

T925

THE TWO GREAT CHAMPIONS OF THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH
GREGORY VII and INNOCENT III
IN THEIR RELATIONS WITH THE SECULAR RULERS

By
CHARLES A. RIEDL, A.B.

0378.27
R44
cop. 2

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty
of the Graduate School, Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts.

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Preface.....	Page 1
Chapter I. Victory of Christianity over Paganism.....	3
Chapter II. Gradual Growth of the Papacy to the Holy Alliance.....	11
Chapter III. The Reign of Gregory VII.....	20
Chapter IV. The Reign of Innocent III.....	40
Chapter V. Evaluation of these two Champions.....	66
Bibliography.....	81

PREFACE

Medieval history is the history of the union of Church and State. In order to understand secular history one must augment it to a degree with the history of the Papacy. One must not study the Papacy in the light of the present, but rather in the light of the past -- under the circumstances, ideals and customs of that generation.

The two most misunderstood popes of Medieval history are Gregory VII and Innocent III. Secular historians charge them with using every shifting of fortune to increase the spiritual authority and the temporal possessions of the papacy. They were diplomats and opportunists, and hence did not hesitate to play upon selfish motives, when they could secure an advantage by so doing. Gregory VII, in his declarations on a world theocracy, laid the foundation for world conquest. Innocent III, even beyond the most ambitious plans of Gregory VII, used the declarations of Gregory VII on the relation of state to Church to advance his most selfish designs and satisfy his lust for limitless power.

The writer is desirous of revealing the rights and obligations that befell both Church and State, when the Holy Roman Empire was created in 800 A.D. He intends to show that when Gregory VII and Innocent III excommunicated and even deposed some temporal rulers during their respective pontificates, they had no other choice -- for the law of the

Church and the law of the kingdom made the temporal rulers either retract or regret -- and it was not done with any intention of world conquest. In a word the writer wishes to give Gregory VII and Innocent III the credit that is their due, and thereby remove some of the misconceptions about them.

CHAPTER I.

Victory of Christianity over Paganism

"Now, there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works, -- a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was (the) Christ; and when Pilate at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day." -- Flavius Josephus*

-
1. Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, XVIII, chap.3, P 3, n.437.
-

Christianity, according to Josephus, owes its origin to Jesus of Nazareth. It was he who gave to his followers new teachings and moral practices -- the spirit of charity, justice, obedience to law, purity of morals and sanctity of domestic life. Christianity was predicated on love -- the love of God and the love of one's neighbor.

"It was a love that was to join in one body those whom suspicion and prejudice and pride of race had hitherto kept apart. There was thus formed by the new religion a community of the faithful, a holy Empire, designed to gather all men into its bosom, and standing opposed to the manifold polytheisms of the older world, exactly as the universal sway of the Caesars was contrasted with the innumerable kingdoms and city republics that

had gone before it." 2

2. Bryce, James, The Holy Roman Empire, chap. 8, p.93.

When Christ perceived that His earthly mission was drawing to a close, He was desirous of perpetuating His work by appointing someone to be the visible head of His Church. One of His apostles, Peter, after making a profession of faith in the Divine Nature of Christ, was chosen to be Christ's successor, as Christ thus addressed him --

"Blessed art thou Simon, Bar-Jona; because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys to the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." -- (Matt. XVI, 17-19; John XXI, 15-17)

These words convey only one meaning, namely that Peter, and in him his successors, was to be the head of the Christian Church.

"Peter is to be to the Church what the foundation is in regard to a house. He is to be the principle of unity, of stability, and of increase. He is the principle of unity, since what is not joined to that foundation is no part of the Church; of stability, since it is the firmness of this foundation in virtue of which the Church remains unshaken by the storms which buffet her; of increase, for if she grows, it is because new stones are laid on this foundation....The only manner in which a man can stand in such a relation to any corporate body is by possessing authority over it. The supreme head of a body, in dependence on whom all subordinate authorities hold their power, and he alone, can be said to be the principle of stability, unity

and increase." 3

3. Catholic Encyclopedia, Pope, XII, p.261.

The Catholic Church at its inception was wholly Jewish -- her Divine Founder was a Jew, the Apostles and disciples were Jews, the first converts were also Jews. The Apostles regarded the Jews as the children of God. The three thousand persons whom St. Peter baptized at Jerusalem on the feast of Pentecost were Jews of the dispersion. 4

4. 1) Those Jews who remained in foreign countries after the return of their countrymen from the Babylonian captivity.
2) The scattered communities of Jewish emigrants in countries outside of Palestine.
-

St. Peter addressed Jews exclusively when he said,

"Therefore let all the house of Israel know most certainly that God hath made both Lord and Christ, this same Jesus, whom you have crucified." -- (Acts II, 36)

The Jews did not wish to close the doors to the gentiles. Rather, those gentiles who desired to accept Christianity, were allowed to do so by at the same time accepting to a degree the same rights and duties as the Israelites by birth.

