contraste parfait." Ibid., 93. Aside from the fact that Vacandard's personal choice of the two leaders on the basis of morality has nothing to do with historical narrative, one may further note that there is no evidence predating the schism upon which one may judge Anacletus' moral life. Vacandard's attempt represents that school of though which attempts to justify orthodoxy after the fact. Except for the fact that Innocent was made official pope through his victory over Anacletus, there is no reason for so calling him. Had Anacletus won the election, there would no doubt have been a systematic destruction of Innocentian documents, and we should have been constrained to reconstruct our picture of Innocent from purely biased sources. Thus envisaged, it seems most difficult to accept Vacandard's conclusions which are based solely upon the accounts of Hubert of Lucca and (strangely) Arnulf of Siez. See especially Mühlbacher, op. cit., 52-56, and Bloch, op. cit., 163, note11.

Completely ignoring the canonical question, Williams gives himself completely to the defense of St. Bernard's actions. Williams prefaces his summary of the role of Bernard in the schism by noting that "it has been necessary to tell at some length the story of these two elections, in order to show what was at stake, and thus to justify the line taken in the matter by St. Bernard." Williams, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, 104. It turnsout that what was at stake is outlined from purely pro-Innocentian and therefore pro-Bernardine sources. Williams argues that Anacletus was "avaricious and ambitious," and only Aimerich's far sighted policy saved the Papacy. Aimerich is described as that "one member of the Curia who was keenly alive to the ambitious machinations of Peter,...a man trusted and respected by St. Bernard and much in his councils." Ibid., 99. Here one might paraphrase the Platonic query and ask,"Was Aimerich liked by Bernard because he was good or was he good because he was liked by St. Bernard?" Williams and his kind of historian seem to adopt the latter proposition. Any of Bernard's friends can never be suspected of anything shady by the very fact of being Bernard's friends.

[47]Wilhelm Martens, Die Besetzung des päpstlichen Stuhls, 323-24.

[48]Anton Michels, Papstwahl und Konigsrecht, 93, note 15; Kuttner, "Cardinalis," 176ff.

[49]Williams, op. cit., 97-98. The latest work to deal with the subject is an anonymous essay which appears in the Commission de l'Histoire de Citeaux, St. Bernard de Clairvaux (Paris: Editions Alsatia, 1953), 351-53, a prospectus for the publication of a new edition of Bernard's works. The article does not add anything to our understanding of the subject, doing little more than repeating Vacandard's position.

[50]Michels, op. cit., 34-35.

[51]Ibid.

[52]See above, p. 52ff.

[53]See above, p. 286ff.

[54]Michels, op. cit., 35.

[55]See above, p. 129ff.

[56]See above, p. 66-69.

[57]See above, p. 286ff.

[58]Gratianus Decretum i. 5.

[59]Watterich, op. cit., II, 187; "Hubertus ad Norbertum," PL, CLXXIX, 40.

[60]"Historiae Novellae," MGH, SS, X, 486.

[61]Watterich, op. cit., II, 188.

[62]"Caeterum Petrus Leonis cum Jonathon ab eis recedens, ut corvus ille vel submersus vel carnum ingluvie detentus, ad fratres posteà **redire** contempsit, et conventicula seorsum collignes, altare maledictionis eligere satagebat." "Hubertus ad Norbertum," PL, CLXXIX, 40.

[63]See above, p. 473ff.

[64]Muhlbacher, op. cit., 115-17.

[65]See below, p. 345ff.

[66]"Historiae Novellae," 486.

[67]Ibid.

[68]See above, p. 345ff.

[69]Muhlbacher, op. cit., 69ff.

[70]See Hinchius, op. cit., 137, 635, 527.

[71]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 220-220.

[72]Petrus Damianus, "Disceptatio Synodalis," MGH, Lib., I, 179.

[73]Ottonis Frisingensis, "Historia de Duabus Civitatibus," MGH, Scriptores rerum germanicarum, 209-13.

[74]Ibid., 535-36.

[75]Hinchius, Decretales Pseudo-Isidoreanae, 528-33.

[76]Ottonis, "De Duabus Civitatibus," 535-36, 539-44.

[77]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, I, 122.

[78]Ibid., lxix-lxx. Compare pp. 14ff.

[79]Ibid., 122.

[80]Ibid., 125.

[81]Hinchius, op. cit., 83.

[82]See Thaner, Anselmi Collectio, Canon I, p. 1.

[83]Hinchius, op. cit., 84, 73.

[84]See Pietro Fedele, "Le famiglie de Anacleto II e Gelasio II," Archivio della Societa Romana di Storia Patria, XXVII (1904), 437ff. Compare Demetrius Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and Pierleoni in the Crisis of Rome in the 11th Century," Traditio, II (1944), 155ff.

[85]See Borino, "Quando e dove si fece monaco Ildebrando?" 241ff., and Fedele, op. cit.,433.

[86]See the "Chronicon Maurinensis," Bouquet, Recueil, XII, 79.

[87]Zema, op. cit., 161-168.

[88]See above, p. 339.

[89]"Chron. Maur.," 79.

[90]Bernardus, "Epistola CCCXXX," PL, CLXXXII, 535-36.

[91]See Anacletus II, "Epistola VI," PL, CLXXIX, 696. Compare Arnulfus,"Invectiva," MGH, Lib., III, 93, and "Chron. Maur.," 79.

[92]Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," 216, note 4.

[93]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 302-303; Robert, Bullaire, II, 345, n. 233; Brixius, Die Mitglieder, 38.

[94]Robert, Bullaire, II, 345.

[95]PL, CLXXIII, 1263.

[96]Brezzi, Roma e l'impero medieovale, 315.

[97]Zoepfell, op. cit., 324; Brixius, op. cit., 34.

[98]Ibid.

[99]See Fliche, Histoire, VIII, 387.

[100]Pietro Fedele,"Sull'origini dei Frangipane," Archivio della Societa Romana di Storia Patria, XXXIII (1910), 493-506.

[101]Fausto Palumbo, "La cancelleria d'Anacleto II," Miscellanea de scritti di paleografia e diplomatica in onore di V. Federici (Firenze: n.p., 1943), 1-53.

[102]See especially L. Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, I, 325, note 22. The sketch of the mosaice is reproduced in Josef Wilpert, Die römischen Mosaiken und Malereinen der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV.-XIII. Jahrhundert (Freiburg: Herder' sche Verlagshandlung, 1917), I, i, 163. See also Bloch, op. cit., 181.

[103]See PL, CLXXVIII, 717-18.

[104]St. Bernard, of course, favored the former view. See the discussionsof his political theory in Dempf, Sacrum Imperium, 223, and Caspar, Meister der Politik, 576. Bernard's biographer, Watkin Williams, argues that Bernard grants authority to the pope in the same way that Gregory VII had wanted to do. See his St. Bernard of Clairvaux, 249. The latest work on the subject would seem to support Williams. See Walter Ullmann, The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: A Study in the Ideological Relation of Clerical to Lay Power (London: Methuen and Company, 1955), 413ff.

[105]The defeat of the prominent pro-Anacletan canon lawyers by Bernard of Clairvaux we take to be highly significant. Bernard had been able to do exactly what the imperial writers had sought unsuccessfully to accomplish for twenty years. The collapse of such legalists as Gerard of Angouleme, Hildebert of Lavardin, and Peter of Pisa before the irrational, emotional,

and intuitionist Bernard is more than an event; it is a symbol of the defeat of the disciplines of canon law and dialectic in Rome. The metaphysics of inner experience had triumphed until Alexander III reinstated canon law there.

[106]Mabillon, Annales Ben., VI, 152.

[107]For a complete discussion, see Bloch, op.cit., 159ff.

[108]See Anacletus' letter to the Cluniacs in PL, CLXXIX, 696-97. Arnulf of Siez notes how fortunate it was that Peter the Venerable was now ruling Cluny, since Anacletus doubtless had many friends there when the monastery was under the role of Pontius. Arnulfus, "Invectiva," MGH, Lib., III, 94.

[109]On Anacletus' following in Sicily, see Chalandon, La domination normande en Italie et en Sicilie, II, 1-60, and Palumbo, Lo scisma del MCXXX, 486ff.

[110]Wilpert, op. cit., I, 1, 63.

[111]It will be recalled that St. Sylvester was the recipient of the imperium which Constantine had given to the Bishop of Rome in the papal mythology. Hispresence in the mosaic seems to indicate that the popes of the Investiture Contest from Gregory VII to Anacletus II had never surrendered the translatio imperii idea. The pope as successor of Constantine was viciously attacked by Bernard in his "De Consideratione," IV, iii, 6, PL, CLXXXII, 775-76.

[112]The identification of the figure on the right of the Virgin as Anacletus was the work of Louis Duchesne, who, through a clever examination of the inscription, concluded that the name found there (Anastasius IV) could not have fitted into the cursus scheme employed in the composition of the inscription. See Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, I, 325, note 22.

[113]See above, note 6.

[114]March, "Ancora sul Pandolfo continuatore del 'Liber Pontificalis,'" 173.

[115]March, "Sull'autore della biografia di Pasquale II," 416-18; Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, xxxvi, note 7.

[116]March, Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis, 203, 162.

[117] Ibid.

[118] Ibid., 164, 194.

[119] This is especially true of the "Vita Paschalis," Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 296-7.

[120] "Vita Calixti," March, Liber Pont. Dert., 192-93.

[121] Ibid.

[122] "Vita Gelasii," March, op. cit., 165.

[123] "Vita Honorii," March, op. cit., 204.

[124] "Vita Paschalis," Duchesne, Liber Pont., II, 296.

[125] Ibid.

[126] Levison, "Aus Englischen Bibliotheken," 408-409.

[127] "Vita Paschalis," Duchesne, Liber Pont., II, 303; "Vita Gelasii," March, Liber Pont. Dert., 169; "Vita Calixti," Ibid., 192-94; "Vita Honorii," Ibid., 203-205.

[128] "Vita Gelasii," Ibid., 165.

[129] Didacus, "Historia Compostellana," Watterich, op. cit., II, 187.

[130] Ibid.

[131] "Quod utique fratres nostri malae mentis esse indicium attendentes, pars maior et sanior ad praedictum monasterium non sunt amplius ausi redire." Ibid., 188.

[132] "Mande fact in praedicto secretario quatuor episcopi, quibus nulla vel minima est in electione potestas,..." Ibid.

[133] "Aymerici, quondam cancelarii, dolis et astutis ebriati cum nimia festinantia, sicut inter se condixerunt, fraudulenter conveniunt,..." Ibid.

[134] Ibid.

[135]Ibid., 189.

[136]Ibid.

[137]Ibid.

[138]Ibid.

[139]Vacandard, Vie de St. Bernard, I, 300; "Historiae Novellae," 484-85.

[140]Ibid.

[141]Ibid., 485.

[142]Ibid.

[143]Ibid.

[144]Ibid.

[145]Anacletus II, "Epistola VI," PL, CLXXIX, 697.

[146]Ibid.

[147]Anacletus II, "Epistola XV," PL, CLXXIX, 704.

[148]Didacus, "Historia Compostellana," Watterich, op. cit., II,

[149]

[150]Innocentius II, "Epistola V," PL, CLXXIX, 56.

[151]Mühlbacher, op. cit., 125-26.

[152]"Epistola por canonica electione amenda," PL, CLXXIX, 37.

[153]"Hubertus ad Norbertum," Ibid., 40.

[154]Ibid.

[155]Ibid., 40-41.

[156]Ibid.

[157]Ibid., 41-42.

[158]Gualterus Ravenatensis ad Norbertum," PL, CLXXIX, 39.

[159]"Gualterus ad Chonradum," Muhlbacher, op. cit., 36-40.

[160]Ibid., 39. [161]Ibid.

[162]Ibid. Compare Arnulfus,"Invectiva," MGH, Lib., III, 92-93.

[163]See Innocent's itinerary in Jaffe-Wattenbach, 841ff.

[164]Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles, V, i, 676ff.

[165]Bernardus, "Epistola LXXVIII," PL, CLXXXII, 191.

[166]Jaffe-Wattenbach, 7423 (5329).

[167]Muhlbacher, op. cit., 130.

[168]Sugerius, "Vita Ludovici," PL, CLXXXVI, 1330-31. See the further comments in Hefele-Leclercq, op. cit., V, i, 680-86.

[169]Haller, Das Papsttums, III, 31-37.

[170]Whether the final word was left to Bernard of Clairvaux or not was investigated by Muhlbacher, op. cit., 173-79, who concluded that undoubtedly Bernard was the commanding force at the council. Vacandard's studywas based upon the assumption that Bernard was given actual cotrol of the choice of the new pope. See Vacandard, "St. Bernard et le schisme d'Anaclet," 306ff. Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V,i, 682, note 3, generally agrees with Vacandard's conclusions.

[171]Vacandard, Vie de St. Bernard,II,65: Williams, op. cit., 104-110.

[172]Ernaldus, "Vita Prima Bernardi," PL, CLXXV, 270. "Vita Petri Cluniacensis," PL, CLXXXIX, 20. Hugh of Grenoble excommunicated Anacletus II before the issue had been settled at Etampes in council at Anse in 1130. Mansi, Concilia, XXI, 435-36.

[173]Ernaldus, "Vita Prima," 270.

[174]Bernardus, "Epistola CLXXXIX," PL, CLXXXII, 355-56.

[175]"Historiae Novellae," MGH, SS, X,485-86.

[176] Sugerius, "Vita Ludovici," PL, CLCCCVI, 1330.

[177]Ernaldus, "Vita Prima," 270.

[178]"Vita Petri Cluniacensis," 20.

[179]Ernaldus, "Vita Prima," 268.

[180]See Fliche, Histoire, IX, 65.

[181]Bernardus, "Epistola CXXVI," 8, PL, CLXXXII, 276.

[182]Ibid. [183]Ibid.

[184]Ibid.

[185]Anacletus II, "Epistola XII," PL, CLXXIX, 702.

[186]Bernardus, "Epistola CXXVI," 9, Ibid., 277.

[187]Ibid. [188]Ibid.

[189]Ibid., Ch. 10, 279.

[190]Ibid. [191]Ibid.

[192]Ibid., Ch. 11, 279.

[193]Ibid., Ch. 12, 279-80.

[194]Ibid., Ch. 13, 280.

[195]Ibid. [196]Ibid.

[197]Bernardus, "Epistola CXXVII," Ibid., 281-82.

[198]Mühlbacher, op. cit., 129ff.

[199]See Hildebertus, "Epistola XLI," PL, CLXXI, 265.

[200]Bernardus, "Epistola CXXIV," PL, CLXXII, 268.

[201]In a letter written in 1146 to the people of Rome on behalf of Eugene III, Bernard spoke of Rome as a Babylon and expressed the hope that although the Romans were a famous people and great while he himself was "mean and of no reputation, of smaller stature and smaller influence," they might be converted to Eugene's cause. See Bernardus, "Epistola CCXLIII," PL, CLXXXII, 438. Bernard's real feelings were expressed in the "De Consideratione" when he described the Romans in the same terms used to describe Anacletus II, possessed of ambition, avidity, and avariciousness. See "De Consideratione," PL, CLXXXII, 761-62, 774.

[202]Bernardus, "Epistola CXXIV," Ibid., 269.

[203]Ibid.

[204]Bernardus, "Epistola CXXV," Ibid., 270.

[205]Ernaldus, "Vita Prima," PL, CLXXXV, 271.

[206]Ibid.

[207]See the account of Landulphus, "Historia Mediolensis," R.I.S., V, iii, 35. Ernaldus, "Vita Prima," 273-75.

[208]Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V, i, 706ff.

[209]Ernaldus, "Vita Prima," 273; Landulphus, op. cit., 36.

[210]Ibid.

[211]Bernardus, "Epistola CXXXI," PL, CLXXXII, 286-87.

[212]For Bernard's view of the papal power in the 1130's see Bernardus, "Epistola CXXI," Ibid., 266. Compare "Epistola CXXXI," Ibid., 287.

[213]This is the view of Ullmann, op. cit., 427-28, where Bernard is called the apex of hierocratic thought.

[214]Landulphus, op. cit., 37; Ernaldus, op. cit., 274-75.

[215]Bernardus, "Epistola CXXXIII," PL, CLXXXII, 288.

[216]Bernhardi, Lothar von Supplinburg, 493ff.; Chalandon, op. cit., II, 77.

[217]Anacletus II, "Epistola XXXIX," PL, CLXXIX, 715. Chalandon, op. cit., II, 7-10.

[218]Fulconis Beneventani, Chronicon Beneventani, in Watterich, op. cit., II, 244-48.

[219]Ernaldus, "Vita Prima," 293.

[220]Ibid., 294.

[221]Ibid.

[222]Ibid.

[223]Ibid.

[224]Ibid., 295.

[225]Fulconis, Chron. Ben. in Watterich, op. cit., II, 247.

CHAPTER VIII

THE AFTERMATH OF THE SCHISM, THE FORMULATION OF THE CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP IDEAL BY ST. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX

The nature of the victory of Innocent II over his rival is such as to suggest that the schism of 1130 was essentially ideological in character. Thus, the fact that the two popes were representatives of the two leading families of the Roman nobility would seem to be more a consequence of the schism than the cause of it. We have sought to demonstrate that the real power behind the revolt of 1130 was not the Frangipane but a group of reformers newly come to the Roman Curia who were influenced by the ideals of St. Bernard of Clairvaux. We have likewise argued that the Pierleoni was a family fighting to sustain a position long enjoyed in the Papacy--not the perpetrators of the schism of 1130--but the defenders of orthodoxy in Rome. As we have seen in our study of the pontificates of Calixtus II and Honorius II, Frangipane power was the result of the reform parties' intrigues. Their rise to power was not, as has long been held, an event which took place prior to the emergence of a reform party in Rome.

Now, apart from investigating the Frangipane-Pierleoni relationship in the curia, we have also sought to discover the grounds for schism which might have existed within the Church leadership as early as the Gregorian Reform. We have seen that two ideologies--the sacerdotal and the ascetic--

had existed from the very beginning of the reform movement. We have noted that the two foremost exponents of those ideologies, Peter Damiani and Humbert of Silva Candida, represented this antagonism in its most bitter form as early as 1059. Schism had been possible here, but it had been averted by the emergence of a personality who incorporated virtues esteemed by both leaders--Gregory VII. The peace effected by Gregory between adherents to the two ideologies was only temporary and was probably occasioned by the increasing pressure exerted upon the hierarchy as a whole by Henry IV. But this increased pressure in turn resulted in the acceptance by the hierarchy of a purely Amtscharismatic leadership ideal and the defeat of the ascetic element in the curia. The withdrawal of Peter Damiani foreshadowed this event.

Asceticism was given a new impetus, however, by the rise of a popular pietism in France and Germany. Outstanding representatives of this movement were Bernard of Clairvaux and Norbert of Magdeburg. As the influence of these mystics increased, the effectiveness of the Gregorian leadership ideal, with its emphasis upon the purely formal aspects of papal power, decreased. As the Emperor continued to attack the papal control of the temporalia, the Papacy was forced more and more to the defense of that control. To the adherents to the ideal of paupertas, this striving after the worldly could only be regarded with disgust. After the Concordance of Worms and the death of Henry V, the papal hierocracy presented the aspect of a highly efficient war machine without an enemy upon which it could demonstrate its peculiar talents. In the prov-

inces we have seen tendencies towards disillusionment among the masses. These masses, inspired by the teachings of the ascetics, came to feel that they had little if anything in common with their masters. This feeling of disillusionment made the leadership even more oppressive, and, as we have seen, anti-ascetic legislation was passed in Rome, legislation which forbade the preaching of one of the most popular mystics of the time, Norbert of Magdeburg. Out of this feeling of mutual ill will was born a movement which was to challenge the leadership of Rome. Gradually the adherents to the movement infiltrated into the curia and showed its desperation in 1124 by placing one of their own upon the papal chair by a military coup (Honorius II). But this coup was artfully concealed from the general Church membership while the centers of Gregorian strength were sysematically destroyed. In 1130 this minority in the curia felt strong enough to risk a general schism in the defense of its ideals; it felt strong enough to present its concept of what constituted a worthy leader to the Church as a whole and to oppose the forty-five years of Gregorian tradition upon which the majority based its claim to legitimacy.

The schism of 1130 and the resultant Innocentian victory redefined the leadership of the Church in terms which had not been given official recognition in the hierarchy since the time of Peter Damiani. Here the power of the Papacy was reoriented, given new goals, and brought into line with ideas by which society of the time acted. A reaction to Gregorianism and all that it had come to stand for was the major feature of this

reorientation. It was necessary for the Innocentians to justify what can only be regarded as an open breach with tradition. They had defied the canons of Rome and defied legally constituted authority. Therefore, in order to present their own actions as "legal," the Innocentians had to redefine "legality." In order to do this, it was necessary to demonstrate that the Gregorians in the curia had departed from primitive ideals, were sophists, and had destroyed the true law of the Church through their dialectical subtlties. The basis of the revolution envisioned was the rule of charitas. Upon the emotive connotations of this term, the Innocentians (or the Bernardines) constructed a whole new idea of leadership; this was the charismatic leadership ideal.

