

The Church is a mystery, and its governance is quite unlike any other form of government. Its task, as that of other institutions, is to bring freedom, not restraint; but the freedom of Christ is something different from the freedom that men can confer. Against love, joy, peace and service there can be no laws; and though law liberates in the main by restricting in certain regards, it is insufficient to express the drives of man, who is at once bound by time and his nature and destined for eternity and God's grace. Man lives in two orders of being, the spiritual and the seeable, constantly aware that his life is sacramental, inward and beyond him and yet evidently tangible and controllable by him.

These orders of being are not to be confused. The one embraces the operation of spiritual energy, a breath of God, life from life, which man can receive or reject, but can neither create nor control. The other is the mundane order of growth and decay, seasonal change, supply and demand, contract, agreement, enforcement. The Church stands astride these two orders of being, exercising its authority and its laws not because such laws reflect divine life but because the Church is composed of men - men who are called to live fully human lives, and are called essentially and primarily to the responsibility of the service of God, which alone is perfect freedom transcending all human authority. The Church is an organic synthesis of these two orders - and so an apparent living contradiction, fraught with anomalies. Did Christ not say that he had come to fulfill the Law, and his vessel of election Paul then say that the Law had been done away with? Are we not baffled as how to reconcile the justice of God with the mercy his Son preached? Were we not exhorted never to cease endeavouring, yet Christ said "without me you can do nothing"? And what of the virtues of humility, gentleness, modesty and meekness, of forbearance and bearing the burdens of one another, which accord little with the self interested prudence of this competitive world? And what does it mean that we should become as little children, when the whole drive of man in his highest civilising nature is towards adult maturity of mind? And what are we to make of the doctrine that the exalted are to be humbled and the humble exalted? And what is the lesson of Christ washing his disciples' feet or a succession of Popes calling themselves *servus servorum Dei*? The Church is a sign of contradiction reconciling two worlds

‡ A paper delivered to the York Minster Lecture Society, 21 November 1969

that seem irreconcilable. Her role is well illustrated by the title of a recent book (1969) by Professor von Campenhausen:

Ecclesiastical Authority & Spiritual Power

My subject is the growth of the papacy, as of a mustard seed in Peter burgeoning into the pontifical structure of Hildebrand, Alexander III and the two Innocents (III and IV), spiritual office that gathered immense international temporal power. Its early diplomatic and undefined relationship with the local popes, the bishops of the Churches bordering on the Mediterranean - Carthage, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch and the rest - changed, imperceptibly at first and then deliberately, as a reform programme, into one of paramount precedence over all bishoprics; and more than precedence, dominance - Roma locuta est, causa finita est. The Rome of the later Popes had universal centralised power far beyond the Rome of Caesars and Consuls in their time. My subject is the shift to high papalism during the Middle Ages.

I do not mean it to be a lesson in medieval Church history so much as a tract for our times. The first Extraordinary Synod of Bishops having met only last month at the Vatican to hammer out practical means of implementing the theoretical doctrine of Collegiality, already established in the Conciliar decree Lumen Gentium on the Church in the early 1960s, the subject is highly relevant to our present interests. What is the historical background of the momentous developments in the structure of ecclesial government in the Roman Catholic Church brought about between October 1962 - October 1969? How have the claims of the papacy developed and the claims properly made for the episcopate been swamped by them over the years? We must trace how it came about that Cardinal Suenens should be able to speak at Rome of "an absolute papacy, resembling the French monarchy before the Revolution of 1789". Pope Paul VI on the same occasion last month said this: "The government of the Church has an original form of its own, which intends to reflect in its expression the wisdom and will of its divine founder". This brings us to our starting point, the Apostolic Church as we know it from the New Testament.

The root of the papal tradition lies in the texts that show St. Peter as given a primacy among the Apostles. When Matthew lists the Twelve, he begins "first Simon, who is called Kepha" (Aramaic for Rock). When Jesus brings his inner circle to witness the Transfiguration, the raising of Jairus' daughter and the Agony at Gethsemane, they are recorded as Peter, James and John - and it is to the first of these only that Jesus asks, "Peter, art thou asleep?" There are then the three petrine texts, "Thou art Peter .." (Ma 16), "I will confirm thee .." (Lk 22) and "Feed my flock .." (Jn 21); and these are backed by many lesser innuendos to the same effect. Then in a very clear way the Resurrection visions were directed first to Peter: "Go tell Peter and the rest of his disciples .." (Mk 16.5). It was he who first ran to the empty tomb, he that first saw the Risen Christ (1 Cor 15) before the other eleven, he that tumbled into the water to greet his Lord by the lake, he that conducted the election of Matthias in Judas' place, he that condemned Ananias and Saphira, he that stood with the other eleven around him to preach in the open, he that answered the Sanhedrin with the Apostles about him, he that Paul sought out after his three years in the desert, and he that Jerusalem looked to as the spokesman of Christ and his Apostles. This last is clear by many references in Acts, but most especially Acts 5.15: "they brought sick in their beds .. in the hope that even the shadow of Peter might fall upon them here and there". He was even called to raise the dead, as no other Apostle was (Acts 9.36).