"In a word, without denying to anyone the right to adore with her the true God, Israel expected each worshipper to receive from her, in some way, the investiture, to become a Jew in more or less measure, according to the right he wished to enjoy." 5

5. Kurth, Godfrey, The Church at the Turning Points of History, p.31.

"The Jews saw in the Church a synagogue of superior order to which God had revealed

the obscure meaning of the prophecies, but a synagogue nevertheless into which no one could enter without being a member either by birth or by adoption of the people of Israel." 6

6. Ibid., p.32.

Christianity was still a national religion, and seemed doomed to be nothing else. It was at this moment that an eventful scene took place, which is minutely preserved in the Acts of the Apostles.

There was in the city of Caesarea in Palestine, a centurion of the Roman army, named Cornelius. He was a just man and God-fearing. One day an angel appeared to him saying that his prayers had been agreeable to the Lord, and that he was to send for one Simon Peter who was then living at Joppe, in the house of a tanner by the seaside. Cornelius obeyed and despatched three men to the Apostle.

"And on the next day whilst they were going on their journey, and drawing nigh to the city, Peter went up to the higher parts of the house to pray about the sixth hour.

And being hungry, he was desirous to taste something. And as they were preparing, there came upon him an ecstasy of mind;

And he was the heavens opened, and a great vessel descending, as it were a great linen sheet let down by the four corners from heaven to the earth.

Wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts, and creeping things of the earth, and fowls of the air.

And there came a voice to him; Arise, Peter, kill, and eat.

But Peter said; Far be it from me; for I never did eat anything that is common and unclean.

And the voice spoke to him again the second time; That which God hath cleansed do not thou call common.

And this was done thrice; and presently the vessel was taken up into heaven.

Now whilst Peter was doubting within himself what the vision that he had seen should mean; behold the men who were sent from Cornelius inquiring for Simon's house stood at the gate.

And when they had called, they asked, if Simon, who is surnamed Peter, were lodged there?

And as Peter was thinking of the vision, the Spirit said to him: Behold three men seek thee.

Arise, therefore, get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing: for I have sent them." -- (Acts X, 9-20)

Peter went to Caesarea, and baptized Cornelius and his family. They were the first Gentiles to enter the Church who did not first pass through the synagogue. The other apostles followed the example of Peter and they were thereby

"overthrowing the whole hierarchical order in the relations among nations; they were abolishing the privilege of Israel, and compelling the people of God to mingle henceforth with the crowd of newcomers of every descent who were about to invade the Church." 7

7. Kurth, Godfrey, op. cit., p.39.

All the outraged feelings of patriotism, all the passions of self-love, and, perhaps, also of self-interest were let loose against this innovation. At the Council of Jerusalem (52 A.D.) the momentous question was discussed. The Council flung open the doors of the Church to the nations with these words,

"It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay no further burden upon you than the necessary things."

The Council of Jerusalem had saved Christianity at the sacrifice of Judaism. It had killed the national pretensions

of the Jewish people. The Church

"had just separated her cause from the precarious destiny of a nation. She had refused to espouse the cause of the petty contingencies of history so as not to fail in her universal mission. Peter's bark had cut the rope that bound it to port, and was gaining the high seas where, without doubt, there awaited it storms, but also miraculous draughts of fishes." 8

8. Kurth, Godfrey, *op. cit.*, p.43.

About 42 A.D. Rome was made the center of the Church by Peter because it was then the center of the known world. Rome thereby was not only the governmental center of the Roman Empire, but also of the Church.

It was inevitable that Christianity was to arouse popular sentiment against it in the Roman Empire. Since the established ways of society -- trade interests, family life, popular amusements and the accepted religious observances -- were permeated with idolatry, immorality and frivolity, the Christians held themselves aloof from them. The new religion seemed to threaten indefinite disturbances.