We have seen that at Etampes in 1130 St. Bernard completely ignored the traditional method of evaluating what constituted a legal papal election. That self contained entity composed of Pope and Curia which had been the creation of the Gregorian legalists' conflict with the Empire was ignored. The idea that a legally elected pope (i.e., one who had been elected by the correct formal process) was above criticism from his inferiors in the hierarchy was abolished. A de facto ordering of the papal office took place by a group of non-official leaders of the Church who were also predominantly non-Roman. The canon law which had been so laboriously constructed by the Gregorians was more calmly ignored than debated and rejected by those assembled at Etampes. Anacletus' claim that his was

a legal electoral process by the clergy and people of Rome were drowned in the hellfire and brimstone of Bernard of Clairvaux. Bernard argued that morality, not due process, was the mark of the true leader of Christianity, and by implication, he further asserted that his was a peculiar power of discerning where such morality existed and where it did not. Officially, Innocent II was chosen pope solely on the basis of his superior moral worth. This is the significant fact to be derived from an objective and complete analysis of the sources of the schism of 1130. Bernard's choice of Innocent II and the basis of that choice were accepted by the secular and religious leaders of the Church of that time.

Bernard himself emerged as the real charismatic leader in complete control of the situation at the same time (as witnessed by his offer to accept the sins of those who erred in accepting Innocent upon his own head). The stream of libel to which Anacletus was submitted was only a corollary not the cause of Bernard's argumentation. The appeal to morality used a generation earlier by such writers as Walram von Naumburg and the Anonymous of York had been ineffectual or apparently so. But in 1130 the same arguments which had been so easily defeated by the curial Gregorians were eminently successful. Let us note how these arguments were presented and then correlate them to the formal leadership ideal as expounded by Bernard in his tractates and letters.

The Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem Episcopum was written c. 1133-35 by one Arnulf, Archdeacon of Siez and later

Bishop of Liseux.[1] Arnulf had gone to Italy at an early age in order to study law. Presumably he studied for a time at Bologna, although it is possible that he studied in Rome.[2] However, the law did not sit well with him, and he soon returned to France where he was swept up in the religious reform led by the Cistercians. The propaganda epistles which he authored are among the foremost examples we have of the complete negation of the legalist view of Church leadership ideals. His Invectiva is wholly emotional, anti-intellectual, ascending to heights of fallacious vilification, and completely devoted to the cause of Innocent and St. Bernard.[3] As a source for the study of the events per se, it is completely untrustworthy. Yet it has been used by Catholic apologists of Bernard's actions in the schism of 1130 with unfailing regularity.[4] It has been used by them as a source which makes Bernard's damnation of Anacletus morally acceptable. However, even if we admit that its use as a mine of political facts leaves something to be desired, the Invectiva contains a wealth of information on the ideology, the Weltanschauung, of the reform party to which Bernard, Innocent II, and Arnulf belonged.

The Invectiva is directed against Gerard of Angouleme, honored member of the curia, papal legate in Acquitaine, and right arm of four popes in France.[5] The first two books of the work are meant to undermine the character of Gerard, who was then supporting Anacletus II against Innocent. Here Arnulf attempts to show how Gerard is interested only in the money and honor which comes with the office of papal legate, not in supporting the true pope.[6] In an age in which concepts of the priestly

office were dominated by the De Moribus et Officiis Episcoporum and the Apologia of St. Bernard, Arnulf's allegations would be met with sympathy.

In the third book of the Invectiva, the schism of 1130 is discussed at length, and the conflicting claims of Innocent and Anacletus are evaluated by Arnulf. Here all thought of formal argumentation is forgotten. Arnulf paints the most vile picture of the antichrist and tailors his picture to Anacletus' dimensions. He writes in the beginning of this book:

> Placet hoc loco mihi utriusque personae describere qualitatem, ut de duobus similem similis elegisse proberis et cupidum cupidus adorasse. Parcendum tamen est obscenitati verborum, dum Petri vita narratur, et rerum venitas sermonum pallianda decore, ut honor habitus honestati legiendum videatur. [7]

We are then given a description of how Pierleoni gold bought its way into the prominence it enjoyed in Rome, how it raised a family of Jews from the ghetto to a position of prominence as councillors of the popes themselves.[8] Upon reflection it becomes obvious that Arnulf is here criticizing not only the Pierleoni but their employers as well. Needless to note, these employers were none other than the popes of the Gregorian Reform. From the beginning Arnulf has assumed the validity of Bernard's stand as taken at Etampes. The election itself is not examined critically; instead, we are given a picture of Anacletus' depravity -- as evidence of the righteousness of the Bernardine and Innocentian cause.

The reader is told that ambition and avarice are the marks

of Peter Pierleoni, and that these marks were evident even in his childhood. It was for this reason supposedly that his parents sent him to Paris; the child apparently was deemed worthy of study in the schools of dialectic there.[9] This sort of statement seems to have been meant to throw discredit upon the Paris as an intellectual center. One is given the impression that the art of deception could be easily learned in the Paris of Abelard.[10] Here Anacletus could be taught the black arts necessary for one who was meant to fill the role of antichrist. Arnulf writes:

> Profecto cum in his operibus nec Deum dignatur revereri nec hominem, tantam sibi suscitavit infamiam, ut eis ortu, ambitione vitaque precognitis, ipsum esse antichristum universitas gentium passim crederet et publice testaretur.[11]

The attack against Peter Pierleoni's educational background is buttressed with evidence concerning his Jewish origins:

> Augebat fidem, quod ex Iudeis ortus, quod totius mundi dominium Romanae sedis auspicabatur obtenu, quod vitiis deditus infamiam nulla virtute redimeret et quod infinitam patris et avi pecuniam deinceps possessurus esset.[12]

The Jews of the Pierleoni family had been seeking to capture the Papacy all along, according to Arnulf, and now in Anacletus they were near their goal. Arnulf has carried the arguments of Bernard of Clairvaux to their logical conclusions. His view is that since Anacletus incorporates all of the vices of antichrist in his personality, he cannot hope to be recognized as pope -- regardless of his legal election. Of course, on this point not even the most avid opponent of Innocent II could agree, but the burden of proving that he was not antichrist

rested with Anacletus.

Arnulf further maintains that in order to conceal his evil intentions Anacletus sought to mask himself and his black soul by assuming the garb of a monk. It was for this purpose that Anacletus took himself to Cluny after his stay in Rome. Furthermore, Arnulf continues, Anacletus hoped by his term at Cluny to win that monastery to his cause when he finally did make his move to sieze the papal power, but fortunately the monastery had been reformed (through the efforts of Bernard of Clairvaux and Honorius II) and today that monastery was not the place of sin that it had been under the Gregorian popes.[13] One need not note that once more the Gregorians and corruption have been linked: even the charge of "false monk" leveled at Gregory VII being resurrected to use against Anacletus.

The curia is attacked by the use of the same sort of innuendo. Peter Pierleoni's rise to power is seen as a result of corruption in that body -- corruption so deeply grounded that even antichrist could buy his way into the highest of offices. However,once more we are given to believe that through the actions of Honorius II that body also has been reformed and is now engaged in weeding out the elements which brought on such corruption.[14] Note again that this corrupt curia to which Arnulf refers is none other than the curia of Paschal II -- the same men who led the struggle against the Holy Roman Empire during the Investiture Struggle.

Pierleoni's legateships into France and England are subjected to the same close inspection, and while they constitute

an attack upon Anacletus personally, just as surely they represent an attack upon the curia of Calixtus II.[15] As a legate Pierleoni is supposed to have revealed his adherence to worldly things, his avarice, his greed. Arnulf describes in great detail the luxury with which the cardinal dined, his lust for women and his immoderate interest in fine clothes:

> Bina singulis diebus sumptu plurimo convivia parabantur, tantusque ciborum luxus et superfluitas erat, ut ad exquisitas ferculorum varietates sollicitari plerumque figulos oporteret et ignotae compositionis nova vasa formare. Docebatur etenim figulus amphoras figmenta plasmare mirabili, quibus ad similitudinem solii per transversum medium discrimen inesset, statusque superior, repositis escis, fumum per modici oris respiraret angustias, inferior vero pars cancellatis arcubus undique perforata prunas clauderet, quibus thuris copiam tamdui sollicitus minister infunderet, donec coctis cibis ipsum transferret cocus artifex in saporem...[16]

This section of the work ends with a contrasting of the vices of this "false monk" and the virtues of the"real"monks who are supporting Innocent II.

Worse was in store for the unfortunate Anacletus, however. Arnulf relates how this antichrist became aroused with desire for his own sister, took her, and how a monster was born of this unholy union.[17] Could such a man be considered a worthy candidate for the honors of the Papacy? Arnulf left not a doubt as to his stand on the matter. The successor of Peter must be as pure as Christ or must at least follow in his footsteps insofar as this was possible for mortal man.[18] He concluded his argument with a final appeal:

> Tu vero, Petre, cum de vitiis casu continuo devalvaria in vitia et signatum super te lumen divini vultus obtenebres, deformata iam divinitatis imagine et ipsius similitudine flagitiis obfuscata, qua temeritate Christi successore esse presumis, cuius prius similitudinem non assumis? Nulla enim conventio Christi ad

Beliae, nulla lucis ad tenebras communicatio.[19]

With this admonition ended Book III of the Invectiva.

Book IV of the work attempts to show the logical conclusions following from the three previous books. Until now nothing has been said concerning the election process itself; Arnulph has been concerned only with outlining the moral character of Pierleoni. The claims made by the majority of the College of Cardinals to the right of election have been ignored. Where, in fact, did the right of election lie? Whence came the authority for assuming the power of St. Peter? Both candidates claim legal process for assuming the pontifical power. The term "legal" was the stumbling block. Bernard had argued that mere legality was of no import; one must, he maintained, go beyond such superficialities. Bernard had shown that one must look at the more basic issue: which candidate was more morally suited to govern the Church? After Arnulf's first three books there could be little doubt which candidate was the purer -- that is, if all of Arnulf's assertions were true. Thus, Arnulf's work is not argumentation; he is not seeking to make the point of Innocent's legality. He is seeking instead to create a body of facts to support Bernard's assertions that Innocent is the purer of the two. Once he has done this, the conclusion is patent. Was such a man as Anacletus fit to lead the Church in its struggle to save the world?[20] Arnulf's conclusions are contained in his eulogy of Innocent II's morality.

He seeks to prove in the last works of his Invectiva that Innocent was predestined to be the successor of Peter

and Paul.[21] Innocent's early life is seen to be the exact opposite of Anacletus'.[22] Indeed, as Arnulf sees it, in Innocent there was no illiberal youth, no luxurious adolescence, no indecorous conduct.[23] Innocent had spent all of his life living the role of the true monk (cibi potusque tanta sobrietas ut illis non fastidium, sed abstinentia modus terminator assistat).[24] It is this fact and this alone which makes Innocent's claim to the papal power sufficient.

Arnulf maintains that had Anacletus not rebelled, there could have been no question of the worthiness of Innocent to lead the Church.[25] But since there are two claimants, the only way to settle the issue is to examine the morality of both of them:

> Verum oportet nunc ex meritis, non ex gratia iudicare gratiosum tantum, sed et dignum constituere sacerdotem...Vita probabilem, scientia preditum, celebratum fama tantus honor exposcit, ut ipsi divinum favorem probabilis vita conciliet, gerendorum facultatem scientia conferat, et nominis celebritate clara comparetur auctoritas. Quales ex hoc ipso numero promptum est inveniri? Quis enim ego sum, qui preponar episcopis? Quis ego sum, sub cuius arbitrio rerum summa versetur? Quis, inquam, ego sum, quem papam Roma salutet, qui non inter primos dumtaxat, sed etiam primorum primus assigner?[26]

Here then the problem is posed once more: what is to be the standard for selecting the leader of the Church? For Arnulf it is a simple matter. One need only consider the ideal of the ecclesia primitiva. A new generation of Church leaders must take it upon themselves to reform the Church and to bring it back to the ideals of the primitive Church. If such is to be the goal, then perfect morality must be the

standard for choosing the leader. The new leaders must match in virtue those of the Apostolic Age. Arnulf writes:

> Antiquis ecclesiae Romanae dignitas occidit, ipsius gloria commutatur approbio, et formidata extremis hominum potestas vertitur in in contemptum...Fuit, fuit hactenus hec Romana ecclesia caput orbis, penes quam constantissima fides, suprema potestas, honestas incomparabilis inconcussa, severitas, gerendorum summa discretio et nota toti mundo pietas viguisset, fuit, inquam, fuit hec olim terror improbis, bonis in tranquillitate presidium, in necessitate refugium singulare, a cuius integritate minores ecclesiae vires sumerent et velut ab illes capite membra saucia suae sortirentur initia sanitatis.[27]

Here then was the real issue; reform was the justification for the revolt of Innocent. Rome had declined; it had fallen away from the ideals of the primitive Church and was in need of a cleansing in head and members. What must we take to incarnate the declined Church. Certainly it was not the Papacy of Honorius II; Arnulf must be referring to the Papacy of Calixtus II, Gelasius II and Paschal II. One wonders if those same Catholic apologists who accept Arnulf as an authority on the issue of Anacletus' morality will also accept him as an authority on the decline of the Papacy under these popes. For Arnulf certainly has the Gregorian Papacy in mind. The antichrist is upon us, he would cry, and now is the time to reform.[28]

Book V gives us a further glimpse of the hero who is to lead the reform-- Innocent II. It is now that Arnulf comes to grips with the issue of election itself. But here is merely a restatement of Bernard's position as put forth at Etampes. Almost paraphrasing Bernard, Arnulf writes:

> Utramque te novisse personam et electionis ordinem plenius exquisisse: procul dubio cum Innocentio papa stare iustitiam, eo quod plane vir esset honestatis egregiae, et ipsius electio prima tempore et a precipuis Romanae ecclesiae fuerat celebrata personis.[29]

Thus is affirmed the superiority of Innocent's morality and the priority of his election. The superiority of electors is similarly argued:

> Aderant autem ibidem venerabiles, que Romae fuerant sub eodem tempestate personae, quae rerum seriem plane cognoverant, presentim quae oculata fide singula percepissent.[30]

The Gregorian old guard is seen to be merely a faction, a faction which represents force alone, and it is asserted that the faction has support only in Rome itself while the whole Church -- the corpus Christi[31] -- to the very ends of the earth recognize Innocent.

Thus we have the formal enunciation of the issues which motivated the Innocentian party in effecting the schism of 1130. Arnulf has given us explicit documentation for demonstrating the validity of our thesis. Rome, it is asserted, no longer represents the will of the "universal priesthood of believers." Rome must therefore be reformed. Authority to undertake such a reform lies in the mass itself: as evidenced by Arnulf's appeal to Innocent's support in the mass. The standard of judgement is to be completely moralistic, as evidenced by Arnulf's constant reiteration of the morality of the two candidates. It will be remembered that in his debate with Peter of Pisa before Roger II of Sicily in 1138, Bernard of Clairvaux argued in much the same way. Could the entire Church be wrong when it obviously disagreed unanimously with the leadership in Rome? Would the holy men of the provinces

all be damned and only the cardinals in Rome be saved? Bernard had swayed Peter of Pisa with these arguments, and Arnulf hoped to do the same with the general public. This was not to argue (in Arnulf's mind) that the Papacy was not absolutely powerful within the Church. It was rather to raise the question concerning the traditional modes of electind and conferring that power upon a suitable candidate. Does the right of conferment reside only in Rome or upon the Church as a whole? Arnulf's answer is obvious: the final court of appeal is the holy men in the Church as a whole. We shall see this idea further expounded when we encounter St. Bernard of Clairvaux arguing that the pope is a "universal bishop" and that his flock is all the Church. While some may take this argument for support of papal absolutism, we maintain that in its context such an argument detracts from rather than adds to the authority of Rome. But before proceeding with this discussion, let us note Arnulf's final exposition of his argument.

Arnulf seems to be holding a kind of universal constitutionalism in which every member of the Church is given a voice in the direction of the Church proportionate to his morality. He seems to be saying that when Rome agrees with the mass of the Church membership on a question of morality, then the Church in Rome must yield. How, except by morality, does one decide which of two candidates to the most powerful office in the Church is more valid in that claim? Bernard's answer was: decide which party is supported by the <u>maior et sanior pars</u> of the electors. Arnulf arrives at the same conclusion:

an epistle of Leo I is the source:"ubi se partium vota divis-erant; visus est illis iure canonico preferendus is, qui maioribus et studiis iuvabatur et meritis."[32] Here for our purposes ends the Invectiva of Arnulf.

A summary of Arnulf's work yields the following conclusions:

> 1) Innocent's claim is more valid than Anacletus' because of the moral superiority of the Cistercian candidate. Morality therefore equals legality in the thought of Arnulf.
> 2) The more formally "legal" arguments of Arnulf are three: a) Innocent's election preceded that of Anacletus in time; b) Innocent was elected by electors of superior morality; c) the majority of the Church as a whole support Innocent, including the leaders of the great monastic orders of the west. Thus, the whole electoral tradition of the Gregorians is denied.
> 3) The papal office itself is conceived to be a charismatic position; it does not consist of merely a legal definition ornamented with certain symbols of authority. This means in effect that the Papacy is no longer to be considered a purely Roman office; instead, the pope is now a "universal bishop", and as such he is responsible to the whole of Christendom for his actions. This also means that the power of conferring the papal power resides in the Church as a whole and not only in Rome.
> 4) The mass will recognize its natural leader purely by his internal pax, by his spiritual qualities. The papal leadership must be won in a battle with the spirit; it cannot be merely conferred.

Underlying these conclusions are the ruins of the whole hierocratic structure erected by the Gregorians. A new concept of leadership and office was about to triumph in the Church; this concept of office was purely ascetic in its conception and charismatic in its ideals. The monks were reasserting themselves as an independent force in Church affairs for the first time since Peter Damiani.

The identification of Innocent II with the monkish leadership ideal is to be found in the work of Geroh of Reichersberg. In his Epistola ad Innocentium Papam and the Liber de Simoniacis we see an interweaving of three themes: ascetic-monkish ideals, Innocent II's moral superiority to Anacletus II, and the actual support given to Innocent by his militia --the monks.[33] The Epistola ad Innocentium Papam is written in the form of a dialogue between a secular and a regular cleric. The form of the arguments presented can be summarized by a statement made by the priest to the monk:

> Secularis: Vos, qui dicimini regulares canonici, quia velut monachi mundo debetis esse mortui, nullam vocem habetis in aecclesia, quae nobis ad regendum est committenda, sicut actenus habet consuetudo antiqua, cui vos magnam vim facitis, qui novitatem regularis vitae introducitis et hanc ab omnibus clericorum congregationibus observandam predicatis absque documento alicuius certae et indubitatae auctoritatis.[34]

The debate which follows consists of an attempt to refute this statement. Needless to note, the monk is successful in Geroh's dialogue. The last sections consist of a series of eulogies of the monastic life and a final affirmation that Innocent, as leader of the ascetics, can depend upon the support of his brothers. In fact, priests themselves are attacked as usurpers of the charismatic powers of the monks. Anacletus is seen as leader of the priestly hierocracy preeminently. The following exchange demonstrates this:

> Reg: Nonne complices et fautores illius nuper dampnati Petri Leonis, Romanae aecclesiae invasoris, manifeste sunt ministri Pharaonis?

> Sec: Quid ad nos de illo?
>
> Reg: Pluas ad te tuique similes, quam ad me meique similes pertinet ille impius. Nam si percurres omnia claustra canonicorum regularium, nec unum quidem in eis, credo, invenies Petri Leonis consentaneum. At saecularium clericorum nonnulli, precipue incontinentes et conducticii, sive conductores clerici cum Nicolao fornicatore ac Symone Mago dampnati, partim occulte, partim quoque manifeste optant illum precalere contra papam Innocentium, quem Innocentium nos, qui regulares dicimur, omnes unanimes uno ore fatemur successorem Petri legitimum, quem et ante papatum novimus castitatis et religionis fuisse amicum, sicut illum alterum Dei et aecclesiae novimus fuisse inimicum.[35]

Finally, the same arguments put forth by Arnulf and Bernard are repeated by Geroh. He summarizes his argmuent by noting the unanimous support which Innocent can claim among the regular clergy, and this is enough in his eyes to clench his argument.[36]

The effect of such propaganda can be seen in a brief perusal of the Chronicon Mauriniacensis. This work was written by a monk solely for the edification of his brethren within the cloister, not for circulation as a libellus de lite; it professes to record only the common talk current during the schism.[37] Here Gerard of Angouleme is castigated in the words of Bernard of Clairvaux and Arnulf.[38] Peter Pierleoni's reputation is given the treatment put forth by Arnulf.[39] The unfortunate Anacletus is described as an antichrist heralding a new period of decadence in the Church.[40] Pierleoni's studies at Paris and his service as a monk at Cluny come under the same suspicious scrutiny as is found in Arnulf's Invectiva.[41] Innocent is seen as a man"of holier life, better fame, and superior election."[42]

The propaganda of the Innocentians thus presents a unified front -- a front distinguished by its appeal to the ascetic hierarchy of values. The monks were solidly ranged behind Innocent, and his cause was identified with their attempt to establish their voice as a factor in Church administration. Bernard of Clairvaux was the most consistent exponent of the monkish point of view. In his works we can see the development of the propaganda line and the formal statement of the value system upon which the line is built. Bernard's hegemony over the Papacy during the period 1130-1153 can only be explained by assuming that the value system which he represented was generally accepted by the mass of the Church membership. Bernard's power represents a leadership revolution in the Church-- a direct reaction to the Gregorian leadership ideal. Let us examine this revolution in detail as it is to be found in Bernard's writings.