Now the claims to the petrine primacy are so evident that it is often assumed that there was no limit indicated, that it was passed on in petrine succession to every Pope at Rome without diminution (which is ~~true~~) or restriction (which is not true). Scripture suggests that there was a limit to the primacy from the very first. Peter's powers were given in the form of a diakonia, a service and not a jurisdiction; and later Popes, remembering the Washing of the Feet, rightly took the title, even to this day, of servus servorum Dei. We are shown in Acts what we have seen in the recent Synod, Peter subject to the college of Apostles, of which he was of course a constituent member (first of the Twelve, a term used even when there were only eleven of them). The Twelve sent out Peter and John to Samaria, and later Peter had to justify his breaking of the circumcision policy by spelling out his Cornelius vision before the assembly. Paul, as we are often told, successfully challenged Peter.

At the Jerusalem Council, though Peter's evidence weighed most - as it should - it was the Apostles who resolved and the presbyters and then the whole assembly who agreed upon the decisions reached. Where now a Pope must summon a Council, be represented at it, and confirm its decrees if they are to be valid, this procedure was far from established until late in the Church's life.

It is clear that the vestigial signs of Collegiality were present from the outset, and this is shown best in the selection of the seven Deacons (Acts 6). The Twelve initiated the process by calling the general body of disciples. The Church at large were left to select the seven, after which the Apostles both instituted the office and ordained the Deacons sacramentally by laying hands on them with prayer. By this the Deacons received real spiritual power which gave them a charismatic independence, leaving them administratively answerable as much to the Church (the presbyters of Acts 11.30?) as to the Apostles. The Apostles we should note, had been given by Jesus on earth the same powers as had Peter: "I promise you, all that you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and all that you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Ma 18): this is most important in the light of subsequent history, for it shows that the Apostles, and in apostolic succession the bishops, receive their powers not by delegation from Peter, but from the same source as Peter and independently of him.

Whatever we are to understand by the Petrine primacy in the light of the Church's experience, it is clear that the pristine and sub-apostolic Church had no certain light on the matter. At the stage it seems to have been ruled by a council of Elders or presbyters of a kind familiar to Israel (e.g. the Sanhedrin), a council which carried financial responsibility and took both doctrinal and disciplinary decisions. The pattern was introduced at Ephesus (Acts 20. 17), and is presumed in 1 Peter 5 and in James' instructions on the last anointing. Paul speaks of presidents (Rom 12.8), pastors (Eph 4.12), overseers (phil 1.1); and not until the Pastoral epistles - which some scholars date as late as 120- do we find a more institutionalised pastoral ministry breaking out of the two patterns of Jewish Elders and Pauline variety of ministries in one body. By the second century three kinds of Church order seem to exist together, the universal episcopacy of such as Timothy or Titus over several small Churches, the local bishop and his council of presbyters presumed by Ignatius of Antioch, and the council of Elders found even outside

Israel, in for instance Corinth (as 1 Clement 42 suggests). By the early third century, this has resolved itself still further, so that the bishop unmistakably has a charge of a particular pastoral ministry, with a college of presbyters holding powers derivative from their bishop: in urban districts such as Rome, they have directly delegated powers as functionaries, while in rural districts such as Gaul they appear as presidents of their parish community. As this development progressed, the sense of a collegiate council of the local Church, bishop and presbyters, diminished; and bishops found themselves rulers of their dioceses in a way altogether more personal, and perhaps more autocratic, for they then shared their authority with no council, its former members having a care of widespread parishes. (cf. D.N.Power, O.M.I., "Ministers of Christ and his Church" 1963).

A theology of the Episcopate only began to harden with Cyprian of Carthage in the mid third century. Cyprian applied the Ma 16 "Thou art Peter .." text to the bishops of the local Churches. In his Epistle 66.8, he wrote that -

You should understand that the bishop is in the Church and the Church in the bishop, and that whosoever is not with the bishop is not in the Church.

In Ep 43.5 he stated with great force that there is but one Church, one altar, one priesthood and one chair - and all of those pertain to the bishop. But he had an equally strong sense of episcopal collegiality, preaching that the episcopate is one, part of which is held in totality (in solidum) by each. In his epistle just quoted, he ~~continued~~ -

The Church, which is catholic and one, is not split asunder nor divided, but is truly bound and joined together by the cement of its bishops, who hold fast to one another.