"This popular feeling had become strong long before the government, although it had decided to treat obstinate Christians as outside the laws, had yet acquired an impression that they were dangerous outlaws, or that the case required any very serious or systematic treatment. Add to all this that the regular worship of the gods was thought to guarantee the State against calamities, and that neglect of it might bring disaster upon the whole community. For, indeed, the public religion was the consecration of the State, and in a manner the basis of it. And the Christians, not contented with quietly disbelieving, must

openly repudiate it." 9

9. Rainy, Robert, The Ancient Catholic Church, p.11.

It was just a matter of time before the government decided to act. The repugnance and irritation in many was sufficient to dispose an hostile action by the magistrates. They unearthed old laws -- which were no longer in use, but were not repealed -- to justify their acts of death sentences for Christians who obstinately persisted in the offense against authority and before the tribunal. The magistrate treated Christianity as being beyond the protection and permission of the law, when he considered it --

"first, as a perturbing social influence apt to spread, secondly, as interfering with the religious sanctions on which the system of the empire rested (and even with outward deference for them), and, thirdly, as creating an obstinacy of temper which refused to give way to admonition or to punishment." 10

10. Rainy, Robert, op. cit., p.13.

The government was very determined to put an end to this new fancy which aimed at the very roots of the imperial power by openly repudiating the public religion. But to no avail. The major persecutions found Christianity, not destroyed, but rapidly increasing, having been purged in the crucible of martyrs' blood. Seeing that their efforts were to no avail, the emperors decided upon less drastic action. Trajan, for example, maintained that the specific accusers of the Christians had to appear against them before they could be sentenced to the death penalty.

"That the Church should remain for any length of time in a hostile attitude towards those nations among which she had succeeded in establishing herself, and where she was daily growing in importance and increasing in number, is a supposition that would be at variance with every element of her nature, and antagonistic to the genius of her institutions." 11

11. Alzog's Universal Church History. I. p.463.

The peaceful settlement came in 313 A.D. when Constantine published at Milan an edict, giving to the Christians the unrestricted right to practice their religion throughout the Roman empire. Constantine presumed that Christianity and Paganism could exist amicably side by side. This alone is sufficient to show that Constantine did not appreciate the true relations between Paganism and Christianity. Still his policy left Christianity at liberty to spread.

"Christianity, which had so long endured all the evils of bloody and relentless persecution, required no more than the just toleration of an equitable emperor and the prohibition of all violent interference with divine worship, to thoroughly permeate every order of society, from the lowest to the highest, and to finally recommend its claims at the throne of royalty of which it afterwards became the firmest support." 12

12. Alzog, op. cit., I. p.465.

CHAPTER II.

Gradual Growth of the Papacy to the Holy Alliance

"The Church during her sojourn on earth, calls together children from all nations, and forms a society of pilgrims embracing men of every tongue. She takes no heed of diversity of customs, laws and institutions, since these are necessary for the establishment and security of the peace of the world. Instead of changing or abolishing these, she, on the contrary, preserves and adopts them; for although diversities may exist among different people, these will always tend to the general good and peace of the world, provided only they are not of such a character as to be a hindrance to that religion in which we are taught to worship the one omnipotent God." 1

1. St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei, XIX, 17.

Ever since the time of Peter, the Church has aimed faithfully to comply with his precept "Fear God, honor the King" (1 Peter II, 17). Peter thereby recognized the existence of two perfect societies, the Church and the State.

"The State exists to help man to temporal happiness, the Church, to eternal. Of these two purposes the latter is more ultimate, man's greater good, while the former is not necessary for the acquisition of the latter. The dominating proximate purpose of man must be to earn his title to eternal salvation; for that, if needs be, he must rationally sacrifice his temporal happiness. It is clear, therefore, that the purpose of the Church is higher in the order of Divine Providence and of righteous human endeavor than that of the State. Hence, in case of direct collision of the two, God's will and man's need require that the guardian of the lower purpose should yield." 2

2. Catholic Encyclopedia, State and Church, XIV, p.251.

Still the problem of Church and State did not arise, until the decree of toleration by Constantine. Up to that time the old religion of Rome was never more than a department of the State. Constantine saw that Christianity

"was something that could realize the religious side of the Empire in a nobler form than Augustus or Hadrian had ever dreamed of -- a universal Church that could stand beside the universal Empire and worthily support its labors for the peace and welfare of the world. But for this purpose unity was essential. If the Church was divided against itself, it could not help the Empire. Worse than this; it could hardly be divided against itself without being also divided against the Empire. One of the parties was likely to appeal to the emperor; and then he would have to decide between them and make an enemy of the defeated party; and if he tried to enforce his decision, they were likely to resist him as stubbornly as the whole Church had resisted the heathen emperors." 3

3. Cambridge Medieval History, 1, p.11.

He sought to have unity in the Church. With the consent of the Pope he therefore called an ecumenical council at Nicaea. His one object was to make an end of division, so whatever pleased the bishops pleased him. He had thereby established formal relations with the Church, which culminated in the decree of Theodosius in 392, which forbade the practice of obsolete paganism and which recognized the Church as the state religion.