The Final Formulation of the Charismatic Leadership Ideal in Bernard of Clairvaux

The works necessay for the understanding of St. Bernard's idea of papal leadership are the following: the De Consideratione, the De Moribus et Officiis Episcoporum, the De Gradibus Humilitatis et Superbiae, and the Vitae Sancti Malachiae. These works seen inthe light of the saint's letters reveal Bernard's existantial idea of the papal leadership as well his theoretical justification for the propagation of that idea. The works mentioned date from a time span covering the period 1127 - 1149, the date of the composition of the De

Consideratione.[43] Both the De Consideratione and the Vita Sancti Malachiae were composed c. 1049, four years before Bernard's death, at the height of his power, and may be considered a definitive statement of his position.[44] The datation of the documents is hardly necessary, however, because Bernard's position remained remarkably consistent from the publication of his vitriolic first epistle until his death.

By far the most important work in our study of Bernard is the De Consideratione. Not only did this work exert a profound influence upon succeeding popes, it demonstrates by its very existence the triumph of charismatic leadership ideals in the Church of Bernard's time.[45] It is a unique document in the history of the medieval Church in that it demonstrates how an abbot, the pope's inferior, would dare write and criticize and prescribe actions for the pope himself.[46] The De Consideratione could only have been composed in Bernard's time by a personality such as Bernard possessed. The document cannot be taken as a eulogy of the absolutism of the papal power for it in fact prescribes to the holder of that power exactly how he must act. The De Consideratione is the record of the prophet's admonition of the priest; the charismatic leader in action. The very existence of such a document demonstrates the truth of the assertion that during the period 1130-1145 there were two leaders of the Christian community: St. Bernard and the popes.[47]

There are certain assumptions underlying the exposition

of the De Consideratione which may be revealed by a perusal of another of Bernard's work, the De Gradibus Humilitatis.[48] This work, when buttressed by the ideas of the De Diligendo Dei and the Tractatus de Erroribus Abaelardi, reveals the epistemological assumptions upon which is based the De Consideratione.[49] The Vita Sancti Malachiae gives us an account of an ideal leader in action, but it is the De Considerations which gives us insight into the role which Bernard played as the advisor to the pope--admonishing him, correcting him, inspiring him to a higher leadership ideal.[50]

It is obvious that the De Gradibus Humilitatis is the theoretical basis of the De Consideratione. In the opinion of the present writer, the latter work is merely an attempt to educate the leader of the Christian community in the ideals put forth in the former. According to his own testimony, Bernard writes the work on consideration (consideratio) in order to show the Pope the way to the attainment of contemplation (contemplatio).[51] "Consideration" is presented as the way of attaining truth; contemplation as the entertainment of the truth attained.[52] Thus, the De Consideratione is a treatise on education, a speculum paparum, the papal equivalent of the mirrors of princes and the mirrors of monks. That Bernard considers the most important of the papal activities to be the same as that of the monk --contemplation--indicates that the monkish ideal of leadership has indeed captured the Papacy. Consideratio is the means by which the leader makes himself worthy of leadership, because through it he attains to perfect knowledge. Through consideratio the pope may ascend the twelve

grades of humility to the apex of human achievement: the vision of God.[53] Let us consider the nature of knowledge as Bernard expounds it in the De Gradibus.

Bernard assumes, with his Augustinian predecessors, that the Real is hidden beyond the limits of sensory experience. His thought is permeated with psychology of medieval Neo-platonism as it had been transmitted from the classical period by way of Gregory I. The world of the senses is an overflow of the Supreme Good, a chain of Being in which reality flows into unreality in proportion to the distance of any one aspect of reality from the Supreme Good. This chain of Being extends from the source --God-- through the angels (who are eternally good not as a function of their own being but God's) to man, animal and inanimate matter.[54] The dimension of man is distinguished from that of God and the angels by its involvement in matter. This involvement in matter is a condition of man's will to sin or concupiscience.[55] The upper reaches of the chain of Being, as a result of their freedom from matter, enjoy the beatific vision of the Supreme Good eternally.[56] Man's task is to find real knowledge by escaping from the world of matter and sensory experience and ascending to the upper reaches of the chain of Being.[57] The pope as leader of all men must attain to the wisdom and virtue which result from the attainment of the beatific vision. To Pope Eugene III, Bernard wrote:

> Quid, quod et inferioribus eges? nonne praeposterum hoc et indignum? Plane superiorum quaedam injuria est, inferiorum operam desiderare: a qua injuria nemo hominum perfecte vindicabitur, nisi cum quisque evaserit in libertatem filiorum Dei.

> Nempe erunt hi omnes docibiles Dei et nulla interveniente creatura, solo beati Deo. Repatriasse erit hoc, exisse de patria corporum in regionem spirituum. Ipsa est Deus noster, maximus spiritus, maxima mansio spirituum beatorum: et ne quid hic sibi usurpet sensus seu imaginatio, veritas est, sapientia est, virtus, aeternitas, summum bonum. Unde interim absumus: et ubi sumus, vallis est lacrymarum, in qua sensualitas regnat, et consideratio exsulat: in qua libere quidem et potestative se exserit sensus corporeus, sed intricatus caligat oculus spiritualis.[58]

This is Bernard's view of man caught between two worlds as he conceived it in 1149. In 1127 he had already set forth in the De Gradibus the means by which man might escape from his unhappy position. Humility (humilitas) was the key to that escape, the key to contemplation and its fruits, the key to leadership.

Humilitas was, according to Bernard's reading of Scripture, the key to all knowledge (Et in hoc apparet quod veritas, quae superbis absconditur, humilibus revelatur).[59] That humility is seen by Bernard as a peculiar attribute of the monk may be seen by noting Bernard's point of departure for the composition of the De Gradibus: St. Benedict.[60] On this saint's authority Bernard asserts that humility is a ladder by which one can ascend the chain of Being; humility is, in fact, the only way by which man can escape the chains of human existence.[61]

Knowledge can be reached by passing through three successive states of spiritual existence: humilitas, charitas, and contemplatio.[62] Humilitas gives to the seeker after truth self knowledge or knowledge of his own miserableness.[63] Once we have recognized our own miserableness and inadequacies we are prepared for the second state, charitas, the recognition of the miserableness of others.[64] Our charitas, or selfless love of others, wins

the highest reward of God:complete knowledge. The attainment of complete knowledge (the vision of God) allows the soul to reside in the peace of contemplatio. Bernard calls this stage the "purification of the eye of the soul for the contemplation of things celestial and divine."[65] This third state cannot come about by the will of man; God must enter into the soul which has been prepared by humilitas and charitas.[66] The humanistic ideal of knowledge through the self awareness of the human mind is rejected. One may be led by divine reason (ratio) to practice humilitas, but the third stage can come about only through the "ravishment" of the mind by God. He writes:

> Cum sint itaque tres gradus seu status veritatis, ad primum ascendimus per laborem humilitatis, ad secundum per affectum compassionis, ad tertium per excessum contemplationis. In primo veritas reperitur severa; in secundo, pia; in tertio, pura. Ad primum ratio ducit, qua nos discutimus; ad secundum affectus perducit, quo aliis miseremur; ad tertium puritas rapit, qua ad invisibilia sublevamur.[67]

We are carried up to this third level of knowledge, not by our own accomplishment, but because God "sweeps us up" in His grace.

This idea of the ravishment of the soul by God is common in mystical literature, appearing usually in the simile of the"dark night of the soul." The dried up and purged soul is filled with God in the moment when the individual feels farthest removed from God.[68] Bernard devotes a long chapter of the De Gradibus to an analysis of St. Paul's "ravishments."[69] He carries the same theme over into the De Consideratione, using

St. Paul as the symbol of monastic-contemplative values, the possessor of complete wisdom, and the ideal Church leader.[70] But it is well that we do not lose sight of the conditions of knowledge which Bernard sets forth. The attainment of complete knowledge hinges upon the purity of the soul which is seeking God. Thus, the attainment of knowledge is not a function of intellect, but is directly dependent upon moral considerations. Naturally, such a view conflicts violently with the Gregorian idea of the nature of the papal office, because the pope attains wisdom solely as a result of his occupation of an office. The Gregorian canonists had left no doubts as to the Roman position in this matter. The Roman Pope could not err, or if he did, he was not subject to correction.

There is yet another point at which the Gregorian and Bernardine views conflict. It will be noted the emphasis placed upon humility by Bernard; this means the complete abnegation of the will of the individual. The first condition of knowledge is not active but passive. The second condition is charity, a charity manifested by genuine compassion for one's fellow men. This is an internal condition and manifests itself in acts of love--not force. Once more we are met with the negation of the efficacy of man's will and the possibility of external activity. Both of these ideas conflict with the activist character shown in the Gregorian Reform. The pinnacle of knowledge is represented by perfect physical inactivity, complete passivity, a state in which the soul alone functions and seeks to escape from the body. By

implication is denied the validity of the entire Gregorian attempt to go into society, to capture it, to change it and to lead it to salvation. Not by force, but by humility and love would Bernard's reform be undertaken. Any moral reform must, for Bernard, begin with the individual, and salvation must be a purely individualistic thing. Until the seeking soul has been completely purified itself, it will not be enlightened; and until it has been enlightened, it will not be able to enlighten others. Thus is justified the leadership of the saint.

The morality of the monk is carried over and applied to the priest in the De Moribus et Officiis Episcoporum. Bernard takes his point of departure from the word pontifex. He notes that the word is probably derived from pons (bridge) and argues that the priest must indeed be a bridge between God and man.[71] He states that the priest carries to God the "vows and prayers of the people and reports to the people the graces and benedictions of God."[72] The priest must therefore be chaste, must"raise clean hands to God."[73] The office of priest presupposed a morality which was unblemished. This was not to argue necessarily that an unworthy priest destroyed the efficacy of the sacrament, but whereas Bernard might theoretically accept the idea that the immoral priest could handle the sacrament, in practice he would not think of allowing such a situation. In the De Consideratione he expressed himself most forcefully on this matter:"Quid Sacramenta acceptius? Usurpata tamen ab indignis, indigneve tractata, minime acceptantur. Magis habet damnationem, quia debitam venerationem non

habent."[74] The priestly hierarchy was presented with the same choice as that given to the ascetic: Were they there to serve man or God? Was the sacrament a service to man or to God? Bernard asked the bishops themselves this same question: "Verum tu, sacerdos Dei altissimi, cui ex his placere gestis, mundo, an Deo?"[75] According to Bernard the honors of the sacerdotal hierocracy were ephemeral, a trap to the truly devoted man which enmeshed him in a fruitless search after service to the external man.[76] Just as the life of the soul was preferable to the life of the body,[77] membership in the community of saints was preferable to membership in the formal Church.[78] Since salvation was truly sought only by the monk, it was the monkish standard of values which was to predominate in evaluating any self proclaimed servant of God. Summarizing his speculum episcoporum, Bernard wrote: "Labor, et latebrae, et voluntaria paupertas, haec sunt monachorum insignia;... Vestri autem oculi omne sublime vident, vestri pedes omne forum circument, vestrae linguae in omnibus audiuntur conciliis, vestrae manus omne alienum diripiunt patrimonium."[79] The formal superiority of the episcopal dignity was granted; the real superiority of the monkish life was not left in doubt.

The ascetic ideal as the standard of all ecclesiastical life is given its most foreeful expression in the De Consideratione. The composition of this work was undertaken in a most trying period of Bernard's life. As early as 1133 Bernard had shown a certain disillusionment with the man whom he had placed upon the papal throne. In that year he had felt compelled to write to Innocent II; he had asked if "the virtue which had shone so brightly in weakness would succumb

to power."[80] In 1139 he had noted that "justice in the Church is perishing, the keys of the Church are mere ornaments, the episcopal authority is wholly vile..."[81] Bernard's faith in the Pope or the Papacy had been so shaken that he had written:

> Quis mihi faciet jusitiam de vobis? Si haberem judicem ad quem vos trahere possem, jam nunc ostenderem vobis (ut parturiens loquor) quid meremini. Exstat quidem tribunal Christi: sed absit ut ad illud appellem vos, qui illic (si vobis necessarium, et mihi possibile esset) vellem magis totis viribus stare, et respondere pro vobis![82]

Here Bernard threatens the Pope with the tribunal of Christ before which he had summoned the entire Roman Curia and Calixtus II in 1119. In his first epistle Bernard had not hesitated to threaten the Papacy with God's ire. Why does he say to Innocent: "but far be it from me to summon you there"? Was it because he felt that the plenitude of power of the Pope forbade such an alternative? Bernard's activity vis a vis the Papacy during the pontificates of Calixtus II, Honorius II, and Eugene III would not seem to indicate such an idea. Rather, we must assume that there was a personal bond uniting Innocent and Bernard which made Bernard restrain himself. Furthermore we must remember that Bernard and Innocent were blood partners in the promotion of a revolt against the authority of the Roman Curia. Bernard had spent eight years proving to all Christendom the virtue and morality of Innocent II; he could hardly afford to question it after the victory over Anacletus. But that Bernard was disillusioned with Innocent may be seen in the letters.

But there were two other events which served to evoke a "loss of nerve" feeling in St. Bernard. One of these was the conflict with Abelard and Gilbert de la Porree. These encounters are too well known to merit detailed discussion here. Suffice to say that the conflicts made a profound impression on Bernard and awakened in him the necessity of defending his own epistemological position.[83] Epistemology in itself was of little interest to Bernard; he conceived of Abelard as a moral danger. Bernard could not abstract purely philosophical problems from moral ones under which he subsumed all societal activity. He saw in Abelard merely another aspect of the general decline of the Church which had produced an Anacletus II. He decried the"philosophizing"of ethics in the following terms:

> Nova fides in Francia cuditur, de virtutibus et vitiis non moraliter, de sacramentis non fideliter, de mysterio sanctae Trinitatis non simpliciter ac sobrie, sed praeter ut accepimus, disputatur.[84]

He adds that this Abelard boasts of his friends in the Curia.[85]

It is in this psychological atmosphere that Bernard comes forth from his monastery "touched with holy zeal, or rather kindled by the fire of the Holy Spirit."[86] Abelard is given the same marks of heresy which were accorded Anacletus II; he is described as a false monk (Monachum se exterius, haereticum interius ostendit, nihil habens de monacho, praeter nomen et habitum).[87] Abelard was pursued with the same relentlessness that had led to Anacletus' fall; in a curia in which Bernard's men now held complete sway, Abelard's fall was a foregone conclusion.[88]

The fall of Abelard and Anacletus did not, however, satisfy Bernard that Rome was free from all pollution. Even after the death of Innocent II he wrote to Pope Celestine II condemning the new evils arising in the Church. He chided the laxity of the courts of the Papacy in Rome, noting that many cases would have fared better had they never been sent to the Roman Curia.[89] He professed to see "dreadful things in the house of God" and noted that "if these were amended, well. If not, I have liberated my soul: you have no excuse for your sin."[90] The Roman Curia was warned; Bernard had led one revolt against it, and he argued that if that body enacted legislation against the good conscience of any man, it stood open to other rebellions.[91] One is reminded of a letter written to the three Cardinal-bishops of Ostia, Palestrina, and Tusculo in which Bernard warned these prelates that if they defiled the dignity of their power the "Great Father" would put them down as the "mighty who had not been equal to the power they had received."[92] By these letters it is apparent that Bernard considered the Church still in a state of crisis which the successful conclusion of the rebellion of 1130 had not rectified.

The failure of the Second Crusade also preyed upon Bernard's mind. In January of 1147 Eugene III had come to France to preach the crusade, and Bernard had made himself an instrument of the papal will. The crusade itself was a miserable failure, a fact which threw both Eugene and Bernard into the depths of despair.[93] Here was clearly enough ample reason for the morbid state of mind which Bernard had arrived at by 1149. The

election of one of his students, the monk Bernard of Pisa, to the pontifical power as Eugene III disconcerted Bernard of Clairvaux even more. It was in the mood of failure and despair coupled with the assumption of papal power by a poor monk that Bernard decided to set down his speculum paparum. If Bernard of Clairvaux would not accept the papal power officially, he could at least give formal utterance to what he considered the ideal pope.

Eugene III had, as a Cistercian abbot, come to Rome to head the monastery of St. Anastasio, sent by Bernard himself.[94] On the death of Lucius II (1144-45), who had succeeded Celestine II (1143-44), Eugene and his monks, fearing the turbulent Roman mobs, had fled to the monastery of St. Caesarius on the Palatine.[95] The people of Rome, however, elected Eugene as pope.[96]

Now the situation in Rome was explosive, because under Lucius II a rebellion had been led by Giordano Pierleoni, brother of Anacletus II, against the Papacy. Giordano had been proclaimed patricius of Rome and the Roman Republic had been reconstituted.[97] Such a move indicates a distinct anti-papal feeling, because the creation of the patriciate had resulted in the abolition of the city prefecture, the office by which the popes since Gregory VII had controlled the citizens of Rome. Both Lucius and St. Bernard had written to Conrad III for aid against the rebels; but Conrad, well occupied with his own affairs, had been most desultory in replying and no aid had been forthcoming from Germany.[98]

It will be remembered that the Frangipane had come to power originally in Rome as a result of a dispute over control of the city prefecture. They now rallied to Lucius II, and soon all Rome was once more split in factions. The times were similar to those of 1130. During the riots, Lucius II died suddenly.[99] The new republic, led by Giordano Pierleoni, directed its ire against the Roman Curia, seizing its members' lands and houses and generally mistreating them.[100] The election of the otherworldly and poverty-minded Eugene III had put a temporary end to the riots, but that peace was possible seemed dubious at best. It was at this time that there arrived upon the scene one of the most turbulent personalities of a turbulent era-- Arnold of Brescia. His chiliastic preaching, his devotion to the ideal of a new Rome and his attacks against the Roman Curia soon forced the withdrawal from Rome of Eugene III; the Pope fled to France in January, 1146.[101]

The De Consideratione and the Vita Sancti Malachiae were composed shortly after these events, and both take their point of departure from the thesis that the times are evil.[102] The De Consideratione was to be an example of papal leadership ideals, and the Vita was to serve as an inspiration to the mass of the clerics of the time.[103] Even the highest reaches of the official hierarchy were not safe from Bernard's scathing attack. His Vita begins with the condemnation of the "columns of the Church," and he asks,"If all your lights are darknesses, what will be our darknesses themselves?"[104] In order to illuminate these darknesses the standards of leadership in the Church are to

be set forth in unequivocal terms. Malachiae is described by Bernard as one who carried the law of God in his heart.[105] The De Consideratione will show the Pope Eugene how the law of God can be written even in the heart of the highest official in Christendom.

According to the preface of the De Consideratione, Bernard wrote to edify, to please and to console the pope.[106] Plainly, Bernard did not approve of the devout monk leaving his cell in order to become the official leader of the Church.[107] This feeling did not arise so much as a result of Bernard's lack of confidence in Eugene's virtue as it was a fear that Eugene's contact with the world would result in the ideals of the monk being subordinated to those of the priest.[108] In few of Bernard's writings is the dichotomy between the two professions so vividly drawn.[109] The conflict will be resolved in the De Considerstione by arguing that the ideals of the priest must be those of the monk.