In his famous treatise de Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate, the first ever to be written on that subject, the unity resting on the single bishop's undeclegable authority, Cyprian spoke of a primatus given to Peter, displayed in cathedra una. The so-called Primacy Version suggests that the Church is a unity of pastors and flock around the touchstone of the cathedra Petri, on whom the Church was founded. In the Textus Receptus it is the unity of the Church that is the touchstone -

This unity should be maintained and appropriated with firmness, especially by us bishops who preside in the Church, so that we may prove the episcopate itself to be one and undivided. (cap 5)

Here, in ascribing a priority to Peter - and he was the first writer to do so - Cyprian is ascribing a priority only of time, referring to the fact that Peter was called before the other disciples: as Peter was to the Apostles, so is a bishop to his flock, the cathedra petri being perpetuated in all legitimate episcopal sees. However, Cyprian does respect the special status of the Roman Church in the West as the ecclesia principalis - but that applies to the location of the capital bishopric and not to the office of Peter-become-pope. However much Rome stood as a centre of unity, it stood in no sense thereby as a centre of jurisdiction or appeal. This is made doubly clear by Cyprian's quarrel with Pope Stephen over schismatic baptisms, when he called a synod of eighty-six African bishops to confirm his opposition to Rome. He neither submitted (since he held that every bishop has an equal right of personal decision), nor did he break with Rome (since he held Rome as the permanent centre of gravity in the one Church): instead he stood his ground without diminishing his deference to the see of Peter. For him, God alone was judge of episcopal conduct, a view never stated before.

It is important to notice how Cyprian acted, viz by calling a synod of his colleagues, for he believed that no bishop could go out on a limb alone. If one did lose communion with the College, or if he were expelled, he thereby lost his legitimate power (as, at that time, did the Bishop of Arles). He believed the College, when guided by the Holy Spirit, was infallible: this infallibility and this catholicity was merely localised by a bishop for his flock - it was the bishop's to mediate but not to initiate. "The glue of priests in mutual concord" was one of his more vivid phrases, and he wrote to Stephen that "though we pastors are many, we feed but one flock". As Peter was prior to the episcopate, so the universal Church is logically prior to the local Churches, which are its expression. In the same way, the Church is prior to the individual. (cf. G.S.M. Walker, "The Churchmanship of St. Cyprian", 1968).

Now we must ask how the petrine primacy fits into this early development of Church order. But first there are two questions to ask: what primacy, and primacy over what? This is the root of much confusion and many extravagant claims, made from evidence anachronistically used. First, the primacy may be referred either to Rome as the premier see in the west, the see founded by the two first princes of the Church, SS. Peter and Paul, and so the see at the centre of the Western Patriarchate, to which all bishoprics west of Antioch and Alexandria

looked as daughters to a mother; or to the Pope in petrine succession. The evidence for one is not transferrable to the other: Cyprian, looking out from his Carthage bishopric in the 250s across the narrows between Sardinia and Sicily, gave the primacy to the ecclesia principalis at Rome, a primacy of place rather than person (place of course in virtue of an original person); discussing the increase of episcopal authority during the third century, von Campenhausen carefully states that "of a specially effective authority of the Bishop of Rome there is in this context hardly any indication" (op cit p.299) - but we shall see. Secondly, what kind of primacy; primacy of honour (honoris causa) or of time, or of succession, or of office? Different as these are, they were all invoked by Leo I in the mid fifth century so that he might claim a juridical or jurisdictional primacy (which became the lever of papal power) in virtue of a sacramental primacy, the theology of which has sadly and woefully never been insufficiently worked out until these present days. We now know that the primacy of the Pope rests in the last analysis on a sacramental primacy given as from the Father to Christ (Ma 28), and from Christ within its compass to Peter, and to all Popes as vicars of Peter. Paradoxically it was Hildebrand, Gregory VII, who best understood and voiced this vicariate in all his greatest pronouncements, while he was extending the juridical claims to primacy until they broke under the strain of extension. Beate Petre apostolorum princeps, he wrote, inclina quaesumus aures tuas nobis et audi me servum tuum... and many like passages. (Register III.6)

The earliest and most inchoate bid made by the Roman see to assert its primacy came in 96, when Clement, supposedly the third Pope in Rome after Ilnus and Cletus, wrote in the name of the Roman Church (note that it was not in his own name, or by his own authority, but rather that of the Council of presbyters) to the presbyters of Corinth, to intervene in their strife. He called for penance, the reinstatement of deposed presbyters and obedience to legitimate authority. The letter was so well received that it was being read out in the Church of Corinth along with the Scriptures a century later: but this was surely more because of the letter's intrinsic value than any extrinsic value it purported to have.

The next bid came in 198, a century later, when in his last year Victor I assembled a Council at Rome and ordered synods to be held throughout Christendom to settle the Paschal Controversy. At Rome he threatened Polycrates of Ephesus and other bishops of Asia Minor with excommunication if they did not

change their practices. More we do not know, except that St. Irenaeus and other bishops wrote to the Bishop of Rome reproving him for high-handedness; and that the two Churches remained in communion with one another. Victor, near his death, may have been forced to climb down.