"As soon as liberty of conscience was established the Roman world in its entirety asked for admission into the communion of the faithful, and before the fourth century had drawn to a close the pagans saw themselves

reduced to the state of a discouraged minority. Christianity had become the religion of the emperors, the religion of the provinces; its limits were co-extensive with those of the Empire." 4

4. Kurth, Godfrey, op. cit., p.45.

The Church by demanding a more rigid uniformity in doctrine and organization and in making more and more vital the notion of a visible body of worshippers united by participation in the same sacraments, maintained and revived the doctrine of unity, which was being lost because of the division of the Empire. It is a strange coincidence that Theodosius, who recognized the Church as the state religion, was the last to rule over the whole Roman Empire. Later on the oneness of the Empire existed in name only, since the emperor ruled in Constantinople ever since Constantine moved the seat of government there from Rome.

The conception however of the Roman Empire was that it was eternal, because its dominion was universal. With the decline of the Empire, the Church kept alive the idea of a universal government.

"With the triumph of Christianity this belief had found a new basis. For as the Empire had decayed, the Church had grown stronger: and now while the one, trembling at the approach of the destroyer, saw province after province torn away, the other, rising in stately youth, prepared to fill her place and govern in her name, and in doing so, to adopt and sanctify and propagate anew the notion of a universal and unending state." 5

5. Bryce, James, op. cit., p.21.

"But dark clouds were gathering slowly on the horizon, disturbing the serenity of the world and announcing the catastrophe of the morrow. The Barbarians, strangers to Christianity and to civilization, excluded from the Roman felicity were prowling like wolves about the sunny domain of the Empire. Rome having tried to subdue them, at last came to the conclusion that its hour for new conquests was past, and that it would never triumph over them by force of arms. The time came when the Barbarians were supplying her with soldiers, and it was amongst them that she recruited her staunchest defenders." 6

6. Kurth, Godfrey, op. cit., p.46-7.

The Empire sought to assimilate them gradually by first making Romans out of them and then having the Church make Christians out of them. In this peaceful triumph of civilization the Germanic world took possession of the Roman world. Yet a time came when these lovers of wealth and voluptuousness, came in quest of fortune. They broke down the barriers set up against them, and in ever increasing numbers they swept over the Empire like a plague, thereby foreshadowing the destruction of the Empire.

"A day indeed came -- a day of shame and of mourning such as the world had never known -- when the savage hordes captured the Eternal City. Then was the sanctuary of civilization violated in a most sacrilegious manner, and men had a foretaste of the end of all things." 7

7. Ibid., p.51.

In the fall of the Empire, many also saw the fall of the Church, because it was so intimately connected with the

Empire. For a second time it appeared as though the Church, as the national religion, would perish with the destruction of the Empire. The Church though saw in the movement the birth of a world as yet unknown. Here, as elsewhere, the triumph of the Church was brought about through the instrumentality of a Christian prince. Clovis, king of the Franks-- one of the many barbaric tribes -- in spreading his kingdom came in contact with the remnant of the Roman Empire, and was successful in the battle of Soissons (486 A.D.). Clovis had come to know the Church, in that he had taken for his wife the Christian Burgundian princess, Clotilda. While engaged in battle with the Alemanni, at Zulpich Clovis made a vow to become a Christian, if God should grant him the victory. In fulfillment of his vow he was baptized on Christmas Day, 496 A.D., and with him three thousand noble Franks and many Frankish ladies.

In his victory over the Alemanni, Clovis was like Constantine in appealing to the God of the Christians, but in his baptism he was like the centurion Cornelius. Now the Church repeated her experience of over four centuries previous, when she separated from the people of Israel, by separating her destinies from those of the Empire, by putting into the hands of the Barbarians the scepter of the world without requiring them first to assimilate the Roman civilization.

"Everywhere without imposing conditions, the Catholic Church unlocked the gates of her sanctuaries and opened the road of salvation to the new nations....When these became convinced that they could carry the

sweet yoke of Christ without submitting to the heavy yoke of Rome, their prejudice against the Catholic faith fell to the ground, and its natural superiority over heresy, as well as over paganism, found no longer any obstacle. Joyfully the Barbarian world, whole and entire entered into the Church." 8

8. Kurth, Godfrey, op.cit., p.55.

The converted Barbarians loved the Church, and showed their love by making large benefactions to the Church. In this, though, they were but following the example of the Christians of the earlier times. This did not embarrass the Church, for ever since the time of Constantine, the emperors had bestowed the exercise of regal powers upon the pope. The people became accustomed to see in the Pope the best protector even of their temporal interest.