The De Consideratione begins with a condemnation of the judicial functions which have come to be associated with the papal office. Bernard argues that the papal role is distinguished by its teaching function, not its judiciary function. He asks the Pope what good is served by hearing litigants throughout the day (Quaeso te, quale est istud, de mane usque ad vesperam litigare, aut litigantes audire?).[110] Bernard would have the Pope escape from this role of judge and give himself over to the salvation of his own soul, for from this search would come the wisdom necessary to be a good pope. He would

have the Pope give some time to consideration.[111]

Taking his point of departure from two Biblical texts found in Paul's epistles, Bernard argues that no member of the Church is competent to judge another.[112] He applies this decision even to the Pope: Itaque secundum Apostolum, indigne tibi usurpas tu apostolicus officium ⟨al. judicium⟩ vile, gradum contemptibilium.[113] Furthermore, the judicial function of the popes is denied on the basis of Apostolic example and tradition. The very basis of Gregorian power is denied. Bernard claims that the function of judge is unworthy of the papal honor. In Book I of the De Consideratione, Bernard states:

> Putasne haec tempora sustinerent, si hominibus ligantibus pro terrena haereditate, et flagitantibus abs te judicium, voce Domini tui respond res:'O homines, quis me constituit judicem super vos?' In quale tu judicium mox venires? Quid dicit homo rusticanus et imperitus, ignorans summam et praecelsam sedem, derogans apostolicae dignitati? Et tamen non monstrabunt, putoqui hoc dicerent, ubi aliquando quispiam Apostolorum judex sederit hominum, aut divisor terminorum, aut distributor terrarum. Stetisse denique lego Apostolos judicandos, sedisse judicantes non lego.[114]

Here was a direct denial of the Gregorian assertion that Rome could judge all and could be judged by none, and the denial was based upon the ideal of the primitive Church. Judication was the weapon by which the Gregorians had won the their victory from the Empire. Bernard would destroy the judicial function, granting only a right of moral jurisdiction to the popes:

> Ergo in criminibus, non in possessionibus potestas vestra: quoniam propter illa, et non propter has, accepistis claves regni coelorum, praevaricatores utique exclusuri, non possessores...Quaenam tibi major videtur et dignitas, et potestas, dimittendi peccata, an praedia dividendi? Sed non est comparatio. Habet haec infirma et terrena judices suos, reges et principes terrae.[115]

Clearly then the papal office was, according to Bernard, directed toward purely spiritual ends. Book I ended with the above quoted castigation of the judicial function of the Papacy. Bernard had rejected the sacerdotal interpretation of the papal office. The last four books of the De Consideratione will be concerned with defining the relationship of the papal office to these otherworldly goals. We are given a clue to the theme of these books in a sentence which appears near the end of the first book:"Nam certe lex Domini immaculata, convertens animas."[116]

The papal role is defined above all as that of a teacher; his major activity is seen as prayer, teaching and meditation: "Denique quando oramus? quando docemus populos? quando aedificamus Ecclesiam? quando meditamur in lege? Et quidem quotidie perstrepunt in palatio leges, sed Justiniani, non Domini."[117] The proper devotion to such activity requires a certain type of man, and we shall not be surprised after our perusal of the De Gradibus Humilitatis to find that Bernard has in mind a man distinguished by the contemplative ideals described in that work. This contemplative and ascetic will attain complete knowledge through his purity. This purity and wisdom will make him (like St. Paul) all things to all men. He will thus be the perfect leader of the Church, a man who will inspire rather than command, a charismatic leader. It is for this reason that Bernard asks the Pope to set aside " some portion of your heart for and of your time for consideration."[118] Through consideration --the process of self investigation-- the papal leader will become the possessor

of humility. This humility will lead him into the next and higher stages of knowledge: charity and contemplation. In this third stage wisdom is necessary for the governing of the morality of the mass. Consider the following comments:

> Si item totus vis esse omnium, instar illius qui omnibus omnia factus est; laudo humilitatem, sed si plena sit. Quomodo autem plena, te excluso? Et tu homo es? Ergo ut integra sit et plena humanitas, colligat et te intra se sinus qui omnes recipit.[119]

The road to wisdom is humility; it is also the road to leadership. In order to attain both, the Pope himself must go through the same training as all men. The De Consideratione may be considered the practical application of the De Gradibus to the problem of Church leadership. The former is the handbook for the papal leader by which he can attain the fruits described in the latter.

Now, the organization of the De Consideratione has led to some confusion concerning the aims of the work. Book II begins with the distinction between the office and the personality of the pope, but it ends with a demonstration of how the two are connected essentially.[120] Book III purports to deal with those things which come below the pope in the hierarchy of Being,[121] Book IV with the things around him and Book V with the things above him.[122] The hierocratic arrangement of the subject matter, combined with Bernard's specific instructions to the Eugene III to respect the ecclesiastical hierarchy as unchangeable has led to the assertion in a recent work on the subject that St. Bernard himself represents the culmination of the "hierocratic theme" in the political theory

of the later Gregorian epoch.[123] Ullmann argues that in the De Consideratione "the Pope appears as, and is, the true monarch,"[124] and Ullmann bases this assertion upon the fact that Bernard has termed the Pope "vicarius Christi" and has granted him control of the two swords and the "government of the world."[125]

Ullmann's argument is a common one, but such a thesis states only one part of the argument. It is true that Bernard grants to the Papacy all of its traditional power and titles; but the De Consideratione is born of the assumption that absolute power is valid only when it is used in the proper manner, and Bernard is not willing to admit, along with the Gregorians, that whatever manner is prescribed by the Papacy is ipso facto the proper manner. "What you do," he writes to the Pope on one occasion, "no doubt you are able to do, but ought you to do it?"[126] Eugene's power was undoubtedly complete, but there were conditions attached to the use of it, not the least of which was the necessity on the part of the Pope of realizing that "he was only a man."[127] It is this fact, the fact that ultimately the Pope must live the moral life as a man, which necessitates Bernard's writing the last four books of the De Consideratione. In these books we will see Bernard reject the Gregorian assumption that offices carry with them their own virtue.[128]

Upon investigation of Book II of the work we find nothing but a eulogy of the purely contemplative nature of real leadership. This book is based upon the assumption that all reality is internal, that whatever structure one raises outside oneself

will be like a heap of ashes exposed to the wind.[130] It is not in the erection of s strong office that the pope will become the leader of his flock, but in the construction of a genuinely pious soul. He must be like the "Great Father of all," who because of his complete goodness is capable of "sending forth his word and keeping it with him at the same time."[131] It is the task of the pope to extend his own problem of personal salvation to the whole of humanity. That Bernard felt this way may be seen in his admonition to the pope: "Quidquid se considerationi offerat, quod non quoquo modo ad tuam ipsius salutem pertineat, respuendum."[132]

The pope is therefore admonished to "follow his first profession," that is, monasticism. He must, as both pope and monk, amass a treasury of merit which will not only serve to aid all mankind but will also give to the pope some kind of wisdom which will allow him to lead the Christian community in its quest for salvation. If the pope is successful in his quest for virtue, his own goodness will overflow and permeate to the lowest reaches of the hierarchy. The Pope Eugene is reminded of his role as the fount of all Christendom by Bernard who writes: "Stultus et sapiens, servus et liber, dives et pauper, vir et femina, senex et juvenis, clericus et laicus, justus et impius, omnes pariter participant te, omnes de fonte publico bibunt pectore tuo..."[133] Naturally, if we maykeep the simile, the source from which the entire Christian community drinks must not be polluted; it must be morally pure in order to give the succor which is rightfully asked of it. It is for this reason that personality is as important as office in considerations concerning the

nature of the papal office.

Humbert of Silva Candida and the canon lawyers who had followed his lead had drawn the distinction between office and personality in order to free the occupant of the papal office from criticism by the lower orders on the basis of morality. Bernard begins his work by drawing a distinction between office and personality as well, but he does so only so that he can demonstrate how closely the two entities are allied. He writes in the De Consideratione:

> Et haec tui consideratio in tria quaedam dividitur, si consideres quid, quis, et qualis sis. Quid in natura, quis inpersona, qualis in moribus. Quid, verbi gratia, homo. Quis, Papa, vel summus Pontifex. Qualis, benignus, mansuetus, vel quidquid tale.[134]

Thus, the pope is three natures in one; he is a member of three hierarchies at one and the same time. Firstly, he belongs to the hierarchy of nature as man, as a combination of spirit and matter (man is defined as "quem dicunt animal rationale").[135] Secondly, he is a member of the hierarchy which constitutes society--the hierarchy of offices. Thirdly, he is a member of the hierarchy of Being and this according to his ability to rise above his natural state, to divest himself of both his physical attributes which are his as man and his societal attributes which are his as pope. In the natural hierarchy he is only a man. In society he is the highest priest. His position in the hierarchy of Being is not determined except by his personality, by his personal morality. It is the pope's task to bring his position in the hierarchy of Being into conformity with his official pos-

ition in society. This is the reason that Bernard devotes a large section of his work to a lengthy discussion of the "what" of papal existence.

Bernard argues that no matter what offices may be given the man, he can never escape from his manly nature. What a man is, he is by the sole fact of his birth; and what he becomes is only an imprint, never a change. Bernard says that the same holds true for the pope, who, without ceasing to be "what" he is, has become "who" he is.[136] That is, without having ceased to be a man, without having ceased to be subject to human errors, a man has been made pope, has received the imprint of office which has raised him from the societal role of monk (in the case of Eugene) to that of pope. But his human nature has remained unchanged even though he has donned the robes of the highest pontifex. Bernard stresses this fact in order to bring home the enormity of the responsibilities to which Eugene had fallen heir. If the papal power is unique and complete, but if it is given to "only a man," then it follows that the man must above all be the carrier of Christian wisdom to the ultimate degree. "Wisdom" of course means the kind of knowledge sought by the mystic: the beatific vision. No other kind of wisdom has a place in the papal world. But in order to attain the knowledge of the mystic, the pope must be a mystic. How to be pope and mystic and how to make the two functions compatible; this is the central problem of the De Consideratione. The very posing of the problem shows a rejection of the Gregorian idea world.

Having set up his problem, Bernard begins with a discussion of what the office of pope means in formal terms. The pope is, he says, "sacerdos magnus" and "summus pontifex," "vicarius Christi," and "vicarius Petri."[137] In priority, the pope is Abel, in government Noah, in order Melchisedech, as patriarch Abraham, in rank Aaron, in authority Moses, in power Peter, and in the virtue of his anointing Christ.[138] There are other doorkeepers of heaven and other shepherds of flocks, Bernard will admit, "sed tu tanto gloriosus, quanto et differentius utrumque prae caeteris nomen haereditasti."[139] The pope alone has been given the power of the two swords--both the temporal and spiritual swords--and this in itself is enough to distinguish the papal office.[140] Here, it must be noted, Bernard comes close to the Gregorian position. But he will not follow the Gregorians into their final argument; he will not admit that the pope cannot be criticized on the basis of morality by those below him in the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

For Bernard any number of men might be below the pope in the ecclesiastical hierarchy and still be his superiors in the hierarchy of Being. In a passage usually avoided by those who wish to show Bernard as a strict Gregorian, the saint argues:

> Arguar forsitan, quod non satis primis explicitis partibus, in secundas nescio quomodo stilus excurrerit, describere inchoans qualem te oporteat esse, cum necdum, quis sis, plenius expressisset. Credo erubescens in summo positum apice videri hominem nudum, festinavit induere insignibus suis. ...Et nunc audi canticum meum, et quidem minus suave, sed salutare. Monstruosa res gradus summus, an animus infimus: sedes prima, et vita ima; lingua magniloqua, et manus otiosa; sermo multus, et fructus nullus; vultus gravis, et actus levis: ingens auctoritas, et nutans stabilitas. Admovi speculum:

> foedus se in eo vultus agnoscat: tu tuum gaude dissimilem inveniri....Quid si summus pontifex sis? Numquid quia summus pontifex, ideo summus? Infimum noris esse, si summus putas. Quis summus? Cui addi non possit. Graviter erras, si te illum existimes. Absit. Non tu de illis es qui dignitates virtutes putant.[141]

Here then is Bernard's basic position. If he will not go so far as to assert that the priestly authority is valid only when used by morally pure men, in practice his puritanical ideal is so intense that the demand is made upon even the pope of complete moral purity. In fact, he will even go so far as to argue that: "Tu vero considera non consummatione summum te dici, sed comparatione. Nec me putes comparationem dicere meritorum, sed ministeriorum."[142] For Bernard office was only an imprint. Underneath the garments and symbols of office was the real vital force of the office--the man who occupied it. Consider, for example, the following passage:

> Nec modo quid natus, sed et qualis natus, oportet attendas, si non vis tuae considerationis fructu et utilitate fraudari. Tolle roinde nunc haereditaria haec perizomata ab initio maledicta. Dirumpe velamen foliorum celantium ignominiam, non plagam curantium. Dele fucum fugacis honoris hujus, et male coloratae nitorem gloriae, ut nude nudum consideres, quia nudus egressus es de utero matris tuae. Nunquid infulatus? nunquid micans gemmis, aut floridus sericis, aut coronatus pennis, aut suffarcinatus metallis? Si cuncta haec, veluti nubes quasdam matutinas, velociter transeuntes et cito pertransituras, dissipes et exsuffles a facie considerationis tuae, occurret tibi homo nudus, et pauper, et miser, et miserabilis; homo dolens quod homo sit, erubescens quod nudus sit, plorans quod natus sit, murmurans quod sit; homo natus ad laborem, non ad honorem; homo natus de muliere, et ob hoc cum reatu; brevi vivens tempore, ideoque cum metu; repletus multis miseriis, et propterea cum fletu. Et vere multis, quia corporis et animae simul. Quid enim calamitate vacat nascenti in peccato, fragili corpore, et mente sterili? Vere ergo

> repletus, cui infirmitas corporis, et fatuitas cordis cumulatur traduce sordis, mortis addictione. Salubris copula, ut cogitans te summum Pontificem, attendas pariter vilissimum cinerem non fuisse, sed esse.[143]

By virtue of the pope's humanity then, the problem of morality is validly raised concerning the occupant of the papal office: "Dixi supra consideranti quid sis, naturam occurrere, qua es homo: nam homo natus est...Hoc ergo consulo consideres maxime, quod maxime es, hominem videlicet, quod et natus es."[144] Therefore, heavenly virtues, the virtues which assure salvation, must exist in the papal character above all. In the definition of these virtues, we once more make contact with the De Gradibus Humilitate.

Humility is the key to the inheritance of Peter. Fortitude, wisdom, faith, all are the fruit of humility: "Pretiosissimus fundus virtus est. Bonus fundus humilitas in quo omne aedificium spirituale constructum crescit in templum sanctum in Domino."[145] Humility is particularly important to the occupant of the papal office, for its strength is increased in proportion to the difficulty of obtaining it. He writes:

> Caeterum cum omni indifferenter personae haec sit quaedam turris fortitudinis a facie inimici; nescio quo pacto tamen vis ejus major in majoribus, et in clarioribus clarior comprobatur. Nulla splendidior gemma, in omni praecipue ornatu summi pontificis. Quo enim celsior caeteris, eo humilitate apparet illustrior et se ipso.[146]

The virute by which all men must begin the ascent to knowledge is made the virtue by which the pope is to show his aptness to rule also. Thus, no distinction is made between the pope and the lowest laymen within the Christian community. He has no special road to knowledge because of his office, and he must ascend the same hard path opened to all men.

Bernard appeals to the Apostles as those men of the primitive Church who manifested humility in an ultimate degree. We are reminded of the ideals which were supposed to guide Eugene III and those which had been prominent in Rome during the period of the reform when we read the following passage:

> Sic Prophetae, sic Apostoli facitabant. Fortes fuere in bello, non molles in sericis. Si filius es Apostolorum et Prophetarum, et tu fac similiter. Vindica tibi nobile genus similibus moribus; quod non aliunde nobile quam morum ingenuitate, et fidei fortitudine fit.[147]

The ideal leader thus envisioned by Bernard does not lead by the elegance of his robes or the dignity of office, but by his humility. The papal goal must be the attainment of humility in order to be the real heir of the Apostles. Once he has attained humility, he will then be able to properly define his role in society. Bernard attempts to do this for Eugene in that part of the tractate which deals with the relation of the pope to the rest of the hierarchy.

Having established the nature of the papal leader in abstract terms, that is,as a mixture of a specific personality with certain societal powers, Bernard then turns to a consideration of the specific duties of the pope as ruler of the Christian community. Thus, the substance of Book III of the De Consideratione is a study of the ideal papal leader in action. The point of departure of this part of the work is the discussion of the evils which the existence of the Gregorian curia with its administrative bureaucracy had brought into existence. The four institutions subjected to

the most violent attack are those which are typically Gregorian: the system of appeals, exemptions, dispensations, and the science of canon law.[148] Bernard argues that these institutions have been misused by the Papacy. In fact, Bernard is even willing to argue that their competence--the secular world--has nothing to do with the papal office at all. In one passage he writes:

> Non enim per omnem reor modum, sed sane quodam tenus (ut mihi videtur) dispensatio tibi super illum credita est, non data possessio....Possessionem et dominium cede huic: tu curam illius habe. Pars tua haec: ultra ne extendas manum.[149]

Thus the pope has been given the care of the world, not the possession nor the the "dominium." He must minister to it, not attempt to rule it. This is a fundamental departure from Gregorian ideas, especially that which stressed the papal inheritance of the <u>imperium</u> and the control of the temporal sword. For whereas Bernard is willing to admit that the pope has precedence in the Christian community, he will not admit that he enjoys absolute sovereignty.[150] The pope's role is to act as the servant of those beneath him; this is the height of humility. One might argue that Bernard had translated the Cistercian constitution into the governing rule of the Church. The pope, like the Cistercian abbot, was merely <u>primus inter pares</u> and only this in order to better serve the community. He writes: "Ita et tu praesis, ut provideas, ut consulas, ut procures, ut serves... nam nullum tibi benenum, nullum gladium plus formido, quam libidinem dominandi."[151] And service is best given to the

Church when the pope emulates the role of the Apostles by concerning himself with the spread of the Christian doctrine of salvation.[152]

Now the training needed for those who would spread the faith is not the same as that needed for those who would, like the Gregorians, be concerned with the spread of temporal power. Proof of this may be found in Bernard's constant appeals to the pope to do away with the papal judicial functions. The litigation of appeals to Rome is, according to Bernard, unworthy of the supreme pontiff. In any case, the judging of appeals is not to be used for the spread of papal power over the lay authority.[153] Appeals, if they are to have any worth at all, should be used for the protection of the weak and the poor.[154] Beyond this, Bernard notes the rising tide of scandal which comes from the curial courts and admonishes the pope to set this right.[155] Litigations and appeals are at best merely a minor part of the papal function, and the law itself(that is,formal law) is shown to be nothing but an instrument ofopression when compared with the law of the heart. Not through the study and function of formal, canon law will the pope become the ruler of the Christian community, but through the practice of humility which alone can lead to sapientia. The pope must be absolutely pure and must purge his court of all impure elements.[156] His conscience must come from confidence, his beauty from the strength of good character, and he will be strong in faith.

The ability to lead hinges upon moral character. Precisely because the pope has absolute power officially over the

souls of men he must be as pure as the Apostles. He may not use this spiritual power for the gratification of his own will to power. Bernard writes:

> At quomodo non indecens tibi voluntate pro lege uti; et quia non est ad quem appelleris, potestatem exercere, negligere rationem?...Quanquam noti minus dejecti, quam elati animi est, veluti rationis expertem, non pro ratione, sed pro libitu agere; nec judicio agi, sed appetitu.[157]

Therefore, the pope is given his power not to dominate, but to regulate; not to possess but to supervise. Above all, the Church has need of teachers in order to spread the Gospel. Bernard is specific on this point, arguing that Christ ordered the Church thus: Apostles prophets, evangelists and teachers for the edification of the body of Christ, the perfecting of the saints, the work of the ministers.[158] These teachers, like the Apostles and the prophets, must rule through mimesis, not by formal, compulsive authority.[159]

Before the heritors of the Apostles can effect a spiritual reformation through their teachings they must themselves purify their own surroundings. The evils of the curia thus form the major part of Book IV of the De Consideratione. Firstly, the special privileges of the curia are brought under attack. Bernard argues that the curia has no rights not enjoyed by the entire Christian community, although its members do have special obligations. With possible reference to the power which the curia has taken upon itself, Bernard warns Eugene that although the curia is really under him, their nearness to the pope lead them to be more importune. The pope must guard against the curia, for there is reason

to fear that "they may carry you away altogether."[160] Was this a reference to the capture of Paschal II by the curia? It is certainly a warning of curial attempts to control the Papacy. But while the pope must take pains to avoid a curial coup, at the same time he must assure that his curia is a model to the entire clergy; for it is they who "set the pattern for the clergy throughout the Church."[161]

Bernard admits that his reforms will be met with the cry "innovation!" But he is certain that the ideals of the apostolic life must be reestablished. Above all, the court of Rome must cast off its outward ostentation. He writes:

> Pauperum vita in plateis divitum seminatur. Argentum micat in luto: accurritur undique, tollit illud non pauperior, sed fortior, aut qui forte citius praecucurrit....Scilicet sic factitabat Petrus, sic Paulus ludebat? Vides omnem ecclesiasticum zelum fervere sola pro dignitate tuenda. Honori totum datur, sanctitati nihil, aut parum.[162]

Needless to note, Bernard did not think that an apostolic reform was possible in Rome.

Here then was an attack upon the practices of the curia which had developed under Gregory, the same curia which had been lauded by Landolf of Pisa in 1130, attacked by the early reformers, and reformed by Bernard during the schism. Even the Gregorian idea of the "translatio imperii" was not left untouched. In one passage Bernard openly derides the idea that the pope might consider himself the successor of Constantine:

> Petrus hic est, qui nescitur processisse aliquando vel gemmis ornatus, vel sericis; non tectus auro, non vectus equo albo, nec stipatus milite, nec circumstrepentibus septus

> ministris. Absque his tamen credidit satis posse impleri salutare mandatum: 'Si amas me, pasce oves meas.' In his successisti, non Petro, sed Constantino.[163]

The pope had to become a spiritual leader in order to fulfill his role as pope. "To preach the Gospel was to feed the sheep," Bernard said.[164] None of those practices which were usually associated with the Gregorian leadership ideal had any meaning for the saint, and while he ruled the Papacy they could have little meaning there.