The third bid came in the controversy of 255-6 over the policy of rebaptising lapsed defectors, following the Decian persecutions. Stephen, the Bishop of Rome, held that both schismatics and heretics could validly administer baptism, and in this he quarrelled with Bishop Cyprian, who already had behind him three councils of African bishops for the opposite view. After a violent correspondence, the result was inconclusive. Stephen laid claim to what we could call papal status, peremptorily demanding universal acceptance for the Roman judgment. He specifically invoked the special status of the cathedra Petri, and behind this (though we have no evidence of it) there may have been some recognised theology. Nothing came of it; and indeed nothing ever would until the universal advent of "monarchical" bishops instead of merely "presidential" bishops, and until there was a specific formulation of the doctrine of apostolic succession in the episcopacy. (cf E. Molland, "Irenaeus of Lugdunum and the Apostolic Succession", Journ Eccl Hist 1.12-28). Then it became possible for Peter to claim monarchical rule over the bishops of the west in virtue of his petrine succession.

The stages of development of the papacy between Stephen I (254-7) and the high papalism of Innocent III (1198-1216) may rudely be roughed out as these: First, Leo the Great (440-461) successfully substantiated the papal claims to a universal jurisdiction, not merely as a diakonia (service) but also as monarchia (rule), in virtue of the petrine succession. Secondly, during the years up to the Gregorian Reform, the old ministerial concept of ecclesial authority gradually gave way to a nonarchical concept of papal authority, a hierarchical concept of hierocratic office and an over-judicial concept of the Church of Christ. These obscured the principle of collegiality, the conciliar principle, the harmony of functions and the principle of subsidiarity. Thirdly, the Gregorian Popes of the late eleventh century achieved the reality of their claim to be not merely vicarius Petri with right of sacramental rule in the affairs of the Church, but vicarius Christi with right of juridical rule in the affairs even of the temporal order in as much as it affected the life of the Church. Fourthly, this reality was underpinned by a corpus of papal theory in the time of Alexander III - Innocent III and the Canonists of the twelfth-thirteenth century. As is so often the case in the affairs of men, the reality preceded and the theory followed to entrench the gain, or else the theoretical claim was put out as seed and reality came to conform. Innovations of theory and practice are never pressed together: the one is always vanguard to the other. So it was with the Popes.

The first time the Ma 16 text "Thou art Peter .." was invoked on behalf of a Pope to our knowledge (and even here the evidence is doubtful as to attribution), was in the time of Damasus I (366-84). Not until Leo the Great used it, was the Jn 21 text "Feed my flock .." used in the interests of the Roman see, unless that was Cyprian's intention in his Primacy Text (cap 4, Walker op cit p.21f). But before this, papal claims were beginning to be made, notably by Julius I (337-52), Innocent I (402-17) and Boniface I (418-22): the last of these wrote, "our judgment is not to be discussed again, for it has never been permissible to treat again of a matter that has once been decided by the Apostolic See". That he wrote to a Corinth synod, not to one of his immediate suffragans!

The major advance in the claims of the papacy came with Leo the Great, an unyielding ruler used to peremptory commands and authoritarian language, whose acta are shot through with his insistence on obedientia, coercitio, correctio

and his exercise of the gubernacula ecclesiae universalis. He was the first to assert that protean combination, the theological notion of the Pope as vices Petri, the juristic link of traceable direct succession from Peter, and the demonstrable geographical occupation of the same cathedra. He was the first to couple the "vertical" view of the power of Peter with the "lateral" successional view of hereditas sedis, so attractive to the Roman secular mind; and here he invoked at once both Church law and State law. Professor Walter Ullmann has shown with great succinctness that when Leo claimed to be the indignus haeres Sancti Petri, he claimed to be in his person indignus, in his office haeres, and in his function Sancti Petri - with the inherited intrinsic power of binding and loosing. The main shift in thought is the strength of Leo's claims to the office of key-bearer, rather than to the charismatic power of binding and loosing: having shifted his own claim to one of office, he then claimed that bishops, while receiving their sacramental ordo directly at the moment of consecration, received their jurisdictional office by delegation from the Pope: auctoritatem tuam vice nostra te exercere volumus. This was a claim of the most far reaching importance, the first and - because successful - permanent bid for papal control of the episcopacy. Had the bishops wanted to retain their independent authority in their local Churches, that should have been seen as a challenge of mortal consequence to it. Leo the Great's legacy to his successors was of fundamental significance, for it was essentially he who opened the door to high papalism. After him the papacy was turned into a nomen jurisdictionis, the Pope being able to delegate power to bishops; priests, clerics or even laymen. This was the beginning of that process of acquiring plenitudo potestatis which culminated in Innocent IV's declaration in the mid thirteenth century: omnis creatura vicario creatoris subdita est, God's creatures are subjects of His vicar. (cf Ullmann, "Leo I and the Theme of Papal Primacy", Journ Theol Studies, NS XI, 1960, 25-51).

By slow degrees this new principle of papal authority came to predominate, and was used for the domination of three spheres of Church life, (a) the Eastern Church, (b) the secular princes and (c) the bishops. Before we examine each in its turn, it is important to trace another theological shift of like kind, which naturally followed and did quite as much to unbalance the theology of the papacy as did the claim to universal jurisdiction.