"Because the Emperors and exarchs often neglected their duties towards the people, the Popes were compelled to exercise the right of treating with hostile armies and leaders, and of concluding peace with them; they had often to defray all the expenses of the defence of Rome, and the Byzantine possessions in Italy out of the property of the Church." 9

9. Guggenberger, A., General History of the Christian Era, I, p.122.

The little Roman provinces were harassed by the Lombards in 751-2, and with perfect loyalty Pope Stephen II sent letter after letter to the Emperor asking for an army for the protection of Rome. The Emperor's refusal forced the Pope to seek help from the Frankish king, Pepin the Short. The Franks crossed the Alps and subdued the Lombards, but Pepin

gave them reasonable terms upon the insistence of the pope. No sooner had the Franks returned home, when the Lombards again rebelled. The Franks returned in 754, conquered the Lombard people, and as an act of fealty Pepin granted these lands to the Pope forever as a free and independent possession by having the keys of the reconquered cities placed on the tomb of St. Peter.

"Thus the sovereignty of the Holy See and the formation of the Papal States were founded on the law of nature; on the joyful consent of the Roman and Italian people; on the extinction of the Byzantine claims, which the Emperors forfeited by the neglect of the first and fundamental duty of sovereigns, the care of the people; on the solemn recognition by the Lombards of the Papal dominion, as expressed in the Treaty of Pavia, on the free donation made by Pipin the Short, the latest lawful possessor of the ceded territory. For himself Pipin demanded nothing but the prayers of the Church and the title of Patrician in its new Catholic meaning, i.e., Defender of the Church, which he received on the day of his coronation by Stephen II. No European dynasty has a juster or more legitimate title to its dominion than the Holy See." 10

10. Guggenberger, A., op. cit., I, p.126.

In 768 Pepin was succeeded as King of the Franks by his son, Charlemagne. He spent the greater part of his time and efforts to the interior organization and government of the kingdom. He waged his many wars for the twofold political purpose of enlarging his kingdom, and of establishing tributary border states. Charlemagne is remembered more for his ability as a statesman and ruler, rather than as a fighter.

Once again had risen in the midst of the Teutonic people

a ruler who lacked none of the qualifications of an emperor, except the title. The people longed for an emperor who would combine imperial power with an imperial title, and be a defender of the Church, as protector of right and justice. In 799, Pope St. Leo III while in a procession was attacked by a group of Roman nobles. The pope escaped with great difficulty. Like Pope Stephen II he went across the Alps to secure the assistance of Charlemagne. The following year found him in Rome, where he took vigorous measures for the future safety of the pope. Then on Christmas Day, 800 A.D., when Charlemagne was kneeling in prayer in St. Peter's Church hearing mass, the pope came down to him and placed on his head a golden crown, saying these words,

"'Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus, crowned of God, the great and peace giving Emperor of the Romans....' Charles did not owe his imperial elevation to conquest; he had entered Rome without opposition. He did not receive it from the Roman Senate; that body had long before lost its influential position. Leo III acted neither as the instrument of Charles' policy, nor as the agent of the Roman people, but as the Supreme Head on earth of the Catholic Church, conferring by his own act and impulse the protectorate of the Church and the guardianship of public right and order on Charles the Great. The Roman people could not give a protector to the universal Church, the Roman people were never asked thereafter about the coronation of a new Emperor. The acclamation of the people on Christmas Day, 800, was the expression of joy over the elevation already accomplished. The same power which had appointed Charles and his father Patricians or Defenders of the Roman Church, gave now to Charles in the most solemn manner the temporal Protectorate over the whole Church." 11

11. Guggenberger, A., op. cit., I, p.148, 149.

The creation of the Holy Roman Empire by the coronation of Charlemagne was the realization of the ideal of unity, peace and strength. It imposed on the emperor the duty of protecting the Church against all enemies, to defend the Holy See and her ministers, to assist the Church in its legislation and in the conversion of heathen nations by the secular arm. The pope was the sovereign and independent judge in matters of faith and morals -- individual, social and political. The emperor was sovereign and independent in all secular and purely political matters.