In order to demonstrate this point we fortunately have a biography of a saint written by Bernard in which the ideal leadership in action can be seen through his eyes. This is the Vita Sancti Malachiae in which we are given a glimpse of the perfect leadership education, shown how leadership manifests itself, and initiated into the rewards which await the ideal leader of the Christian community,

St. Malachie, Bishop of Armagh in Ireland, stands as an ideal leader in Bernard's mind because he represents the ascetic hierarchy of values. Malachie is seen as one of the citizens of the New Jerusalem, one of the saints, who has partaken in the kind of knowledge which transformed St. Paul.[165] His withdrawal from the world at an early age, after he had realized that the liberal arts held little that could educate the inner man, is shown by Bernard as the mark of leadership. It is from the conversion, the inner, spiritual transformation which reveals true knowledge. Thus, one

must be the chosen of God before one can claim the leadership power. The choice is purely internal and exists as a relationship between God and the individual. Here the sacramental notion of leadership is rejected. Malachie becomes bishop later, not because he hopes to thus become a leader of society. Instead, he is made bishop because he has already given evidence of being one of the elect of God--a saint. For example, Bernard notes that upon his conversion Malachie foresook the world and went to live with a certain holy man who resided near Armagh, sleeping in an abandoned grave and teaching others the wisdom of divine ignorance.[166] As a student of this mystic, Malachie demonstrated his attainment of the highest virtue: humility.[167]

It is upon the basis of Malachie's fame as an ascetic that he is offered his first position in the sacramental hierarchy. It was not through training in the liberal arts or the law that Malachie became a deacon; nor did he seek a formal office. In fact, we are even told that in becoming a deacon and later a priest at such an early age, Malachie broke the canon law. Bernard argues that the formal law does not apply to the saint, however; that they have rights which they have earned by their holiness. He writes:

> Erat autem, cum sacerdos ordinatus est, annos natus quasi viginti quinque. In qua ejus utraque ordinatione, si quid praeter Canonum formam processisse videtur, ut vere videtur (siquidem infra vicesimum quintum annum leviticum ministerium, infra tricesimum adeptus est sacerdotii dignitatem) donandum sane tum zelo ordinatoris, tum meritis ordinati. Ego vero istud nec in sancto regarduendum, nec usurpandum consulo ei qui sanctus non fuerit.[168]

Thus, sanctity is its own law, higher than the formal law of the canons. The saint could do nothing that was not holy. For men such as Bernard law was mutable--that is, the law of the canons. The real law--the law of God--worked through certain holy men instead of through books, and the testimony of the holy man was more valuable than the written word. Bernard, acting upon this principle, had gone beyond the law at Etampes in 1130 and had not shirked the responsibility of that action. Now, Malachie's breaking of the law in accepting an office before the required age had presented itself to Bernard solely as a mystery--the mystery of God's actions as shown in the life of the holy man.

Malachie's contact with the sacramental hierarchy is used by Bernard to show the differences between its ideals and those of the ascetic. Bernard stresses the fact that although Malachie was prevailed upon to accept the office offered to him, the saint was loathe to do so; because he felt that the cares of the secular office might effect his own chances of salvation.[169] Sent to the most depraved of dioceses, Malachie assumed the office of the Bishop of Connerth so that "the example of his life might lead those people back to God."[170] And, indeed, it was Malachie's virtue which converted those people. Bernard makes special note of this aspect of his teaching, arguing that all the world "took him for its model, and also that the Lord was with him."[171] Nowhere is it implied that the laying on of hands gave Malachie any spiritual power which he did not previously have. It was this success in teaching

which led to his next promotion to the see of Armagh.

Malachie had been offered this see often, but just as often he had refused. The populace would hear none of this, however, and finally they prevailed. Bernard protrays Malachie as destitute with grief and has him say to the people who elect him: "It is to my death that you lead me."[172] He then accepts only on the condition that if he achieves the reform of the see which is desired he may be allowed to return to his first love--that is, the lady poverty.[173] Thus election to the episcopal see in the case of Malachie has followed the ideal pattern: inner virtue and saintliness have brought forth in the mass a sense recognition of the leader and the leader is rewarded by formal recognition in the sacramental hierarchy.

Malachie made a particularly acceptable model for Bernard's thesis, for it is he who has attained the apostolic ideal. Commenting on Malachie's life, Bernard writes that he lived the Gospel according to the rule established by the Lord Himself: 'He who works merits a reward.[174] Poverty and humility, the marks of the apostolic life, continued to be the marks of leadership presented in the priest. Malachie is shown going forth to preach the Gospel on foot, not attired in flowing robes nor mounted on a great warhorse. Thus he was able to pass for a real successor of the Apostles and a veritable image of St. Paul.[175] One could multiply Bernard's comments endlessly, but the multiplication would serve to further document our first statement; Bernard's leadership ideal is different in spirit as well as fact from that eulogized by the

Gregorians. One more incident serves to outline Bernard's concept of Christian wisdom and its effectiveness against the pagan scientia.

Bernard notes that there was a certain cleric of Lesmor who, although of a rather edifying life, had a faith somewhat less than good. This cleric taught that the Eucharist was but a simple benediction, not really the body of Christ.[176] Malachie met the man in public debate--a debate which is most reminiscent of St. Anthony's activities against philosophers. In the debate the man was forced to yield to Malachie, but he claimed that he had yielded only to the authority of the bishop, not to the force of the bishop's arguments. Here is illustrated the weakness of force in handling the evil which afflicts men's mind in their quest for worldly science. To the accusation that he had used his auctoritas in order to arrive at the truth of the Church, Malachie answered that God knew how to show the man the truth. Upon hearing these words the man fell to the ground, writhing in pain, obsessed by the wrath of God.[177] Before he expired, however, the man asked Malachie's benediction; and having received it, he died in peace. Hence, it was plain in Bernard's mind that the purity of soul which was Malachie's was stronger than the intellect of his opponent. These miracles worked by the saint were the outward signs of God's appointment, marks by which the man of God was known.[178] Moral purity bring special power, and Malachie, according to Bernard, attained the summum bonum[179] in which "the Holy Spirit spoke from his mouth."

A view such as this tends to the establishment of an aristocracy of holy men who have a pipeline to heaven by which they receive direct knowledge of the will of God no less than does the pope speaking ex cathedra. At the same time the centralized authority of the Papacy is challenged by the establishment of an infinity of individual centers of divine authority vested in the holy men. This aristocracy acts as St. Bernard does, not through the force of any official position, any office, but through the force of the immense prestige that his asceticism commands. These holy men might even--upon the command of God--depose a pope.

Of course, the mystic leader never assumes--as does the priest--that his authority comes from his own creative personality, as does the hero. The mystic is merely the instrument chosen by God to act for Him in particular situations. Bernard had made this clear at Etampes. Similarly, it had been the "will of God" which had led to the deposition of Celestine II in 1124 by the forces of Aimerich in the curia and the seizure of the Papacy by force. The "will of God" had led the Crusaders into the Holy Land, had given them temporary victory, and then subjected them to crushing defeat. All was the"will of God." The effectiveness of any particular program ultimately depended upon the ability of the charismatic leader to convince the masses that his view of the "will of God" was more correct than other views. During St. Bernard's time, the charismatic leaders rose up against the formal hierarchy and succeeded in demonstrating that actions which they led were more efficacious than those directed by the Papacy per se.

From a purely administrative point of view, the establishment of this aristocracy of saints in a commanding position in the Church could have been disastrous to the Papacy. By its very nature and composition, the aristocracy of saints was unstable, provided no means of orderly succession to command, and was directly responsible to the personalities of its members. If Bernard's ideal of leadership--as seen in the Vita Sancti Malachiae--had really been established, the Papacy would have been back to where Hildebrand and Humbert had found it upon coming to Rome with Leo IX. Of course, Bernard could not see the merit of the Gregorian hierocracy nor the failings of his aristocracy of saints. For him it was a simple matter. A saint was a saint, and he could prove his sanctity by the purity of his personal life and the miracles which this purity allowed him to work. The masses no matter how ignorant could recognize the man of God, and it was certain that real sanctity could always triumph over iniquity. It is only the saint who cannot err; not even the highest of offices of Christianity can make that statement unless the occupants of it can attain the holiness of the saint.

With these considerations in mind we may return to the fifth book of the De Consideratione. Here in this book Bernard sets forth what should constitute the pope's relations with the external world which he is to rule. Here Bernard attempts to show the relationship which the pope must maintain between the otherworldly values of God and the world of temporal existence. "Consideratio" is the key to real wisdom, says Bernard, and is the real stuff of leadership power. He writes:

> Creatura coeli illa (consideratio) est, praesto habens per quod potius ista intueatur. Videt Verbum, et in Verbo facta per Verbum. Nec opus habet ex his quae facta sunt, Factoris notitiam mendicare. Neque enim ut vel ipsa noverit, ad ipsa descendit, quae ibi illa videt, ubi longe melius sunt quam in se ipsis. Unde nec medium requirit ad ea corporis sensum: sensus ipsa sibi, se ipsa sentiens.[180]

Here is a complete submission to the Augustinian "metaphysics of inner experience." The world of the dialectician is to be shut out of the papal experience. Only if we lose ourselves to ourselves, like St. Paul, will we be found by God.[181] Then, through His grace, we may ascend to the realm of abiding truth.

The person who would have real knowledge, whether he be pope or merely a private individual, must ascend to knowledge through three stages of consideration. Bernard calls these three stages economical, estimative and speculative.[182] One sees immediately that these three stages are merely the practical equivalents of his three steps to knowledge as presented in the De Gradibus Humilitatis. The economical is defined as "the systematic use of the senses so as to win the favor of God"--that is, as the equal of humilitas. The estimative is the "wise and diligent search of things in order to find God"--that is, charitas. The speculative is defined as the retirement into oneself, or contemplatio.[183] In the last stage the soul attains the wisdom derived from direct contact with God.

The third stage is, of course, the most important. Since the three stages are applied to the disciplining of the Church, it is important to note that each stage is merely a higher kind of withdrawal from society. The Bernardine papal ideal,

like the monk, withdraws from society in order to serve it best. Active societal effort is definitively subordinated in Bernard's theory of leadership to withdrawal, contemplation and asceticism. None of the virtues which stood the Gregorian popes in such good stead is even considered by St. Bernard as worthy of consideration. Dialectic as epistemology, law as a means of discipline, administrative ability as a means of spreading the faith, and skill in arms as a means of defending the papal honor are expressly deplored. These represent the absurdity or attempting to deal with moral or spiritual problems by worldly or temporal means. The Bernardine ideal leader withdraws from all contact with the concrete in order to better understand its merely transitory character. The wisdom for the solution of the problems facing man will not be found in the study of man, in his books, or his society; it will be found only in communion with God. All that is needed for this is a simple heart, rich in humility, deep in love, and pure in spirit:

> Ergo quae supra sunt non videbo docentur, sed spiritu revelantur. Verum quod sermo non explicat, consideratio quaerat, oratio expetat, mereatur vita, puritas assequatur.[184]
>
> . . .

By way of rounding off our arguments we may consider two final documents, both of which discuss the nature of papal authority in terms which are germane to the study of leadership values. Both documents also have their roots in the very problems posed by the schism of 1130. Both also appeared during those years in which a canon lawyer, Alexander III, was attempting to reestablish the Gregorian ideal of papal power.[185] These two works are the Dialogus de Pontificatu Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae.

written c. 1162-63,[186] and the Dialogus inter Cluniacensem et Cisterciensem, composed shortly thereafter.[187] Both documents are composed in an attempt to deal with problems raised by the double election of 1159.

The double election of 1159, while differing on many points from that of 1130, bears many striking resemblances to it. Many of the characters are similar to the actors in the Anacletan-Innocentian struggle. For example, we have our villain, Victor IV, presented as a wealthy, ambitious, and noble Roman.[188] We are told that the cardinals met before the election, as they had in 1130, in order to decide upon election procedure, and that it was decided that the election had to be unanimous in order to be valid.[189] Also, we see the body of the dead Adrian IV fought over as though it were a prize which brought the papacy to the victor.[190]

Apparently the majority of the cardinals favored the papal chancellor, Rolandus Bandinelli; but Octavian, his opponent, could count upon nine of the votes in the College of Cardinals, and these nine would not change.[191] The majority of the College of Cardinals therefore proceeded to elect Rolandus and invested him with the power of the papal office with the name Alexander III. This precipitated a struggle which soon spread to the streets of the city, Octavian received the support of the Emperor, and the schism was a fact.[192] It was during the course of this struggle that the Dialogus de Pontificatus S. R. E. appeared.

The dialogue opens with a prologue, a eulogy of the seat of Peter as the unifying force of the Christian community. The Roman Pope is held to be the only true "vicarius Christi" and the only real successor of the Apostle Peter.[193] The person of the Pope is likened to a single source of light in a field of total darkness, the point from which the rest of the Church draws its strength, and this on the authority of Cyprian, Origine, and Augustine.[194] Since there can be only one source of authority, the author argues, claims to it cannot be easily dismissed or lightly made. To the end of discovering which of the rival claims to authority are valid, he has brought together the two claimants so that they may set forth their ideas of the nature of the papal office and the basis of its authority. Victor IV and Alexander III are, therefore, the participants in the debate which follows.

Victor argues that three conditions are necessary for a valid papal election: namely, the authority to elect, fitness of the electors, and the vacancy of the papal throne. He further holds that his election alone has adhered to this prescription.[195] Alexander maintains that more is needed that this; he states that the conditions of election are: "auctoritas, libertas, vacans dignitas, petitio populi, vota civium, assensus honoratorem."[196] He holds that anyone who has not been elected in accordance with these conditions cannot claim the papal authority. One notes immediately how Alexander's position is shown to be exactly

the same as that set forth by the Gregorians and practiced by them up to the schism of 1130, particularly in the insistence upon the participation of the people, the complete freedom from external controls on the populace of Rome, and the auctoritas of the electing party. Victor, on the other hand, tries to give the auctoritas of election to his minority party on the same basis as that claimed by the Innocentians in 1130, i.e., upon "ideonitas personae eligendae." Alexander is presented as holding that authority resides only in the College of Cardinals and in the people of Rome, and he does not qualify his statement by positing a condition of fitness.[197] The participation of the Roman clergy and people in the election is given validity by appeal to passages cited from the canons of Leo I and Celestine I.[198] Victor maintains that his election has fulfilled all of the conditions named by Alexander, to which Alexander replies: "Peticio populi tui non fuit populi Romani, sed violentia castellanorum tuorum et temerariae multitudinis quam tu promissionibus et, ut asserunt, largitione pecuniae contra sanctorum patrum statuta collegisti."[199] Thus the role of the people of Rome in the election is positively affirmed. They are to be made, once more, the basis of the escape of the Papacy from imperial control and interference; their importance as an ideological tool increases proportionately to the pressure exerted by the emperors upon the popes, and whereas Bernard would eliminate them completely from any role in the election of the Pope, Alexander III is seen as

making their will the cause of his election, just as had every pope from Leo IX through Calixtus II.

The only recourse left open to Victor is to adopt the position held by Innocent II in 1130 when he was elected by a minority. Victor argues that the paucity of his electors has nothing to do with the validity of his claim to authority, for his is the "maior et sanior pars" of the electoral body. He maintains that his electors are the superiors in morality and thus are the real representatives of the unitas Christiana, the priests who have been chosen to work the will of God. His whole claim rests upon Scripture and the appeal to the pietistic belief in a universal priesthood of believers, a hierarchy of morality, which is more powerful than that which has mere formal or legal being. He writes:

> Paucitatem eorum qui me elegerunt cardinalium mihi obicis. Sed ut taceam illud vulgare quo dicitur: 'ea pars maior et sanior,' audi evangelium: 'Si duos de vobis, ait Dominus, convenerunt in terra de omni re, quecumque petieritis, contingent vobis a patre meo. Ubicumque enim duo vel III collecti fuerint in nomine meo, ego cum eis sum.'[200]

The arguments which follow this assertion are based upon syllogisms which make Victor look the buffoon, but they are not without a purpose for the author of this dialogue. For in essence they are an attempt to show the weakness of the pietistic position: how the transmission of authority from Rome to the Church as a whole can result in anarchy.[201] Alexander's only answer is to quote the canons which give the sole authority of election to the College of Cardinals.[202]

One would point out that here, in the double election of 1159, the positions of the two parties of 1130 are essentially re-created. The majority party in the College of Cardinals claims the authority of election. Alexander's election is valid solely upon the basis of process; nothing is said of either his merit or the merit of his electors. The minority position is essentially the same as that expounded by the Bernardines in 1130, but here their position is made to appear ludicrous. Alexander is shown to be the canon lawyer par excellence, the master of dialectic and formal legal theory, while Victor appears as an ignorant and misguided soul who can quote only the vague phrases of Cyprian and Augustine. Above all, it is interesting to notice the reappearance of an old Humbertine argument: the concept of Rome and the Curia as the cardo et caput of the Christian community. Humbert's Sentences are echoed in Alexander's words when he is made to say: "Et quamquam prima sedes non sit a quoquam iudicanda, quae caput et cardo a Domino et non ab alio constituta est,..."[203] And when Victor argues that the four patriarchal sees of Antioch, Constantine, Alexandria, and Jerusalem have independent rights and the ability to judge Rome, Alexander again reminds him that no one may judge the see of Rome and it may judge all.[204]

Yet the whole of the papal revolution of 1130 was not denied. Alexander, no doubt wishing to return a measure of stability to the Curia, argues that the primary right

of election is to be found only in the order of cardinal-bishops, although the other orders have the right of approval and the Roman people have the right of acclamation.[205] But the power of electing the Pope is in Rome and in Rome alone, and it stems from the fact that the people of that city must act as a free people in the election of their bishop. Thus Alexander is seen as the defender of the very position which had been denied in the Innocentian victory of 1130.

The Dialogus inter Cluniacensem et Cisterciensem helps us in our attempt to sketch in the aftermath of the leadership revolution which Bernard led in yet another way. Whereas the Dialogus de Pontificatu S.R.E, depicts Alexander III as the defender of the legalist concept of the papal office, this debate between a Cluniac and a Cistercian monk shows how the Bernardine leadership ideal persisted even though Bernard himself was dead. Whereas Alexander III is seen arguing that no one might judge the See of Rome in the former work, we see this position placed in doubt in the latter. Significantly, the person who is represented as showing this doubt is a Cistercian monk.[206]

The Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian takes its point of departure from the same argument as that which led to the schism of 1130, i.e., the differences between the Cistercian and Cluniac interpretations of the Benedictine Rule. The Cluniac holds that it is by papal indulgence only that monks may be called "clerics."[207] The Cistercian

denies the truth of this assertion, and when the Cluniac counters by stating that his statement is based upon the authority of certain holy writers,[208] the Cistercian asserts that it is entirely possible that even the highest of priests may be wrong in certain decisions.[209] The Cluniac is shocked; so much so that he asks the Cistercian if he thinks it possible that even the pope may err in his decisions, and he quotes Scripture with the traditional Gregorian interpretation of the words: "Ego pro te rogavi, Petre, ut non deficiat fides tua."[210] To this argument the Cistercian answers that he does not question the theory that the papal authority does not err when turned to matters of doctrine, but he does assert wholeheartedly that since the pope is only a man it is possible for him to be led astray by other men "quia homines sunt, ab hominibus falli possunt."[211] This statement is made on the authority of three documents which we have seen to be most important in our study of papal leadership ideals, the De Consideratione, the De Moribus et Officiis Episcoporum, and the first Epistle of St. Bernard of Clairvaux![212] In fact, the Cistercian even goes so far as to quote the famous statement which Bernard made to the Curia and the Pope in 1119: "Tuum, Domine Jesu, tribunal appello: tuo me judicio servo; ubi plus valet conscientia bona, quam marsupia plena."[213]

No more specific statement of the ideological gulf separating the saint from the priest, the ascetic from the

administrator, could be presented. The Pope was, to the Cistercian, still only a man, subject to the errancy which characterizes all men. Thus, in the light of statements found in the Dialogus inter Cluniacensem et Cisterciensem, one must conclude that the charismatic leadership ideal was, even as late as 1159, still an important factor in the choosing of the papal leader. But it was decidedly on the wane. Alexander III not only represented a throwback to the leadership ideal found in a Leo IX, not only represented a return to educational and administrative ideals of the pre-Bernardine period, he also gave vent to his own concept of how the papal office was to function by more specific actions.

One of his first acts was to replace the mystics and ascetics from the Cistercian Order who had penetrated into the Curia by a new generation of dialecticians and canonists. Innocent II had raised no less than five Cistercians to cardinals.[214] Eugene III continued this tradition, for of the eleven cardinals whose occupations are known, eight were monks from the reform orders.[215] Only one "magister" and one jurist were named, although one of these was Rolandus Bandinelli.[216] This Rolandus, as Alexander III, named no less than five canonists to his Curia, while only one Cistercian monk found himself there.

Beyond this point, the ascent of Alexander III to the papal power, we are not prepared to go. The restoration of the Roman Republic in 1143 was probably not unconnected with

the events of 1130-38. Ideologically it was an established fact that the people and clergy of Rome conceived of themselves as existentially involved in the papal power. Bernard's capture of that power and his open desire to give it a universalist interpretation were possible motivating factors in the revolt of the Romans which followed the close of the schism. To establish the importance of the schism of 1130 has been of primary interest in the writing of this paper, and the revolt of 1143 was only one of many of the lasting effects which the schism brought about.