This was the shift of papal claim to the title vicarius Petri, from that - which (to those of Roman persuasion, at least) is unimpeachable - to one of vicarius Christi, an altogether bolder claim. The early popes saw the heady dangers of that title, and when it was offered to them in excesses of adulation they were swift to cast it aside. Eleven times the Roman synod of 495 hailed Gelasius I: Vicarium Christi te videmus, and each time he demurred. The most his successor would claim for himself two years later was legatione fungimur pro Christo. Gregory the Great at the end of the sixth century was acutely aware of the dangers that such titles presented, refusing to accept either for himself or for the Byzantine patriarchs such titles as "universal patriarch" since he would attribute to none but Christ a universal leadership. Like Cyprian, Gregory believed in the essential equality of all bishops: if one were to be called the universal bishop or patriarch, the name bishop or patriarch would then cease to have meaning for all of the others. "Never have any of my predecessors", he wrote "consented to use such an impious appellation (hoc tam profano vocabulo .. absit a christiani mente)". He spoke of the elatio pompatici sermonis, a title by which "all the bowels of the Church are upset". To Patriarch Athanasius of Antioch he wrote that, should Popes or patriarchs accede to such a title, it would undermine the faith of the Church at large and indeed split the Church. For Gregory the word universalis in this context was a stultum ac superbum, nerversum, nefandum, scelestum vocabulum; nomen blasphemiac, verbum superbiae in quo omnium sacerdotum honor adimitus. To this day Orthodox bishops stress that the fulness of catholicity resides in each local Church by virtue of its bishop in communion with the other bishops; and this was entirely the mind of Cyprian and of Gregory the Great, the one a bishop in Carthage, the other a Pope in Rome, both of whom described the universal episcopate as the sacramentum unitatis under the One Lord.

For all that, Gregory, the author of the Cura Patoralis on the office of a bishop as a shepherd of souls, saw the place of the Pope not merely as the bishops of the See with the primacy in the west but as the shepherd of bishops, servus servorum. He accepted that he was in his office vicarius Petri, exercising a function with responsibilities towards all Christendom. While he granted the Emperor dominion in the temporal order, he expected to be granted authority in the spiritual, indeed in a way as yet undefined but for all that unrestricted: but it needed a man of forceful temper in the See of Rome to have all of his claims recognised, or to draw fully on the potentialities of his office.

Gregory IV (827-44), neither a wise nor a resolute Pope, when he journeyed across the Alps in 833 as peacemaker in the Carolingian quarrels, came as a superior, refusing equality with the imperial order, claiming hierarchical jurisdiction over all of the bishops (of both camps) without which - as he said - there could be no proper function of the corpus ecclesiae or exercise of what he described as the key to Church unity, the papal authority. Nevertheless he took care to state that the headship of the Church belongs to Christ, and to him belonged only a petrine vicariate. Kings might call themselves vicarius Dei or even vicarius Christi (as Conrad II was called by the Archbishop of Mainz in 1033) and be challenged in those titles (as was Henry III by Cardinal Humbert in 1047), and Gregory VII in the year of his election might call the Pope vicem Christi just once; but for all that the title vicarius Petri stood firm even through his reign (1073-85) - and most particularly through his reign, as we have seen - until all the edifice of centralised government was built ready for the reality to be invested with a new title, vicarius Christi. It took the unobtrusive diplomacy of the monk Urban II, the steady and tactful insistence of the canonist Alexander III and the sheer aristocratic exuberance of the curialist Innocent III to prepare the ground for the assumption of that title to the papacy, a title which remains from Innocent's time to this day.

Innocent III (1198-1216) was the first to govern with the notion that he was Christ's visible vicar on earth, with episcopal powers derived not from Christ directly but through the Pope. Though many reforming cardinals, not least among them Peter Damian, had tried to persuade their Popes to this policy, all had still then resisted it. The Englishman Adrian IV had come nearest. In his consecration sermon, he described himself as "set in the midst between God and man ... less than God but greater than man, judge of all men and judged by none." In his letter to the league of central Italy written the year he became Pope, a letter anticipated by the one of Gregory VII to William the Conqueror in May 1080 (Register VII.25), he wrote:-

Just as God, founder of the universe, has constituted two large luminaries in the firmament of heaven, a major one to dominate the day and a minor one to dominate the night, so he has established in the firmament of the universal Church, which is signified by the name of heaven, two great dignities - a major one to preside (so to say) over the days of the souls,

and a minor one to preside over the rights of the bodies. They are the pontifical authority and the royal power. So, as the moon receives its light from the sun and for this very reason is minor both in quantity and in quality, in its size and in its effect, so the royal power derives from the pontifical authority the splendour of its dignity.