"The Pope and Canon Law governed in the one field; the Emperor and Feudal Law, in the other. In this universal Christian empire it was not deemed necessary for political unity to annihilate the various small nations and to destroy their individuality; rather were their rights, freedom and independence to be placed under the protectorate of the Medieval Roman Emperor. Spiritually, there never was any question of the idealism and necessity of Christian unity. The idea of combining the civil and ecclesiastical in a world-wide commonwealth did not, by any means, imply that the civil and the ecclesiastical were regarded, even theoretically, as identical. On the contrary the nature and scope of each was carefully defined. Invasion of the spiritual field by the secular arm was opposed as vigorously as the assumption of civil authority by ecclesiastics. Because, however, no hard and fast line can be drawn between the civil and the religious, and because, in fact, the two spheres so often touch or even overlap, effective cooperation, mutual support, and close association were looked on as the ideal relationship. The primary principle of effective cooperation was that each power is supreme in its own sphere. The ecclesiastic owed allegiance to the king in secular matters, the king owed allegiance to the Church in spiritual matters. In a direct comparison, the dignity of the priesthood was considered the greater, for it was by the priest that the king was consecrated." 12

CHAPTER III.

The Reign of Gregory VII

"Let not the weak be scandalized when they behold the abomination of desolation seated in the temple; but let them rather marvel and give thanks to God, who watches over the Church and has her in His keeping, in that He did not visit upon her, in the midst of these abominations, the desolation that came upon the Temple of old." --

Baronius 1

1. Alzog, *op. cit.*, II, p.392.

As long as the two powers of the Holy Alliance -- the religious and ecclesiastical authority vested in the Pope, and the civil and political power vested in the Emperor -- continued to work together energetically, each in its own sphere, without serious jar or misunderstanding, the two mutually came to the aid of the other, and each attained a more perfect development. Yet when the power and authority of the emperor began to wane, the established principles were disregarded and violent disorders ensued. In like manner when the emperor sought to hamper and paralyze the authority and influence of the Papacy, internal decay set in. The conflict between the two reached its culmination in the pontificate of Gregory VII. He was the first Pope, who attempted to depose a temporal prince, since the Holy Alliance was entered into. Men have naturally sought to know why, and under what circumstances, Gregory VII maintained a claim to a power seemingly so extraordinary in one who was a successor of the poor fisherman of Galilee.

Gregory VII was the instrument chosen by God to correct the moral evils of his age.

"More than any of his contemporaries Gregory VII was the child of the preceding generation, heir to its work and its difficulties, and, in the great question which his pontificate unexpectedly evoked, he was the parent of the generation to come." 2

-
2. Gibbs, Eleanor, What Lead to Canossa, Thought, III, 4 (1929), p.552.
-

"The Church had unworthy ministers and she had to weep over many immoralities, even at the foot of her altars, precisely because she had been enslaved by the princes of the earth -- her canons contemned, her liberties crushed, and her very sanctuaries sacrilegiously invaded, by those who were clothed with the civil power." 3

-
3. Spalding, Rev. M.J., Church, Culture and Liberty, p.229.
-

These moral evils were not abuses which arose in his age, but rather abuses of the past two centuries which were swelling into a torrent which threatened to destroy the Church. In order to understand these evils, one need stand in retrospect, for it is only in the light of the past that one is able to obtain a correct insight into the usurpations made by the emperor of spiritual powers.

Charlemagne had won a triumph over the barbarism and anarchy of the time, by framing and establishing a gigantic scheme of government. His attitude of protection of the Holy See and his endeavor to spread Christianity belonged only to an Emperor. His coronation therefore was the sanctifying, not the increasing, of his authority.

"As Constantine founds so Charles erects on a firmer basis the connection of Church and State. Bishops and abbots are as essential a part of rising feudalism as counts and dukes. Their benefices are held under the same conditions of fealty and the service in war of their vassal tenants, not of the spiritual person himself; they have similar rights of jurisdiction, and are subject alike to the imperial missi (officials commissioned to traverse each some part of his dominions, reporting on and redressing the evils found). The monarch often tries to restrict the clergy, as persons, to spiritual duties; quells the insubordination of the monasteries; endeavors to bring the seculars into a quasi-monastic life by instituting and regulating chapters. But after granting wealth and power, the attempt was vain; his strong hand withdrawn, they laughed at control." 4

Bryce, James, op. cit., p.67.

Thus at this early date, one sees the two evils -- wealth and power on the part of the clergy, and assumption of ecclesiastical authority and control by the emperor, who would summon and sit in councils, examine and appoint bishops and even settle the smallest points of church discipline and polity.

Upon the death of Charlemagne the returning wave of anarchy and barbarism swept over the empire, but since it no longer had a strong ruler it disintegrated. What was formerly the empire of Charlemagne gradually assumed the geographical division of modern France, Germany and Italy. Of these people, only the German king was permitted to present himself for the honor of emperor. Since the evils that confronted Gregory VII did not exclusively pertain to the empire, one must

also consider the relation of Church and State in the other two countries, as well as in England and in Spain which came to the fore while Charlemagne's empire was disintegrating. Each one of these countries will be touched on very briefly.