Seen from the point of view of the Papacy itself, it can hardly be denied that the victory of Innocent II over Anacletus II was the institutional expression of an ideological event of the first importance. Confronted with this fact certain minor facts, such as the family strife in Rome, fade into insignificance. It is more than apparent that the issues of the schism of 1130 were ideological in nature, a reflection in the realm of leadership values of the greater spiritual events which moved the age. Even if we admit the establishment of causal connection between the institutional event per se, that is, schism in the body social, and a spiritual event per se, that is, mystical-pietism reacting to other forms of thought, we must be prepared to admit, in the light of the present study, that the former was fought in terms of the latter. We must admit that ultimately the leadership authority upon which the new papacy of

Bernard of Clairvaux was to rest was fundamentally different from that of the Gregorian papacy which preceded him. This authority was established at Etampes when canon law, legal process, was disclaimed as a valid way of recognizing the papal successor. When Bernard of Clairvaux decreed that henceforth the Pope was to be chosen on the basis of his personal morality alone the Gregorian tradition was denied; and when Peter of Pisa surrendered to Bernard in 1138 the denial was confirmed in Rome. If the Bernardine view had been consistently upheld the papacy would never have been able to defend itself against an opponent such as Frederick Barbarossa, for with a purely charismatic view of leadership the Pope was subject to correction by other points of authority and morality. Etampes signified that the papacy had returned to the time of Peter Damiani and Henry III ideologically. The essential failure of Eugene III and the emergence of a new Henry IV in Frederick I determined the necessity for the emergence of a new Gregory VII to combat him. Such a man was Alexander III; and with his succession, Rome entered once more upon the intellectual and institutional development which men such as Gregory VII, Humbert of Silva Candida, Anselm of Lucca, Gerard of Angouleme, Calixtus II, and Peter Pierleoni believed to be its destiny. That course of development had suffered a temporary reversal with the victory of the Innocentians in 1138. Whether this was good or bad, whether it was profitable for the Papacy or not, does not concern us here. It is enough for the historian to chart

the phenomena; and if his charting has been complete enough, his conclusions will emerge as self apparent.

Summary and Conclusions

Having brought the investigation of papal leadership ideals down through the reign of Adrian IV and standing on the threshold of Alexander III's triumphant re-entry into Rome as champion of a new legalism, a new Gregorianism, some generalizations concerning changes wrought in papal leadership ideals during the century investigated seem in order. It is believed by the present writer that the history of papal leadership ideals during the years 1059 to 1159 can be summarized under certain generalizations concerning the various phases through which two concepts of leadership, charismatic and Amtscharismatic, passed.

It seems obvious in the light of the evidence presented that the schism of 1130 is terminal in the history of the Papacy. It also seems safe to conclude that the Papacy itself was for the hundred years under consideration the office in which the leadership ideals of the Christian community met in conflict. In the year 1130, it is maintained, the struggle between the two concepts of papal leadership was given explicit definition, and one leadership group was substituted for another through the success of a revolutionary movement which had finally resorted to an open appeal to force. Thus envisaged, the schism of 1130 can no

longer be considered merely a struggle between two noble Roman houses for the purpose of placing their representatives upon the papal throne for either monetary or political gain. Instead, the schism of 1130-38 must assume its rightful place in the history of the twelfth century Church and Papacy as representing a conflict in ideology which had existed in the Church from at least as early as 1059. The results of the schism of 1130 must be henceforth viewed as the installing of one set of values for another, as the overthrow of what we have termed Gregorian sacerdotalism in deference to a revitalized Bernardine asceticism. This uprising of the provinces of the Church against the centralized bureaucracy was led, we have seen, by a group of charismatic leaders who undertook to question and revise the values of the Christian community in the light of the ideals of a primitive pietism. If one accepts these conclusions and admits that the Anacletan faction did indeed represent Gregorian ideas, then one is also forced to admit that instead of representing a fulfillment and culmination of Gregorian ideas, the Bernardine party constitutes a decided reaction to everything that the Gregorians stood for.

We have seen that the conflict in leadership ideals is merely one aspect of a larger conflict in values which one finds in the very conception of the Gregorian revolution in 1059. The Gregorian movement, insofar as it was a revolution in leadership values, represented the attempt of a few administrators in Rome to create a genuine hierocracy

within the Church in which office per se was to be the prime concept of organization. Each church office was to be strictly defined, its responsibilities outlined, and its relations to other offices decided by a supreme authority in Rome, which authority would give systematic utterance to its decisions in a logical body of knowledge, canon law, and an objectified organizational structure, a highly centralized bureaucracy.

The conflict of values came with systematic attempts to re-organize the "corpus Christi," the universal priesthood of believers, the hierarchy of saints, in terms of a conquest of society as a whole and the subjugation of the laity. The sacerdotal hierarchy of values came into conflict with the ascetic hierarchy of values as early as 1059 and manifested a constant irritation within the leadership, irritation which may be seen in the series of ideological schisms characterizing the history of the Papacy from 1059 to 1159. The most important of these schisms was that of 1130 in which the leadership issue was openly broached, but the sources of this schism were inherent in the sociology of the Gregorian movement.

The reform of the Papacy had been instituted by the ascetics and their ally, Henry III. Men such as Peter Damiani and Odilo of Cluny were the driving force behind it. Yet, more and more, the reform had been captured by the sacerdotalists, men such as Humbert of Silva-Candida and Gregory VII, men who, although they represented a radical

departure from the spirit of the early reformers, nonetheless had to ally the ascetics with them in order to win a popular following among the masses. This is not to imply that the Gregorians themselves were not intensely interested in the institution of a moral reform as such; this had always been their prime aim. However, in terms of methods of means of achieving their ends of reform, the Gregorians had seized upon the ideals of establishing a strongly centralized and independent organ of Church administration, and this had led them into open conflict with the Empire for control of the temporalia.

Neither emperor, monk, or priest would have denied that the Church should have been free and independent in order to direct the spiritual ends of society. The revolutionary character of the Gregorian Reform lay in its demand to interpret without limit exactly what aspects of society affected the spiritual life of the individual member of the Church. It became evident in the working out of the reform that in order to achieve complete freedom of action the Papacy could do no other than declare that everything effected the spiritual life of the community and to end by asserting that as a result the pope, as wielder of the spiritual sword, was the wielder of supreme power in all the world. This kind of reasoning reached its apogee of course in the thirteenth century, being given theoretical explanation in the Summa Theologica and the De Regimine Principium of St. Thomas Aquinas and the bull Unam Sanctam of Boniface VIII.

In the early days of the reform the ultimate conclusions to be derived from the new direction taken by the Gregorians were not immediately apparent. Nonetheless such a person as Peter Damiani dimly intuited that there were inconsistencies in the end of moral reformation and the means employed by the Gregorians of instituting a new organization of the Church in formal, administrative terms. Damiani himself expressed his growing concern by attacking the heroes of the new movement, men such as Humbert of Silva-Candida, Leo IX, Alexander II, and Hildebrand (Gregory VII). Damiani's own withdrawal from curial affairs marked the temporary withdrawal of the ascetic element from the struggle with the sacerdotalists.

Outright rupture between sacerdotalists and ascetics was averted by the leadership genius of Gregory VII who allied the theory behind the new concept of the papal office so intimately with his own charismatic qualities that the two became indistinguishable and, as we have seen, the personality of the man himself became for later Gregorians the main justification for the revolution in organization that he carried. An ascetic such as Manegold of Lautenbach thoroughly accepted the Gregorian administrative revolution assumptions (like acceptance of the use of dialectic) which Manegold personally abhorred. Gregory and his propagandists were able, through the exploitation of certain emotive symbols ("ecclesia primitiva," "libertas ecclesiae," "translatio imperii," et. at.), to pacify the most violent of ascetics,

and through the force of his own personality, Gregory was able to make his cause common with that of a number of centers of rebellion against the old order in the Church. Imperial attempts to discredit Gregory clearly show that the Pope had accomplished a union with ascetic forces, for, as we have seen, the main line of imperialist propaganda takes the form of arguing that Gregorianism can only destroy monastic ideals. Notwithstanding the sentiments which made the ascetic the natural ally of the Emperor (that is, the ascetic's belief that the world should be foresaken instead of governed), it was not until the death of Urban II in 1099 that the imperialists were able to profit from their propaganda attack. The series of imperially promoted schisms which confronted Gregory VII and Urban II never succeeded in gaining a mass following although they were clearly directed at mass religious sentiment, especially in their emphasis upon the ideal of pietas and the spiritual nature of the Church's role on earth. However, by 1099 it had become obvious that Urban II was a representative of what can only be construed as the "sacerdotalist" view of Church organization and values. It is with the realization of this fact in the mass that we may detect a spirit of disillusionment with the Church leadership emerging in the provinces, specifically in new religious orders such as the Cistercians. The otherworldly values which dominated the character of these orders make their interpretation of the social role of the Church basically incompatible with the aims of a strongly centralized,

hierocratic Papacy which now seems to be engaged in a life and death struggle with the Empire for control of the temporalia and for that alone. If this hypothesis is correct, it becomes immediately apparent that the appeal of imperial propagandists to the concept of pietas as the governing principle of the Church's social role has increased its chances of success in attempting to woo the mass away from the central leadership organization. One might further hypothesize that here the role of the individual in history may be stressed by showing that only the adamant posture assumed by Henry V in his dealings with the Church kept this new ascetic movement separated from princely interests as long as it did. Yet Henry V, within his own struggle for political survival, was left with no choice in the matter. Until the end of his life political forces in Germany demanded his own unyielding attitude regarding the temporal control over the bishoprics. Nonetheless, it is significant that it is only after Henry's death that criticism of the Papacy (which exists within the leadership elite itself from as early as the time of Ivo of Chartres' break with Urban II) came out into the open. Once the threat of Henry is removed and political emphasis reverts to Germany in the problem of establishing a successor to the defunct Salian house, the Church community is left in comparative solitude to define its own leadership ideals. Naturally, once the political threat is removed, the martial spirit demanded in the leader of the Christian communitas can be subjected to

the most careful scrutiny in the sight of the otherworldly role of the Church.

One may state with certitude that from roughly 1106 until 1138 there was a period of soul searching and self evaluation within the Church leadership itself. By this time the threat to the existence of the independent Papacy has passed; one is faced with deciding how this independent Papacy will interpret its own social role. A number of solutions are put forth if not completely consciously. The attempts of Paschal II to spiritualize the role of the Church in society seems to have been consistent with mass feeling in the Church as a whole, if one may take the Crusades and the rise of radical heresies as an index of the growth of a purely ascetic ideal among the masses. There seems to have been a chance of Paschal's succeeding in his aims, as witnessed by solutions found in Church-State relations in France and England, but the Pope's attitude was revealed as startlingly unrealistic to the radicals in the Curia by the ineffectiveness of the negotiations with Germany. The abduction of the Pope by Henry V and the subsequent "humiliation of Sutri" confirmed the curial clique's suspicion that love and good intentions, while perfectly acceptable for a life in the cloister, were quite impossible as an index to societal action per se. The open rejection of ascetic ideals and the systematic reduction of Paschal's own individuality to a position of subservience to the Curia, made patent

the split which existed in leadership ideals between sacerdotalists and ascetics. The forcing of the Pope to sign a document in which he bound himself to Gregorian political policies and seemingly ignored the religious ones led to the alienation of a large mass of the Church membership and the creation of an internal rupture within the Church community in which the leadership in Rome and its allies were ranged against the "grass-roots" ascetics in the provinces. Paschal was made to sign a document in which he publicly confessed that attempts to divest the Church of its temporal possessions could be interpreted as heresy and could be corrected by a now emerging body with autonomous authority, the Roman Curia.

Whether the capture of the Papacy by the Curia led to the consolidation of the new asceticism in the form of new anti-curial religious orders is impossible to say. Nonetheless, it is apparent that by the time these new religious orders have assumed a prestige in society which allows them to voice their views, one of the first groups to come under attack by them is the Curia and the temporal goals which distinguish it. We may arbitrarily date the emergence of this challenge to the Gregorian leadership in the year 1119, the year in which Bernard's first epistle makes patent the source of authority by which the Cistercian monk undertakes social action: "I appeal to <u>Your</u> tribunal, O Lord..." We may see Bernard's letter as a manifesto of the new "internal proletariat." On this date, a third factor enters the arena

for control of the leadership mechanism of the Church for which Empire and priesthood had been struggling for so long. By 1125, the conflict of values had reached the Curia itself, and Honorius II has openly seized the leadership mechanism of the Church in violation of canons of election and with the open blessings of the new "charismatic" leaders of the Church community, the monkish leaders of the new Cistercian reform.

As a result of the externalization of the leadership struggle, two parties are formed in the Curia on the basis of interpreting the role of the papal leader. The platforms of these parties may be seen as the value structures which we have identified as "priestly-sacramental" and "monkish-ascetic." Henceforth, struggles within the hierarchy take the form of a struggle to define leadership values in terms of the new goals which the mass seems to have adopted. The new "creative minority," the Cistercian's creatures, manifest their creativity by the manipulation of emotive symbols which sway the mass most easily to their standard bearer, Innocent II. On the other hand, the Gregorians in the Curia (and we must not forget that these were the same men who had engineered the papal "victory" in 1122) manifested their inability to perceive the changed attitudes of the mass by their constant reiteration of the (now) old fashioned Gregorian arguments concerning the "legality" of their candidate's election.

But "legality" has no meaning for a mass which has

been conditioned on all levels to look upon office, not as a legal entity, but merely as an extension of the personality which assumes leadership by reason of its superior virtue, its superior moral qualities, its superior piety, its superior devotion to the ideal of ascesis. The ultimate victory of Innocent II over the "legally" elected Anacletus II after the schism of 1130-8 reflects the "making legal" in an institutional sense the shift in leadership ideals which has transpired since the days of Gregory VII. The actual leadership of the Church, the charismatic leadership of the Church, resides from 1130 to 1153 in the hands of the "saint," Bernard of Clairvaux and men like him. At the same time, as we have seen, the center of canon law studies shifts from Rome, where, since Gergory's time, it had enjoyed a favored position, to Bologna. Legal activity (that is, canon law activity) disappears from the Roman scene with Bernard's assumption of charismatic power over the Papacy, another fact which reflects the essential anti-Gregorianism of the saint.

With the establishment of Bernard's sway over Rome, or at least with the establishment of the Bernardine leadership ideal, the Papacy assumes a character completely unlike that which had been under Gregory VII and his immediate successors. No longer will the pope engage in a struggle for the temporalia. The prince will wield the sword of temporal power. Thus, the bureaucracy created by the Gregorians will fall. No longer will the pope judge his subjects; instead, he will lead them

by the inspiration of his holy life. This will destroy the necessity of maintaining the Gregorian administrative bureaucracy. The De Consideratione will create the justification for the new leadership ideal; the monk has won the day. Rome itself will be supplanted as the symbol of authority by an appeal to an Augustinian idea of a priesthood of saints; membership in the official hierarchy is reserved for those who are capable of measuring up to the rigid standards which Bernard imposes upon himself. Until Bernard's death in 1153 this new ideal of leadership prevailed in the Papacy. How much this system of leadership depended upon the vital force of St. Bernard's own personality is seen in the rapidity with which it collapsed after the saint's death.

Viewed from a purely institutional standpoint, charismatic leadership ideals can have little permanency outside of the personality of the men who immediately occasion the victory of such ideals at any given time in the history of an institution. The very nature of charisma is anti-institutional. To the charismatic personality the formality of written law and institutionalized activity is only a bond hampering him in attaining the ends which he envisions. It is the nature of the charismatic personality to cut through the routine of stylized institutional activity and, by the very denial of the efficacy of "legal" procedure, accomplish his ends. One might argue, however, that Bernard's reform of the Papacy was foredoomed to failure and that his temporary success was occasioned only by the historical setting in which he

was allowed to act. This could be said of any prominent historical figure from Ikhnaton to Luther and beyond. And yet certainly the Papacy as an institution had reached that realm of "objective possibility" about which Weber writes in which by its very nature it was impossible to return to the "ecclesia primitiva" ideal as a model for its own social organization. To admit the validity of Bernard's theory of the papal role would have been to return to theworld of Henry III, with whom a Eugene III might have dealt in good faith and in a spirit of charitas. But to return to that world was impossible, and in this sense Bernard must be seen (insofar as he was a social theorist) as an anachronism. But then when we have said this we have only said that he was a prophet type. For all of Bernard's effort and admitting the strength of his remarkable personality, he left little permanent effect upon the institutional structure which he effected so violently for a while. Once those same external challenges which had precipitated the Gregorian movement in the first place reappeared, the charismatic leadership ideal was immediately set aside as something worth striving for but hardly attainable on this earth. This may be seen in the effect upon future popes which the De Consideratione had. It was, for example, a purely "spiritual" inspiration for a man such as Innocent III, but it can hardly be seen as exercising a force in determining the course of Innocent's actions in the final establishment of a real hierocracy.

The inadequacy of the De Consideratione approach to

papal leadership was seen in the failures of Eugene III on three accounts. His kind of leadership, while no doubt personally inspiring to devout men, failed when confronted with the rise of new heresies, was inadequate in dealing with constant rebellions in Rome itself, and was revealed as totally inept when confronted with the Realpolitik of a Frederick Barbarossa. The men who successfully confronted all three threats were canon lawyers, administrators and dialecticians: men such as Alexander III, Gregory VIII, and Innocent III. Beyond the mention of these names we need not go. The claim of Alexander III to the papal authority was the same as the claim advanced by Anacletus II. With the advent of Rolandus Bandinelli, the cycle was completed. Gregorianism had returned with all of its grandiose claims and its forceful presentation of those claims. With Alexander one enters upon a new epoch in the history of the Papacy, an epoch in which Gregorianism, long banished from the court of the popes, returned. The exile of the ideology had been effected by Bernard of Clairvaux and his followers, and the schism of 1130 had been the action in which the exile had been determined. Thus envisaged, the schism of 1130 is seen to be a terminal point in the history of the Papacy, the Church, and Christianity.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER VIII

[1]Julius Dietrich, MGH, Lib., III, 84.

[2]Mühlbacher speculates on the possibility of Arnulf's having studied in Rome. See his Streitige Papstwahl, 53-53. See Arnulfus, "Invectiva," MGH, Lib., III, 85.

[3]See Dietrich's comments in Ibid., 83-84. Both of Bernard's biographers, Williams and Vacandard, accept Arnulf's statements at their face value, finding here the evidence necessary for the vindication of Bernard's canonically illegal action at Etampes. See Vacandard, La vie de St. Bernard, I, 304-305, and Williams, St. Bernard, 98-110. Compare the remarks of Bloch, op. cit., 167.

[4]Dietrich, op. cit., 81-82. For Arnulf's condemnation of Gerard, see Ibid., 86.

[5]Ibid., 86-92.

[6]Ibid., 92.

[7]Ibid., 93.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Totus igitur annis pueritiae suae, ut honestius inhonesta dicantur, ad omne se, quod alteri collibuisset, exposuit, metuque Romani nominis importunis exactor alienis adolescere non refugit exoensis. Et tamen haec aliquantulum modestius exacta sunt, dum ipsum disciplina scolaris inhibet et cotidianae prepedit instantia lectionis, et quedam crimina naturalis impotentia removet ab etate. At vero postquam adolescentia et peccandi facultatem et licentiam fecit liberius evagandi, si qua superbia, si qua petulantia est, tum vere ipse superbus et petulans omni intemperantiae sese satis impudenter addixit." Ibid.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid.

[12]"Post haec habitum quoque monachatus exceptit, ut vita mentis ovino velaret amictu, opprobia vitae preteritae Cluniacense nomen obnuberet, et virtutis existimationem bonorum societas quesita referret." Ibid., 93-94.

[13]Ibid., 94.

[14]Ibid., 94-95.

[15]Ibid., 95. Compare Manfred of Mantua's letter in which the same libel is found. Mühlbacher, op. cit., 52. The letter is also reproduced in Watterich, op. cit., II, 275.

[16]Arnulfus, "Invectiva," 95.

[17]Ibid., 96.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid., lines 10-25.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Ibid., 97.

[24]Ibid., 97-98.

[25]Ibid., 98.

[26]Ibid., 96.

[27]"Nunc autem instat et a fide discessio et antiquae desolatio potestatis et omnium bonorum eius casus manifestus apparet...." Ibid., 96.

[28]Ibid., 100.

[29]Ibid., 100-101.

[30]Ibid., 101. Compare Ernaldus, "Vita Bernardi," PL, CLXXXV, 293-94, and Gerohus, "De Investigatione Antichristi," I, 47, MGH, Lib., III, 355.

[31]Arnulfus, "Invectiva," 101. Compare Gerohus, "Opusculum ad Cardinales," MGH, Lib., III 406.

[32]Gerohus, "Epistola ad Innocentium Papam," MGH, Lib., III, 202ff.

[33]Ibid., 227.

[34]Muhlbacher, op. cit., 44-45.

[35]"Chronicon Mauriniacensis," Bouquet, Recueils, XII, 84-85; PL, CLXXX, 157.

[36]Ibid., 157-58; Bouquet, 79.

[37]Ibid.; PL, 158.

[38]"Iste studii gratia Gallias atque Parisiis adiit, et cum repatriaret, apud Cluniacum, ditissimum atque sanctissimum coenobium, monachilem habitum induit." Ibid.; Bouquet, 79.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Ibid.