He was, of course, echoing Gelasius' distinction, in his letter Duo Sunt of c.495, between the auctoritas of pontiffs (ma 16) and the potestas of monarchs (Rom 13). The argument is extended beyond distinction of function, beyond what other Popes had claimed viz. hierarchy of function, to dependence of function; and it was made to cover both the rule of monarchs and of bishops. Innocent claimed for Peter's successors a threefold title. First, Vicarius Christi, with its implications stretching back to the words of the Gospel: "All power comes from above", and "All authority in heaven and on earth is given to me". From this flowed the second, the notorious plenitudo potestatis, a claim which finally overreached itself in Boniface VIII's Bull Unam Sanctam of 1302. Lastly, from both was drawn a specific office, judex ordinarius omnium, i.e. that the Pope was an omniscient court of first instance for the whole of Christendom, the direct bishop of every man, the confessor of every believer. He limited himself in one regard, that the Pope should not meddle in secular affairs unless appealed to, or unless he judged that the dimension of sin was present - ratione peccati - for it is the dimension of sin which gives a Pope the specific right and duty of secular interference. (cf Dr J.A. Watt, "The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century: the Contribution of the Canonists", 1965).

Armed with these doctrines in their various stages of fruition, juridical overlordship, vicariate of Christ, fullness of power and ordinary authority in every diocese, the Popes brought to bear their new penetrating influence upon (a) the East, (b) the princes and (c) the bishops. We can here give only single examples to illustrate the action.

(a) From the fourth century onwards, the Eastern Church had recognised that the See of Rome had a primacy over all other Churches, the Pope being first bishop in Christendom. For them it was a geographical primacy resting in Rome as the seat of Empire, together with a doctrinal primacy accruing over the years as that see built up an unblemished record of doctrinal orthodoxy. It was accorded by them, and gave Rome no well-defined juridical rights, least of all the right to summon eastern clerics for retrial or to arbitrate in particular local disputes

within a patriarchate. Byzantine theologians were more preoccupied with the sacramental reality than the juridical structure of the Church, and were consequently less articulate than the theologians of Rome when it came to jurisdiction. Their premise doctrine was the belief in the theory of Pentarchy, that the Church's governance was jointly shared by the five patriarchates (Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem), but as Islam submerged some of these and as the Slavonic autocephalous Churches grew up, this doctrine too became obscured. Lacking a doctrine of hierarchy, the East became quick to accuse Rome of attempted aggrandisement.

Dealing with the breach of 1054, Professor Dmitri Obolensky ("The Christian Centuries, II: The middle Ages", (1969) p. 103f) subscribes to the judgment of Pope John that both Churches must take some blame. The immediate causes were the papal enforcement of uniformity of liturgical practice in the Greek churches of Southern Italy coupled with the Byzantine insistence on Greek usages in the Latin churches in Constantinople; and with these the mounting antagonism between the universalist claims of the papacy, and strong desire to preserve its traditional autonomy on the part of a Byzantine Church conscious of its prestige as the partner of the most powerful and civilised state in Christendom. The papal legate Cardinal Humbert's histrionic postures,

abusive language and truculent behaviour were almost matched by the intransigence and self-righteous arrogance of the patriarch of Byzantium. The scene that took place in Constantinople on 16 July 1054, when Humbert and his fellow legates laid a bull of excommunication against Cerularius and his chief supporters upon the altar of the church of St. Sophia, has acquired a melancholy and perhaps excessive notoriety; it was followed by the burning of the bull by order of the Emperor Constantine IX, and the solemn excommunication of Humbert and his associates by a synod in Constantinople.

This moment ranks with Charlemagne's coronation and Canossa as one of the most dramatic and misleading of the Middle Ages. (It is told in detail by Dr Richard Mayne, "East & West in 1054", Cambr Hist Journ XI.2, 1954, 133-48). Both sides were in fact more preoccupied with the stresses of their own internal politics than the doctrinal issues between the Churches; both were posturing to the adversary with their real eye on their colleagues at home. Politics were at the

root of it for both capitals: and yet the event proved a date to mark a lasting broken relationship. It would never have happened in the pontificate of Gregory the Great; or had it, it would soon have been repaired. But the policies had hardened, and the Churches grown strangers to one another. High papalism was at the root of the breach as much as patriarchal pride.

(b) The attitude of the medieval papacy towards secular rulers stems quite as much from a false theology of governance taught by Augustine, as upon the papal doctrine of plenitudo potestatis. In 425, as the Vandals were working their way down through Spain to North Africa, St. Augustine at Hippo wrote his book XIX of "The City of God", which propounded a political philosophy at variance with the Greeks, replacing them for eight centuries until Aquinas resurrected Aristotle's Politics for the thinking world. Where the Greeks placed political action immediately below unalloyed contemplation as the highest of man's functions, Augustine spoke of secular rule as a form of cupiditas dominandi, a libido or drive to control others which arose from the state of nature, not of grace; and more precisely, fallen sinful nature. For Augustine, men are naturally equal to one another and subject only to God as creatures. God has given them dominion over the earth, putting all things under man's feet. But man, imprisoned by his pride (the hallmark of sin), erects regimes where men become subject to one another: all institutional subservience is the working out of sin in the natural order. While society may be rooted in man's unspoiled nature, government is rooted in his sinful nature; and it is the latter which leads to social inequality, coercive power, and ultimately all political authority. Such authority is expressed in kingship, whose actions are conquest, domination and thirst for ever more power. At its ideal (as in Romans 13), kingship is punitive and remedial; but at its normal, it is a condition of fallen man not conducive to salvation.