England, having received her first missionaries from Rome, always maintained the closest union with the See of St. Peter. England was then invaded by the Danes, who left ignorance and immorality in the wake of their destruction of all the educational establishments and monastic retreats.

"In the year 860, the English clergy were openly reproached for keeping concubines, a charge which had never before been brought against them; and so general and notorious did the vice become among them, that the Council of London, (944) held during the reign of King Edmund, reminded them in emphatic language, that they were obliged by their state of life to observe the rule of celibacy." 5

5. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.380-1.

In 878, Alfred the Great defeated the Danes and forced this vanquished people to embrace Christianity.

The great Archbishop Dunstan received a royal command from King Edgar in 969 that he should drive the unworthy from ecclesiastic offices, and in their places put men of virtue and ability. Upon the approbation of the pope, John XIII, an uncompromising war was carried on against the vices of a rebellious and corrupt clergy, while the monasteries were being reformed. The clergy was obliged either to observe celibacy or give up their benefices. Thus it was that the State enforced the decrees of the Church, and England was bound quite closely with the Holy See.

France was afflicted with unhappy dissensions and civil war among her ruling class, so the peace of the country was disturbed which retarded the growth of ecclesiastical discipline and relaxed the bonds of Christian morality. Add to this confusion the "pirate-raids" of the Northmen, who pulled down the churches and destroyed the monasteries -- ignorance of clergy and people was the result. The Carolingian dynasty fell and with it disappeared the reverence and respect for the Church. The vassals began to encroach on the royal power, so the Church maintained law and order until the Capetian dynasty, under Hugh Capet, arose in power.

"The Church made many efforts to restore ecclesiastical discipline and purity of life, but the clergy who had gone on, from day to day, violating their vow of chastity and securing benefices by simoniacal means, refused to listen to her admonitions and give up their habits of sin.... But when these disorders were at their height; when bishops presumed to settle the estates of the Church as dowers upon their daughters; when counts and dukes put on public sale the bishoprics and abacies lying within their respective territories; when the weak had no rights that the strong were bound to respect, a reaction set in." 6

6. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.368.

The reformation was commenced under Pope Leo IX, who, by the Council of Rheims (1049) through the unusual severity of the language of the reformatory decrees, sought to restore the clergy to their purity of life.

Italy, during the domination of the Franks, was pervaded by a deep and earnest religious feeling. The dissolution of

the Carolingian dynasty was followed by anarchy which was worst in Italy. In 959, Otto the Great, king of Germany, married Adelheid the widow of Lothar, the last Burgundian king of Italy, and thereby united Italy with Germany. The influence of the German rulers was too frequently interrupted to produce any permanent result.

"The aristocracy everywhere were strong only against the kings, otherwise they were in constant warfare with each other. Christian countries were invaded by Northmen, Slavs, Hungarians, Saracens; Tyrannical princes and vassals oppressed the people. Ecclesiastical property was plundered with impunity, bishoprics and abbeys were bought and sold with open simony and sometimes conferred even on children. The first half of the tenth century affords the darkest age of the Church. The Church in the person of its head, was first reduced to helplessness in consequence of the Italian feuds, and then degraded by an enforced slavery to a prominent Italian family whose soldiers or even women nominated the candidates to the See of St. Peter. The clergy sank lower in character as it degenerated in morals, and the people forgot the practical duties which Christianity imposed. There were noble but spare exceptions here and there, the germs of a better future." 7

7. Guggenberger, A., op. cit., I, p.167.

In 1022 the Council of Pavia passed a number of decrees against the unchastity of ecclesiastics, but to no avail.

"The inhabitants of Milan were divided into two opposing parties -- one composed of worldly ecclesiastics and vicious seculars, representing the aristocracy and powerful by reason of rank, wealth, and a community of interests; and the other of those who represented the bulk of the people....who prompted by zeal for holy purity, and strengthened by the buoyant enthusiasm which

the consciousness of laboring in a good cause always inspires, assaulted the defenders of simony and concubinage with uncommon vigor and determination." 8

8. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.375.

In 1067 Guido, the archbishop of Milan, was excommunicated for being a staunch leader of the former party.

Spain was ruled over by the Mohammedans since 711, and therefore the Church was a victim of tyrannous oppression. About the middle of the ninth century the kingdom of Navarre was founded, and two centuries later the adjoining Christian kingdoms of Aragon and Castile came into existence. The Christians were subjected to persecution because they persisted in being loyal to the faith of their fathers. This condition of affairs necessarily relaxed the bonds that united the Spanish Church to the Apostolic See; but more intimate relations were restored by Pope Leo IX.