[41]Ibid.

[42]Ibid.

[43]See Mabillon's notes in PL, CLXXXII, 723-25.

[44]Haller has made an interesting observation concerning the terminal character of the years 1151-53. He writes: "Die Totenliste verzeichnet zu 1151 Abt Suger, den Regenten Frankreichs, 1152 Konrad III, 1153 Eugene III, Bernhard von Clairvaux und Alerbo von Trier, den Königsmacher Konrad's III. Zu Anfang 1154 stirbt Roger von Sizilien, und ehe das Jahr um ist, nach Stephen von England Heinrich II. Die Abten sind abgetreten, eines neues Geschlecht steht bereit, die Rollen übernehmen, und ein neuer Aufzug beginnt." Haller, Das Papsttum, III, 115.

[45]Ullmann, The Growth of Papal Government, 427.

[46]Ibid. [47]Ibid.

[48]See Mabillon in PL, CLXXXII, 723-25.

[49]Ibid.

[50]See the introduction to Bernard's "De Consideratione," PL, CLXXXII, 727.

[51]Bernardus, "De Consideratione," PL, CLXXXII,735-36, 745.

[52]Ibid., 745.

[53]Bernardus, "De Gradibus Humilitatis et Superbiae," PL, CLXXXII, 944-45.

[54]"De Consideratione," 789-90.

[55]Ibid., 790-94. [56]Ibid.,794-96.

[57]"De Gradibus Humilitatis," 951-52.

[58]"De Consideratione," V, i, 2, 789.

[59]"De Gradibus Humilitatis," 941-42.

[60]Ibid., 943.

[61]"Illud quoque quod in scala illa, quae in tipo humilitatis Jacob monstrata est, Dominus de super innixius apparuit, quid nobis aliud innuit, nisi quod in culmine humilitatis constituitur cognitur veritatis." Ibid., 943.

[62]"Primus ergo cibus est humilitatis, purgatorius cum amaritudine: secundus charitatis, consolatorius cum dulcedine: tertius contemplationis, solidus cum fortitudine." "De Gradibus Humilitatis," 944.

[63]Ibid., 943-44, 945-48.

[64]Ibid.

[65]Ibid., 648-49.

[66]Ibid., 950-51

[67]Ibid., 951-52.

[68]Ibid., 952.

[69]See especially William James, The Varieties of Religious Experience (New York: The Modern Library, n.d.), 186ff.

[70]Bernard considered Paul to be the incarnation of that spirit which liberated itself from the body in order to ascend to Heaven: "At omnium maximus, qui soreto ipso usu rerum et sensuum, quantum quidem humanae fragilitati fas est, non ascensoribus gradibus, sed inopinatis excessibus, avolare interdum contemplando ad illa sublimia consuevit. Ad hoc ultimum genus illos pertinere reor excessus Pauli." Bernardus,"De Consideratione," PL, CLXXXII, 790.

[71]Bernardus, "De Moribus et Officio Episcoporum," III, 10, PL, CLXXXII, 817.

[72]Ibid.

[73]Ibid., 816-17.

[74]Bernardus, "De Consideratione," 763.

[75]Bernardus, "De Moribus et Officio Episcoporum," 814.

[76]Ibid., 826.

[77]Ibid., 820.

[78]Ibid., 828, 826, 821.

[79]Ibid., 833.

[80]Bernardus, "Epistola CL," PL, CLXXXII, 306.

[81]Bernardus, "Epistola CLXXVIII," Ibid., 340.

[82]Bernardus, "Epistola CCXIII," PL, CLXXXII, 378.

[83]Gilson, La philosophie au moyen âge, 286.

[84]Bernardus, "Epistola CCCXXX," PL, CLXXXII, 536.

[85]Bernardus, "Epistola CXCIII," PL, CLXXXII, 559.

[86]Bernardus, "Epistola CCCXXXVII," PL, CLXXXII, 541.

[87]Bernardus, "Epistola CCCXXXI," Ibid., 536.

[88]Bernardus, "Epistola CCCXXXI," Ibid., 535-36. See also "Epistola CCCXXXII," Ibid., 537-38; "Epistola CCCXXXIV," Ibid., 538-39; "Epistola CCCXXXV," Ibid., 539; and "Epistola CCCXXXVIII," Ibid., 542-43.

[89]Bernardus, "Epistola CCXXXV," Ibid., 423.

[90]Bernardus, "Epistola CCXXXVI," Ibid., 424.

[91]Bernardus, "Epistola CCXXXVI," Ibid., 425.

[92]Bernardus, "Epistola CCXXX," Ibid., 417.

[93]See Adrianus IV, "Epistola CCXLI," PL, CLXXXVIII, 1615-1617; Bernarus, "De Consideratione," PL, CLXXXII, 941-45; and Bernardus, "Epistola CCLXXXVIII," PL, CLXXXII, 493-94.

[94]Ernaldus, "Vita Bernardi," PL, CLXXXV, 297-98.

[95]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 386-87.

[96]Ibid.

[97]"Iordanum filium Petri Leonis in patricium promovit, et senatores de novo in Urbe creavit." Romualdus, "Chronicon," R. I. S., VII, i, 228. See also Ottonis Frisingensis, "Chronicon," VII, 13, MGH, SS, XX, 264. The best commentaries on the events are those of Schramm, Kaiser, Rom und 'Renovatio,' I, 90ff.; Arrigo Solmi, Il senato romano nell'alto medio evo (757-1143) (Roma: Miscellanea della Reale Deputazione Romana di Storia Patria, 1944), 245-46; and Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V, i, 797.

[98]Eugenius III, "Epistola I," PL, CLXXX, 1015.

[99]Bernardus, "Epistola CCXLIV," PL, CLXXXII, 440-42.

[100]Ottonis, "Chronicon," MGH, SS, XX, 264-65. See also Ottonis, "Gesta Friderici," MGH, S.R.G., 132-34; Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 386; and Bernardus, "Epistola CCXLII," PL, CLXXXII, 438-40.

[101]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 386-87.

[102]Bernardus, "De Consideratione," 941; Bernardus, "Vita Sancti Malachiae," PL, CLXXXII, 1074.

[103]Ibid., 1073-74. [104]Ibid., 1073.

[105]Ibid., 1074.

[106]Bernardus, "De Consideratione," 727.

[107]Bernardus, "Epistola CCXXXV II," PL, CLXXXII, 426. It was inkeeping with the ascetic ideal of leadership, however, that Bernard wrote: "Digitus Dei est iste, suscitans de pulvere egenum, et de stercore erigens pauperem, ut sedeat cum principibus, et solium gloriae teneat." Bernardus, "Epistola CCXXXVIII," Ibid., 428.

[108]Ibid., 429. [109]Ibid.

[110]Bernardus, "De Consideratione," PL, CLXXXII, 731.

[111]Ibid., 731-32, 734-35.

[112]Ibid. [113]Ibid., 735.

[114]Ibid., 735-36. [115]Ibid.

[116]Ibid., 733. [117]Ibid., 732.

[118]Ibid., 736 [119]Ibid., 734.

[120]Ibid., 741. [121]Ibid., 757.

[122]Ibid., 771, 787.

[123]Ullmann, op. cit., 413-14.

[124]Ibid., 433. [125]Ibid., 428-30.

[126]Bernardus, "De Consideratione," 766.

[127]Ibid., 734-35.

[128]On this point see especially the work of Walter Nigg, Vom Geheimnis der Mönche (Zürich und Stuttgart: Artemis-Verlag, 1953), 208-211.

[129] "Non est quod blandiatur celsitudo, ubi sollicitudo major. Illa discrimen intendit, haec amicum probat. Huic accingamur, si nolumus tandem cum rubore novissimum locum tenere." Bernardus, "De Consideratione," PL, CLXXXII, 747. Consider also, by way of securing the point, the following: "Factum superiorem dissimulare nequimus; sed enim ad quid omnimodis attendendum. Non enim ad dominandum opinor.... Non sum ego major prophetis; et si forte par potestate, sed meritorum non est comparatio. Haec loquere tibi, et doce te ipsum, qui alios doces." (Italics mine.) Ibid. And again: "Loquere ego tibi: abjectus eram in domo dei mei. Quale est hoc, de pavere et abjecto levari super gentes et regna? Quis ego, aut quae domus patris mei, ut sedeam excelsis sublimior? Sane qui dixit mihi: 'Amice, ascende superius,' amicum fore fidit. Si minus invenior, non expedit quidem. Qui elevavit, et dejicere potest." (Italics mine) Ibid., 746-47.

[130] Ibid., 745.

[131] Ibid., 746.

[132] Ibid., 734-35, 795.

[133] Ibid., 746.

[134] Ibid.

[135] Ibid.

[136] Ibid., 752-53.

[137] Ibid., 751-52.

[138] Ibid.

[139] Ibid.

[140] Ibid., 752.

[141] Ibid., 750.

[142] Ibid., 751.

[143] Ibid., 753

[144] Ibid., 755.

[145] Ibid., 750

[146] Ibid.

[147] Ibid., 749-50.

[148] Ibid., 766.

[149] Ibid., 758-59.

[150] "Quid, inquis? non negas praesse et dominari vetas? Plane sic." Ibid., 759.

[151] Ibid.

[152] Ibid., 759-60.

[153] Ibid., III, iii, 13, p. 764.

[154] Ibid., 731-33, 761.

[155] Ibid., 765.

[156]Ibid., 766 [157]Ibid., 767.

[158]Ibid., 768. [159]Ibid., 768-72.

[160]Ibid., 771. [161]Ibid., 772-73.

[162]Ibid., 775. [163]Ibid., 776.

[164]Ibid.

[165]Bernardus, "Vita Sancti Malachiae," PL, CLXXXII, 1098. Further: "Ut enim taceam interiorem hominem ejus, cujus pulchritudinem, fortitudinem, puritatem satis indicabant mores ipsius et vita...." Ibid., XIX, 43, p. 1097.

[166]Ibid., 1077. [167]Ibid., 1077.

[168]Ibid., 1078. [169]Ibid., 1080.

[170]Ibid. [171]Ibid.,1116.

[172]Ibid., 1087. [173]Ibid.

[174]Ibid., 1098. [175]Ibid.

[176]Ibid., 1105-1106. [177]Ibid., 1106.

[178]Ibid., 1075, 1091. [179]Ibid., 1091.

[180]Bernardus, "De Consideratione," PL, CLXXXII, 787-88.

[181]Ibid., 789. [182]Ibid., 789-90.

[183]Ibid. [184]Ibid., 790, 806-808.

[185]We need not dwell here on the educational and intellectual revolution which Alexander III effected in the Papacy. See, however, the article by Gaines Post, "Alexander III, the 'licentia docendi' and the Rise of the Universities," Anniversary Essays in Medieval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins (Boston and New York: Houghton and Miflin, 1929), 255ff.

[186]See H. Boehmer, MGH, Lib., III, 526.

[187]On the datation see Edmund Martene, Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum (Parisiis, 1717), V, 1571. See also Williams, Monastic Studies, 61-74.

[188]See Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire, V, ii, 916-27.

[189]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 397.

[190]Ibid.

[191]Hefele-Leclercq, op. cit., 918-19.

[192]Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, II, 398; Gerohus, "De Investigatione Antichristi," MGH, Lib., III, 359-62.

[193]"Dialogus de Pontificatu Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae," MGH, Lib., III, 529.

[194]Ibid.

[195]Ibid., 195.

[196]Ibid.

[197]Ibid., 531-32.

[198]Ibid., 532.

[199]Ibid.

[200]Ibid., 533.

[201]Ibid.

[202]"Alexander: 'Ut autem noveris, solos cardinales ius et potestatem habere eligendi Romanae sedis antistitem.'" Ibid., 534.

[203]Ibid., 542.

[204]Ibid.

[205]Ibid., 544.

[206]Martin Preiss, Die poltischen Tätigkeit und Stellung der Cisterzienser im Schisma von 1159-1177 (Berlin: Historische Studien, 1934), Ch. I.

[207]Martene, Thesaurus, V, 1620.

[208]Cluniacensis: "Mirar quod dicis eos in hoc errare, quia magister Hugo in libro de sacramentis dicit ad ipsum: 'Scilicet monachos ex indulgentia clericatum habere...." Ibid., 1620.

[209]Referring to Hugo as "Homer," the Cistercian argues "that sometimes even our good Homer may sleep..." Ibid. It is then that the Cluniac counters with the question of whether or not the Pope may err: "Mira audio. ecce audes etiam ipsos apostolicos, tuae reprehensionis mittere manum: sed per eorum reprehensionem mitigasti nobis nostram. Ego multotiens audivi, quod successores Petri pontifices Romani, numquam errent; et quod eis hoc impetraverit rogatio Christi pro Petri, Christo id ipsum promittente, quando dixit:...." Ibid.

[210]Martene, Thesaurus, V, 1620.

[211]Ibid., 1621.

[212]Ibid.

[213]Ibid.

[214]Brixius, op. cit., 46-47.

[215]Ibid., 55-57.

[216]Ibid., 56-57.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Source Collections and Editions

Bouquet, M. Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France. New edition revised by Leopold Delisle. Paris: Victor Palme, 1878. Vols. X-XIV.

Brezzi, Paolo (ed.) De divina omnipotentia e altri opuscoli di San Pier Damiani, traduzione di Bruno Nardi. Firenze: Edizione Nazionale dei Classici del Pensiero Italiano, 1943.

Bruel, Alexandre. Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1894. Vol. V.

Caspar, Erich (ed.) Das Register Gregors VII. Berlin: Monumenta Historiae Historica, Epistolae Selectae, 1920.

Duchesne, Louis (ed.) Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte introduction et commentaire. 2 vols. Rome: Bibliothèque de l'Ecole Francais d'Athène et Rome, 1886-92.

_____. Le Liber Censum de l'Eglise Romaine. 2 vols. Paris: Fontemoinge et Cie, Editeurs, 1910.

Erdmann, C. Papsturkunden in Portugal. Berlin: Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen, Philologische-historische Klasse, 1927.

Ewald, P. "Die Papstbriefe der Britischen Sammlung," Neues Archiv, V (1879), I, 275-414; II, 505-596.

Foglietti, Raphaelis. Sancti Petri Damiani autobiographia ex operibus eius deprompta. Torino: Tipografia Succ. A. Baglione, 1899.

Hinchius, Paulus. Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni. Lipsiae: Ex Officina Bernhardi Tauchnitz, 1863.

Hugo of St. Victor. On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith. Translated by Roy T. Deferrari. Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1951.

Jaffé, Phillipi. Regesta pontificum romanorum a condita Ecclesiae ad annum post Christum MCXCIII. 2nd. ed. revised by W. Wattenbach, F. Kaltenbrunner, and P. Ewald. 1885.

Mabillon, Jean (ed.) Opera Omnia Sancti Bernardi. 3 vols. Venetiis: 1781.

Mansi, J.D. (ed.) Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio. 31 vols. Venetiis: 1754-98.

Marsh, Joseph (ed.) Liber pontificalis prout exstat in codice Manuscripto Dertuensis textum genuinem complectens hactenus ex parte in editum Pandulphi. Barcelona: Typis "La Educacion," 1925.

Martene, Edmund (ed.) Thesaurus novus anecdotorum. Parisiis: 1717. Vol. V.

Mia-canivez, Josephus D. (ed.) Statuta capitulorum generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis. 8 vols. Louvain: Bureaux de la revue, 1933-41. Vol. 1.

Migne, J.P. (ed.) Patrologiae cursus completus: Patres ecclesiae latinae. 217 vols. Parisiis: 1844-66.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica inde ab anno Christi 500 usque ad annum 1500: Constitutiones et Acta publica imperatorum et regum. 6 vols.

_____. Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum, saeculis XI. et XII. conscripti. 3 vols.

_____. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum. 30 vols.

_____. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scolarum. 61 vols.

_____. Schriften. 8 vols.

Muratori, L. A. (ed.) Scriptores rerum Italicarum. 25 vols. 1723-51.

_____. Rerum italicarum scriptores. New edition by Vittorio Fiorini and Giosue Carducci. 344 fasc. Since 1887.

Neugart, T. Rudpertus. Codex diplomaticus Alemanniae et Burgundiae Transiuranae intra fines Diocesis Constantiensis ceu Fundamentum Historiae eusdem Diolcensis. St. Blasianis: 1719. Vol.II.

Robert, Ulysse (ed.) Bullaire du Pape Calixte II (1119-24): Essai de restitution. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1891.

Thaner, Fridericus (ed.) Anselmi Collectio Canonum una cum collectione minore. Oenimponte: Librariae Academicae Wagnerianae, 1906. Fasc. I.

Ughelli, Ferdinando (ed.) Italia Sacra, sive de episcopis Italiae et insularum adiacentium rebus que ab iis praeclare gestis-deducta serie ad nostram usque aetatam. 9 vols. Roma: 1644-72. Revised edition by Nicola Coleti. Venezia: 1712-22. 10 vols.

"Vie et miracles du Pape S. Leon IX," Analecta Bollandiana, XXV (1906), 258-297.

Von Glanvell, Wolf. (ed.) Die Kannonsammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit. Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh, 1905.

Watterich, I. M. (ed.) Pontificum Romanorum qui fuerunt inde ab exeunte saeculo IX usque ad finem saeculi XII vitae ab aequalibus conscriptae quas ex archivi pontifici, Bibliothecae Vaticanae aliarumque codicibus aductis suis cuique et annalibus et documentis Gravioribus. Lipsiae: Sumptibus Guilhelmi Engelmanni, 1862. Vol. I.

Will, Cornelius (ed.) Acta et scripta quae de controversiis Ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant. Lipsiae: Sumptibus N.G. Elwerti Bibliopolae Academici, 1861.

Books

Andrieu, Michel. Le "Ordines Romani" du haut moyen age. 2 vols. Louvain: "Spicilegium Sacrum Louvaniense" Administration, 1948.

Anthony, E.W. Romanesque Frescoes. Princeton: University Press, 1951.

Armellini, M. Le chiese di Roma del secolo IV ad XIX. Nuova edizione. Roma: Edizioni R.O.R.E. di Nicola Ruffolo, 1942. Vol. II.

Arquilliere, H.-X. L'augustinisme politique: essai sur la formation des théories politiques du moyen âges. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1934.

_____. St. Grégoire VII: essai sur sa conceptione du pouvoir pontifical. Paris: Librairie philosophique du J. Vrin, 1934.

Balzani, Ugo. Le cronache italiane nel medio evo. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, 1909.

Berges, Wilhelm. Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalter. Leipzig: Schriften der MGH, 1938.

Bernhardi, Wilhelm, Lothar von Supplinburg. Leipzig: Verlag von Dunker und Humbolt, 1879.

Bernheim, Ernst. Das Wormser Konkordat und seine Vorurkunden. Breslau: Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats und Rechtsgeschichte, 1906.

Blum, Owen J. St. Peter Damiani: His Teaching on the Spiritual Life. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1947.

Boehmer, H. Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im XI. und XII. Jahrhundert. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1899.

Bresslau, Harry. Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien. 2nd. Ed. Leipzig: Verlag von Veit und Co., 1912.

Brezzi, Paolo. Roma e l'impero medieovale. Roma: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1947.

Brixius, Johannes. Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130-1181. Dissertation. Berlin: Verlag von M. Trinkel, 1912.

Brooke, Z.N. The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1931.

Butler, Cuthbert. Western Mysticism: The Teachings of SS Augustine, Gregory and Bernard on Contemplation and the Contemplative Life. 2nd. ed. London: Constable and Co., 1926.

Carlyle, R.W. and A.J. A History of Medieval Political Thought in the West. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Son, 1922. Vol. IV.

Chevalier, Ulysse. Poesie liturgique du moyen âge. Paris: A. Picard Libraire, 1893.

Cochrane, Charles Norris. Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study in Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1944.

Commission de l'histoire de l'Ordre de Citeaux. Bernard de Clairvaux. Paris: Editions Alsatia, 1953.

Dempf, Alois. Sacrum Imperium: Geschichte und Staatsphilosophie des Mittelalters und der poltiischen Renaissance. München/Berlin: Verlag von R. Oldenburg, 1929.

Dill, Samuel. Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age. London: The Macmillan Co., 1926.

Dmitrewski, Michel V. Die christliche freiwillige Armut vom Ursprung der Kirche bis zum 12. Jahrhundert. Berlin: Abhandlungen zur mitteleren und neueren Geschichte, 1913.

Dudden, F. Holmes. The Life and Times of St. Ambrose. 2 vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1935.

Eichmann, Eduard. Die Kaiserkrönung im Abendland: ein Betrag zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters. Wurzburg: Echterverlag, 1942.

_____. Weihe und Krönung des Papstes im Mittelalter. ("Münchener Theologische Studien," Vol. I.) München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1951.

Erdmann, Carl. Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens. Stuttgart: Forschungen zur Kirchen und Geistesgeschichte, 1935.

Evans, Joan. Monastic Life at Cluny, 910-1157. London: Oxford University Press, 1931.

Fliche, Augustin and Martin, Victor (editors). Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours. 24 vols. Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1947.