Rome and the Popes accepted this theology, using it to bring princes into just that subservience which Augustine inveighed against. The doctrine permeated all Christendom. One example will suffice. At the climax of the Investiture struggle, Gregory VII wrote to one of the Lorraine bishops, Hermann of Metz, in terms that are uncompromising Augustinianism: it is a famous letter defending the papal power to depose kings -

Kings and princes derive their origin from men ignorant of God, who raise themselves above their fellows by pride, plunder, treachery, murder - in short, by every kind of crime - at the instigation of the Devil prince of this world, striving with blind greed and intolerable presumption to dominate over their equals, that is, over men. (Register VIII.21).

One of the best examples of papal claims combined with this view of secular government afforded by the period, appears in the rite of coronation devised for the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa by the English Pope Adrian IV. Adrian was the first Pope to have to withstand serious national challenges, from the Staufens and the Plantagenets, adversaries as well equipped as his curia to fight on ideological grounds. He resisted the challenge and his pontificate stands in consequence at the start of the steep ascent to the euphoric heights of the Innocents. At his own papal coronation he had been crowned with the twin ringed mitre signifying sacerdotal and regnal power, he had had each cardinal in turn kiss his feet, he had been given the twelve seals symbolising the concentration of all the Apostles' powers in his own hands, and he had had a deacon (notably not a bishop) to present him with the pallium from the high altar. All of these gestures were deeply symbolic, and the more so in the light of the rite he imposed on the new Roman Emperor.

Adrian arranged that Barbarossa's anointing should precede the Mass, to show that it was in no sense sacerdotal. He^{B.A.} was anointed, not on the head with chrism as is a bishop, but between the shoulder-blades (as seat of power) with a lesser oil; and the anointing was not done at the high altar, but at a side altar (for only the Pope should use the High altar) by cardinals. Then the Pope, whose symbolic part appears in clearest relief, during the Mass conferred the imperial insignia alone at the high altar, omitting the ring since it properly signifies the marriage of bishop and diocese. The would-be Emperor then had to submit himself to a scrutinium by the Pope, a formal examination which was followed by his kissing of the papal foot as an act of formal obedience equivalent to the eastern proskynesis. There was no enthronement, for Frederick was only an adjutor to the papacy, but instead the Pope took from the altar - as a pallium for a metropolitan - the imperial sword and himself girded Barbarossa, so that symbolically he received his power from the Pope's hand - and likewise his sceptre of imperial

jurisdiction. Finally the Pope crowned the new Emperor; and as Frederick II his grandson was to discover, what was in the Pope's power to confer was also in his power to remove. Where the papal crowning was merely declaratory (for he was Pope from election), the imperial crowning was constitutive, without which no rex was ever imperator. The coronation at Sutri on 18 June 1155 is the surest demonstration that high papalism had succeeded in the sphere of secular rule. (cf. Professor Walter Ullmann, "The Pontificate of Adrian IV", Cambr Hist Journ XI.3, 1955, 233-52).

(c) Towards the local bishops, the Bishops of Rome began by being fraternal; but by slow degrees they became paternal and then impossibly dominant. Even a Gregory the Great, who wrote, qui primus erat in Apostolatus culmine esset primus et in humilitate, who answered Augustine of Canterbury by saying, "you know the usage of the Roman Church in which you were nurtured; but if you have found customs, Roman or Gallican or of other Churches, which are more pleasing to God then teach those to the English Church, still young in the faith"; even he could be severe with bishops. The process had begun early in papal evolution, as we should expect, since a claim to primacy carries an inbuilt claim to hierocratic hierarchy. In the early stages, Popes claimed the right of ruling the bishops of Christendom, not their dioceses or their clergy. Innocent I at the beginning of the fifth century provides a good instance. His Epistle I (as we now have it) confirmed privileges bestowed by previous Popes on the Archbishop of Thessalonica. His Epistle II gave the Bishop of Rouen the rulings he asked for on the consecration of prelates, clerical disputes and celibacy; adding that all causae majores (what did he mean?) should be referred to Rome as both norm and arbiter. His Epistle III settled matters of local ecclesiastical discipline for the Spanish bishops. And so on.

All this did not constitute a threat to the episcopacy until the Gregorian reformers began wholesale dismissals of those they marked out as guilty of "the heresy of synony", i.e. buying their offices. Metropolitans were stripped of their sees sine spe recuperationis; the lower clergy were invited to act a jury of presentment upon their own or proximate bishops; and even lay barons were asked to curb or censure their local prelates. In the end the German bishops could suffer

it no more, and at Worms in 1076 they announced the Gregorian papacy. To "Brother Hildebrand" they wrote -

You have taken from the bishops, as far as you could, all the power which is known to have been divinely conferred upon them through the grace of the Holy Spirit, which works mightily in ordinations

You arrogantly usurp new powers, powers not due to you, to the end that you may destroy the rights due to the whole brotherhood (of the episcopacy).

For you assert that if any sin of one of our parishioners comes to your notice, even if only by rumour, none of us has any further power to bind or to loose the party involved, for you alone may do it, or one whom you delegate especially for this purpose. i.e. a legate a latere.

Anno, imperial elector and Archbishop of Cologne, had earlier written, "as the Roman Bishop claims due obedience from the Archbishop of Cologne, so the Archbishop demands the Bishop of Rome refrain from interfering in canonical discipline within the Archbishop's territory".

Whether it was interference or rightful encroachment, the process proceeded, and that as much in the hands of peaceful pontiffs as of the belligerent ones. A good example of the penetration of the papacy into the domain of the episcopate comes from what has been called a weak pope in a precarious position resulting from a schism, a pope vacillating between ruler and metropolitan in the knowledge that outright support for the one would only bring added troubles from the other - namely Pope Alexander III in the Becket Affair. By temperament and training, Alexander was temperate and patient, even cautious; he was a lawyer disposed to moderation and the avoidance of extremes, dealing with two impetuous and strong-willed men. His declared policy best illustrates his character, and therefore his mode of action: to Becket he wrote:-

Inasmuch as the Roman Church, while observing suitable speed, is accustomed to put up with great inconvenience rather than act hastily..we have upheld this king with such prolonged expectation, desiring by our messengers and letters to recall him benevolently and fraternally from his purpose and to soften his hardness and impatience by a sweet gentleness. (Materials VI.484f).

But when it came to Becket's own suffragan bishops in the Canterbury Province showing signs of diffidence or uncooperation, the Pope wrote swiftly to remind

then that they were dealing not merely with their Primate or metropolitan, but with the Pope's own representative, and that before him they had rights which were severely circumscribed. He wrote:-

Since you are aware that our venerable brother, the Archbishop of Canterbury, presides over you not only in virtue of his metropolitan jurisdiction but also in consequence of his legatine appointment, it is indeed surprising that certain of you, as we have heard, presume to maintain that your Archbishop may not - either as metropolitan or as legate - hear a case from your bishoprics until it is referred to him by appeal. Though it is agreed that as metropolitan the Archbishop should not hear cases from your dioceses unless they have been referred to him by appeal, yet in virtue of his legatine powers as one appointed to act in his Province in our stead, he can and should hear all cases from your bishoprics - whether they come to his court by appeal or come as complaint of any person.

So we order and decree that you relinquish to his jurisdiction cases which are referred from your dioceses to him as Archbishop; and do not attempt to deter or prevent any cleric or layman under your jurisdiction from

transferring his case to the Archbishop if he so wishes. (Materials V.297f)

It is as legate and not as Cantuar that Becket is here upheld, and that is most indicative. By degrees all roads eventually led to Rome, while the local Churches came to be circumvented or frustrated. Bishops gradually ceased to be the spiritual nexus of their dioceses, except where there ruled a prelate of exceptionally strong personality, such as Robert Grosseteste at Lincoln.

Let us, by way of an ending, swiftly survey the outcome of these three dominions - dominions vis-a-vis the Eastern Church, the secular arm and the episcopate. What has proven, as the years resolved the issues, to be valid and what an unfortunate overstrain of due rights? As to the East: on the last day of the Second Vatican Council (7 December 1965) Pope Paul, with great earnestness and a sincere desire to make amends for ancient and long-standing dissensions (as it was put), announced the lifting of the mutual ban with which Rome and Byzantium had excommunicated one another in 1054; it became a matter consigned to history, unable any more to affect the present. As to the secular arm: St. Thomas Aquinas took the newly rediscovered text of Aristotle's Politics in 1261 (or shortly afterwards)

and drew out the distinction between praelatio and subjectio civilis in legitimate government, and dominatio and subjectio servilis in venal rule, and with these he drew the sting from the old Augustinian political theology. The Church settled into a realisation that it had a potestas indirecta, a power of intrusion in matters of serious moral concern: and that is as it is today. As to the episcopacy: the documents of the Second Vatican Council, notably Lumen Gentium on the Church (ch 3) and Christus Dominus on the Pastoral Office of the Bishops (especially ch 1), supplemented by the deliberations of the October 1969 Roman Synod of Bishops, have entirely reestablished any imbalance that persisted in the relationship of the papacy to the episcopate. "By God's institution and the obligation of the Apostolic office", the Decree on Bishops states, "each one is answerable for the whole Church together with the rest". But that always assumes that the College is working in conjunction with the Pope at its head.

Anpleforth

Alberic Stacpoole, O.S.B.