_____. La réforme grégorienne. Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Louvainense, 1937. Vol. III.

Fournier, P. and Lebras, G. Histoire des collections canoniques en occident depuis des Fausses Décrétales jusqu'au Décret de Gratian. 2 vols. Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1931.

Gaffrey, B. Der "liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda" im Lichte mittelalterliche Zeitanschauungen. Berlin: Historische Studien, 1921.

Gigalski, Bernhard. Bruno von Segni, 1049-1123: Sein Leben und seine Schriften. Münster: Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, 1898.

Gilson, Etienne. La théologie mystique de saint Bernard. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1934.

_____. La philosophie au moyen âge des origines patristiques à la fin du XIVe siecle. 2nd. ed. Paris: Payot, 1947.

_____. Introduction a l'étude de saint Augustine. Paris: Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1943.

Goetz, Walter. Italien in Mittelalter. Leipzig: Koehler und Amelang, 1942.

Goldschmidt, Adolph. Der Albanipsalter in Hildesheim und seine Beziehung zur symbolischen Kirchensculptur des XII. Jahrhundert. Berlin: Verlag von Georg Seemons, 1895.

Gregorovius, Ferdinand. Storia della città di Roma nel medio evo. 13 vols. Citta di Castello: Editrice Unione Arti Grafiche, 1942.

Grundmann, Herbert. Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zussamenhangen zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegnung im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik. Berlin: Historische Studien, 1935.

Haller, Johannes. Das Papsttum: Idee und Wirklichkeit. Basel: Benno Schwank und Co., Verlag, 1952. Vols. II-III.

Hallinger, Kassius. Gorz-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebenformen und Gegensätzen in hoch Mittelalter. 2 vols. Roma: Studia Anselmiana, 1952.

Hampe, Karl. Das Hochmittelalter: Geschichte des Abendlandes von 900 bis 1250. Münster-Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1953.

Harnack, Adolf. Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. 3rd. ed. Freiburg: Verlag von J.C. B. Mohr, 1897. Vol. III.

Haskins, Charles H. The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

_____. Studies in Medieval Culture. Oxford: At the University Press, 1929.

Hauck, A. Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands. 5 vols. 3rd. ed. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.

Heer, Friedrich. Der Aufgang Europas: Eine Studie zu den Zusammenhängen zwischen poltischen Religiosität Frömmigkeitsstil und dem Werden Europas im 12. Jahrhundert. Wien-Zurich: Europa Verlag, 1949.

Hefele, Jos. and Leclercq, H. Histoire des conciles d'apres les documents originaux. New French translation from the second German edition. Paris: Letouzy et Ane, Editeurs, 1912. Vol. V.

Histoire littéraire de la France où on traite de l'origine et du progress de la decadence et du rétablissement des sciences parmi les Gaulois et parmi les Francais par les réligieux Bénédictines de la congrégation de S. Maur. Paris: Librairie de Victor Paline, 1869. Vols. XI-XIII.

Katterbach, Bruno. Die Unterschriften der Päpste und Kardinäle in den "Bullae maiores" vom 11. bis 14. Jahrhundert. Roma: Tipografia del Senato, 1924.

Kern, Fritz. Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages. Translated and with an introduction by. S.B. Chrimes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948.

Köniğer, Albert. Burkhard von Worms und die deutsche Kirche seiner Zeit. Munchen: Veroffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen Seminar Münchens, Reihe II, n. 6, 1905.

Lovejoy, A. O. The Great Chain of Being: A Study in the History of an Idea. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Löwe, Heinze. Die karolingische Reichsgrunding und der Sudösten: Studium zum Werden des Deutschentums und seiner auseinandersetzung mit Rom. Stuttgart: Forschungen zur Kirchen und Geistesgeschichte, 1937.

Manacorda, Giuseppe. Storia della scuola in Italia. Milano-Palermo-Napoli: Remo Sandron Editore, 1913. Vol. I.

Mannheim, Karl. Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952.

Martens, Wilhelm. Die Besetzung des päpstlichen Stuhls unter den Kaisern Heinrich III und Heinrich IV. Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1887.

Michel, Anton. Papstwahl und Königsrecht oder der Papstwahlkonkordat von 1059. Munchen: Max Heuber Verlag, 1936.

_____. Die Sentenzen des Kardinals Humbert, das erste Rechtsbuch der päpstlichen Reform. Vol. VIII of "Schriften des Reichsinstituts für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (Monumenta Germaniae Historica)." Stuttgart: Hiersemann Verlag, 1943.

Mirbt, Carl. Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1894.

_____. Die Stellung Augustins in der Publizistik des Kirchenstreits. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1888.

Mühlbacher, Engelbert. Die streitige Papstwahl des Jahres 1130. Innsbruck: Wagnerschen Universitäts Buchhandlung,

Neukirche, Franz. Das Leben Petrus Damianis bis zur Ostersynode 1059, nebst einem Anhang: Damianis Schriften chronologisch geordnet. Göttingen: Robert Peppmüller, 1875.

Oursel, G. La miniature du XIIe siècle a l'abbey de Citeaux d'apres des manuscripts de la bibliothèque de Dijon. Dijon: Librairie L. Venot, 1926.

Palumbo, Fausto. Lo scisma del MCXXX. Roma: Miscellanaa della Deputazione Romana di Storia Patria, 1942.

Pare, G., Brunet, A., and Tremblay, P. La rénaissance du XIIe siècle: Les écoles et l'enseignement. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1933.

Parsons, Talcott and Shils, Edward A. (eds.) Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Poole, A.N. From Doomsday Book to Magna Charta. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1951.

Poole, R.L. The Papal Chancery. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1915.

Prantl, Karl. Storia della logica in occidente. Translation from the second German edition by Ludovico Lumintani. Firenze: La "Nuova Italia" Editrice, n. d.

Preiss, Martin. Die politische Tätigkeit und Stellung der Cisterzienser im Schisma von 1159 bis 1177. Berlin: Historische Studien, 1934.

Reincke, Arnold. Die Schuldialektik im Investiturstreit: Eine Geistesgeschichtliche Studie. Stuttgart: Forschungen zur Kirchen und Geistesgeschichte, 1937.

Robert, Ulysse. Histoire du pape Calixte II. Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1891.

Reuss, Karl. Die rechtliche Stellung der päpstlichen Legaten bis Bonifaz VIII. Paderborn: Bruck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schonigh, 1912.

Runciman, Steven. Le manichéisme medieval: l'hérésie dualiste dans le christianisme. Paris: Payot, 1949.

Sagmüller, J.B. Die Thätigkeit und Stellung der Kärdinale bis Papst Bonifaz VIII: historische-canonistische untersucht und dargestellt. Freiburg: Herder'sche Verlaghandlung, 1896.

Schmid, Paul. Der Begriffe der kanonischen Wahl in den Anfängen des Investiturstreites. Stuttgart: W. Kohlmann Verlag, 1926.

Scharnagl, Anton. Der Begriff der Investitur in den Quellen und der Literatur des Investiturstreites. Stuttgart: Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen, 1908.

Schieffer, Theodor. Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Vertrage von Meersen (810) bis zum Schisma von 1130. Berlin: Historische Studien, 1935.

Schneider, Feodor. Rom und Romgedanke im Mittelalter: Die geistige Grundlagen der Renaissance. München: Drei Masken Verlag, 1926.

Schramm, Percy Ernst. Kaiser, Rom und "Renovatio:" Studien und Texte zur Geschichte des römischen Erneurungsgedankens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit. 2 vols. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1929.

Schreiber, Georg. Kurie und Kloster im 12. Jahrhundert: Studien zur Privilierung, Verfassung und besonders zum Eigenkirchenwesen der vorfranziskanischen Orden vornehmlich auf Grund der Papsturkunden von Paschal II bis auf Lucius III (1099-1181). 2 vols. Stuttgart: Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen, 1910.

Schumann, Otto. Die päpstlichen Legaten in Deutschland zur Zeit Heinrichs IV und Heinrichs V (1056-1125). Marburg: Universitäts-Buchhandlung von Johannes August von Koch, 1912.

Smith, Lucy M. Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. London: Phillip Allan and Co., Ltd., 1930.

Solmi, Arrigo. Il senato romano nell'alto medio evo (750-1143). Roma: Miscellanea della Reale Deputazione Roma di Storia Patria, 1944.

Tellenbach, Gerd. Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest. Translated and with an introduction by R.F. Bennett. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948.

Thompson, J.W. Feudal Germany. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.

Tillman, Helene. Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beëndung der Legations Gualis (1218). Dissertation. Bonn: 1926.

Tolley, W.P. The Idea of God in the Philosophy of St. Augustine. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1930.

Toynbee, Arnold. A Study of History. 10 vols. Oxford: At the University Press, 1935-54.

Troeltsch, Ernst. The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches. Translated by Olive Wyon. 2 vols. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1950.

Ullmann, Walter. The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages. London: Methuen and Co., 1955.

Vacandard, E. Vie de saint Bernard, Abbe de Clairvaux. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1927.

Von Knonau, Gerold Meyer. Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV und Heinrich V. Leipzig: Verlag von Dunker und Humbolt, 1909.

Weber, Max. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Translated and with an introduction by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. London: Routliedge and Kegan Paul, 1952.

_____. Aus den Schriften zur Religionssoziologie. Frankfurt am Main: Georg Kurt Schauer Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1948.

Weisbach, Werner. Religiöse Reform und mittelalterliche Kunst. Zürich: Verlagsanstalt Benziger and Co., 1945.

Williams, Watkin. St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935.

Windelband, Wilhelm. A History of Philosophy, with Especial Reference to the Formation and Development of its Problems and Conceptions. Authorized translation by James H. Tufts. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1953.

Zoepfel, Richard. Die Papstwahlen und die mit ihnen im nächsten Zusammenhangen stehenden Ceremonien in ihrer Entwicklung vom 11. bis 14. Jahrhundert. Göttingen: 1871.

Articles

Andrieu, Michel. "L'origine du titre de cardinal dans l'Église Romaine," Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati, V.(1949), 113-44.

Arquilliere, H.-X. "Origines de la théorie des deux glaives," Studi Gregoriani, I (1946), 501-521.

Bardy, Gustave. "Saint Grégoire VII et la réforme canoniale au XIe siècle," Studi Gregoriani, I (1946), 47-64.

Bernheim, Ernst. "Politische Begriffe des Mittelalters im Lichte der Anschauungen Augustins," Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft, Neue Folge. I (1896-97), 1-23.

Bloch, Herbert. "The Schism of Anacletus II and the Glanfeuil Forgeries of Peter the Deacon of Monte Cassino," Traditio, VIII (1952), 159-264.

Borino, G.B. "L'archidiaconato d'Ildebrando," Studi Gregoriani, III (1948), 463-516.

_____. "Ildebrando non si fece monaco a Roma," Studi Gregoriani, IV (1952), 441-456.

_____. "Quando e dove si fece monaco Ildebrando," Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati, V (1946), 218-62.

Brackmann, Albert. "Die Ursachen der geistigen und politischen Wandlung Europas im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert," Historische Zeitschrift, CXLIX (1933), 229-39.

Carol, Dom. F. "Cluny et Citeaux," Association Bourguignonne des Sociétés Savants: Congrés de 1927: St. Bernard et son temps. 2 vols. (Dijon: Academie des sciences, arts et belles-lettres de Dijon, 1928), I, 19-28.

Caspar, Erich. "Bernard von Clairvaux," Meister der Politik: Eine Weltgeschichtliche Reihe von Bildnissen. Herausgegeben von Erich Marcks und Karl von Müller. Berlin: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1923, 181-221.

Dereine, Charles. "La problème de la vie canoniale chez les canonistes d'Anselme de Lucques a Gratien," Studi Gregoriani, III (1948), 287-98.

Duchesne, Louis. "Les circonscriptions de Rome pendant le moyen âge," Révue des questions historiques, XXIV (1878), 219ff.

_____. "Le Liber Pontificalis aux mains des Guibertistes et des Pierléonistes," Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, XXXVIII (1920), 165-93.

_____. "Le nom d'Anaclet II au palais du Latran," Memoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquairies de France, XLIX (1889), 197-206.

_____. "Note sur l'origines du 'cursus' ou rythme prosaique suivi dans la rédaction des bulles pontificales," Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes, L (1889), 161-63.

Elze, Reinhard. "Das 'Sacrum palatium Lateranense' im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert," Studi Gregoriani, IV (1952), 27-54.

Erdmann, Carl. "Mauritius Burdinius (Gregor VIII)," Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken, XIX (1927), 205ff.

Fedele, Pietro. "Le famiglie di Anacleto II e di Gelasio II," Archivio della Reale Societa Romana di Storia Patria, XXVII (1904), 411ff.

Fedele, Pietro. "Sull'origini di Frangipane," Archivio della Reale Societa Romana di Storia Patria, XXXIII (1910), 493-506.

Feine, Hans Erich. "Die Periodisierung der kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte," Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte, KA, XXXVI (1950), 1-14.

Fliche, Augustin. "Le cardinal Humbert," Révue historique, CXIX (1915), 41-76.

Fournier, Paul. "Bonizio de Sutri, Urbain II et la comtesse Mathilde d'apres le liber de Vita christiana de Bonizio," Bibliothèque de l'École de Chartes, LXXVII (1915), 265-98.

_____. "Une collection canonique italienne du commencement du XIIe siècle," Annales de l'Enseignement supérieur de Grenoble, VI (1894), 1-96.

_____. "Les collections canoniques romaines de l'époque de Grégoire VII," Memoires de l'Institute National de France: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, XLI (1819), 217-397.

_____. "Les deux récensions de la collection canonique romaine dite le 'Polycarpus,'" Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, XXXVII (1918-19), 57ff.

_____. "Etudes critiques sur le Décret de Burchard de Worms," Nouvelle révue historique de droit francais et etranger, XXXIV (1910), 1-144.

_____."Le premier manuel canonique de la réforme du XIe siècle," Mélanges archéologie et d'histoire, XIV (1894), 147-223.

_____. "Un tournant de l'histoire du droit, 1060-1140," Nouvelle révue de l'histoire de droit francais et étranger, XL (1917), 5-56.

Frugoni, A. "Sulla 'renovatio senatus' del 1143 e l'ordo equestrio," Bulletino d'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano, LXII (1950), 159-174.

Funk, Phillip. "Pseudo-Isidore gegen Heinrichs III Kirchenhoheit," Historische Jahrbuch, LVI (1936), 305-33.

Goetz, Walter. "Die Entwicklung des Wirklichkeitssinnes im 12. bis 14. Jahrhundert," Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, XXVII (1937), 33-73.

Holtzmann, Walter. "Zur Geschichte des Investiturstreits," Neues Archiv, L (1935), 312ff.

Jacqueline, Bernard. "St. Bernard de Clairvaux et le curie romaine," Rivista della storia della chiesa in Italia, VII (Genaio-Aprile, 1953), 27-44.

Jordan, Karl. "Das Eindringen des Lehnswesens im das Rechtsleben der römischen Kurie," Archiv für Urkundsforschung, XII (1931), 13-111.

_____."Die Entstehung der römischen Kurie," Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte, KA, XXVII (1939), 105ff.

_____."Zur päpstlichen Finanzgeschichte im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert,"Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken, XXV (1933-34), 61-104.

_____. "Die päpstlichen Verwaltung im Zeitalter Gregors VII," Studi Gregoriani, I (1946), 111-135.

Klewitz, Hans Walter. "Das Ende des Reformpapsttum," Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalters, III (1939), 371-412.

_____."Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," Zeitsdrift für Rechtsgeschichte, KA, XXIV (1936), 115-221.

_____."Monte Cassino und Rom," Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken, XXXVIII (1937-38), 36-47.

Kuttner, Stephen. "Cardinalis: The History of a Canonical Concept," Traditio, III (1945), 129-215.

_____."Zur Frage der theologischen Vorlagen Gratians," Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte, KA, XXIII (1934), 243ff.

Lewalter, E. "Eschatologie und Weltgeschichte in der Gedankenwelt Augustins," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, LIII (1934), 1-52.

March, Joseph. "Ancora su Pandolfo continuatore del 'Liber Pontificalis': attribuzione de altre opere," La civilta cattolica, Anno LXVI (Aprile, 1915), II, 148-73.

_____."Sull'autore della biografia di Pasquale II e delle precedente del 'Liber Pontificalis' cominciando da quella di Leone IX," La civilta cattolica, Anno LXV (Novembre, 1914), IV, 402-420.

Martens, Wilhelm. "Gregor VII war nicht Mönch," Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-gesellschaft, XVI (1895), 274-82.

May, J. "Leben Pauls von Bernried," Neues Archiv, XII (1886), 335-52.

Michel, Anton. "Die Anfänge des Kardinals Humbert bei Bischof Bruno von Toul (Leo IX)," Studi Gregoriani, III (1948), 299-319.

_____."Die folgenschweren Ideen des Kardinals Humbert und ihr Einfluss auf Gregors VII," Studi Gregoriani, I (1946), 65-92.

_____. "Humbert und Hildebrand bei Nicholaus II (1059-1061)," Zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik: Festschrift Georg Schreiber. Johannes Spörl, ed.(Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1953), 133-161.

Morghen, Rafaelo. "Ideali religiosi e azione politica nell'opera di Gregorio VII," Studi Gregoriani, III (1948), 163ff.

Ott, Irene. "Der Regalienbegriffe im 12. Jahrhundert," Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte, KA, XXXV (1948), 234-304.

Overmann, Alfred. "Die Vita Anselmi Lucensi episcopi des Rangerius," Neues Archiv, XI (1895-96), 403-439.

Palumbo, Fausto. "La cancelleria di Anacleto II," Miscellanea di scritti di paleografia e diplomatica in onore di V. Federici. Firenze: 1945. 53 pages.

Pelster, Franz. "Der Traktat 'De ordinando pontifice' und sein Verfasser Humbert von Moyenmoutier (Humbertus a Silva Candida)," Historisches Jahrbuch, LXI (1941), 88-115.

Pivec, Karl. "Die Bedeutung des ersten Romzuges Heinrichs V," Mitteilungen des Ostereichische Institut für Geschichtsforschung, LII (1938), 217-225.

Rubenstein, N. "Political Rhetoric in the Imperial Chancellory in the Twelfth und Thirteenth Centuries," Medium Aevum, XIV (1945), 21-44.

Sackur, Ernst. "Zur Chronologie der Streitschriften des Gotfried von Vendome,"Neues Archiv, XVII (1892), 327-47.

Sagmüller, J.B. "Die Idee der Kirche als imperium Romanum," Theologische Quartalschrift, LXXX (1898), 50-80.

Schaffer, Theodore. "Notice sur la vie de St. Hugues, abbé de Cluny," Le moyen âge, XLVI (April-Juin, 1936), 81-103.

Schmeidler, Bernard. "Zum Papstwahldekret Papst Nickolaus II von Jahre 1059," Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXXI (1938), 554ff.

Schramm, Percy Ernst. "Sacerdotium und Regnum im Austausch ihrer Vorrechte: Eine Skizze der Entwicklung zur Bedeutung des 'Dictatus Papae' Gregors VII," Studi Gregoriani, III (1948), 403-457.

Schreiber, Georg. "Gregor VII, Cluny, Citeaux, Premontre zu Eigenkirche, Parochie und Seelsorge," Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte, KA, XXXIV (1947), 31-172.

_____. "Mittelalterliche Passionsmystik und Frommigkeit," Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift, CXXII (1941), 32-44, 107-123.

Schwarz, Willi. "Der Investiturstreit in Frankreich," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLII (1923), 258ff., XLIII (1924), 92ff.

Seeburg, Erich. "Geschichte und Geschichtsanschauung," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, LX (1941), 310-33.

Smith, Lucy M. "Cluny and Gregory VII," English Historical Revue, XXVI (January, 1911), 30ff.

Stutz, Ulrich. "Gratian und die Eigenkirche," Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte, KA, I (1911), 3ff.

Tellenbach, Gerd. "Zum Papstwahldekret von 1059," Historische Zeitschrift, CLVIII (1938), 123ff.

Throust, Anton. "Das Wahldekret Anaklets II," Mitteilungen des österreichische Institut für Geschichtsforschung, XXVIII (1907), 351ff.

Tritz, H. "Die hagiographischen Quellen zur Geschichte Papst Leos IX," Studi Gregoriani, IV (1952), 191-364.

Ullmann, Walter. "Cardinal Humbert and the Ecclesia Romana," Studi Gregoriani, IV (1952), 111-127.

Vacandard, E. "St. Bernard et le schisme d'Anaclet II en France," Révue des questions historiques, XLIII (1888), 61-123.

Vehse, Otto. "Benevent als Territorium des Kirchenstaates bis zum Beginnder Avignonische Epoche," Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken, XXII (1930-31), 87-160.

_____."Bistumsexemption bis zum Ausgang des 12. Jahrhundert," Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte, KA, XXVI (1937), 86-160.

Von Schubert, H. "Petrus Damiani als Kirchenpolitiker," Festgabe für K. Müller (Tubingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr, 1922), 83-103.

Williams, Watkin. "The Exordium Magnum Cisterciense," Monastic Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), 52-60.

Zema, Demetrius. "The Houses of Tuscany and the Pierleoni in the Crisis of Rome in the Eleventh Century." Traditio, VIII(1953), 160ff.