Germany suffered the same fate as did France and Italy at the dissolution of Charlemagne's empire, but Germany was blessed with more capable rulers. in 894 at Tribur the first German council was held, which decreed the restoration of discipline and the strengthening of ecclesiastical authority. Germany was then overrun by the Hungarians, before the decree could effect any degree of order in the Church. These barbaric people were finally defeated at Lechfeld in 955 by the great Saxon king, Otto the Great. This act saved the Church and raised it to a high level. Otto, it is true, appointed most of the bishops of his kingdom, but he rarely appointed

one who was not distinguished by piety and learning. In 962 he received the imperial crown from Pope John XII. The pope, having betrayed his trust to the emperor, was declared deposed by Otto.

"Otto exacted a new oath from the Romans (Roman clergy and people had the ancient right of electing the pope) by which they promised him to elect no pope except with his own consent and that of his son." 9

9. Guggenberger, A., op. cit., I, p.212.

After two years the schism was successfully healed when the successor of Pope John XII, and the anti-pope died the same year. Pope John XIII was lawfully elected in the presence of the imperial ambassadors.

In 1024, when the Saxon line became extinct, Conrad II was elected king. The religious fervor of the preceding reigns was lacking. He was indifferent. He followed the policy of not filling the episcopal sees with political adherents but he also charged high prices for church appointments and encouraged thereby the practice of simony.

Germany was next ruled by Henry III (1039-56), who combined high culture with practical wisdom. He regarded clerical incontinency and simony as the most dangerous evils that could come upon the Church and he exerted himself to correct the one and suppress the other. But to him being a "Protector of the Church" meant to exercise a sort of lordship over the Church. However, he kept clear of all violent interference in the election of four popes, and, in allowing the electors to have free consent, the papal elections made under his influence were valid.

Upon the death of Henry III his six year old son was elected his successor. The Empress-mother Agnes and the Archbishop of Koeln were the regents. To satisfy the princes the empress retired to Italy, and the Archbishop of Bremen shared the regency. He finally got complete control, and indulged the young monarch in his bad habits. In 1072 when Henry IV began his personal government his court was the seat of

"grossest licence, open simony, a market of bishoprics and abbeys." 10

10. Guggenberger, A., op. cit., I, p.251.

Thus when Gregory VII began his pontificate the Church was paralyzed in its action and in its influence on the clergy. Since the clergy were ignorant, the bulk of the people did not receive the necessary instruction and information. The people grew worldly and sensual, and religion in many cases was nothing better than a degrading superstition.

"He found the Papacy in chains; the emperors of Germany dictating the name of the candidate who should assume the office of Vicar of Christ. The prelates were subservient to the civil authority -- in France as well as in Germany -- because from it they had bought their offices. Simony was almost universal. Church benefices were sold to the highest bidder. The imperial, the royal or the ducal hand was always extended to receive the bribe offered by the would-be bishop or abbot, who frequently had not received Holy Orders, or who was not an ecclesiastic at all, and who was consequently unfit for the discharge of the duties of his holy office. There seemed to be a conspiracy among the civil rulers and the simoniacal clerics to destroy the unity and the catholicity of the Church, and to make her a merely local, national or provincial institution. The king, the emperor,

the duke was to be the head of the Church instead of the successor of St. Peter. But simony was not the only vice prevalent. Licentiousness had invaded the Sanctuary, and the open concubinage of clerics was common; so that the two vices, intrenched behind civil protection, stood in the path of Gregory the Liberator, and the Reformer." 11

11. Brann, Rev. Henry A., Waifs and Strays, p.268-9.

On April 22, 1073 Gregory VII was elected to the papacy. No one ever came to the papacy with as rich an experience.

"As cardinal deacon for over twenty years, and Archdeacon of the Roman Church for thirteen, his work had lain particularly among the secular affairs of the Papacy; from this he had acquired great practical knowledge and a keen sense of the actual." 12

12. Cambridge Medieval History, V, p.55.

"From the pontificate of the Holy Leo IX (1049), who had made him Archdeacon of the Roman Church, to the day of his own election, he was the right arm of the Church's defense. So great was the confidence entertained in his judgment, that St. Peter Damian says, that he himself followed his opinions as he would the canons of the Church. It was he who had prompted Bruno, Bishop of Toul, nominated Pope by Henry IV, to take off the insignia of the Papacy at the Monastery of Cluny, to walk as a pilgrim to Rome, and not to accept of the tiara, until he should be canonically elected by the clergy and people of that city. This was his first step towards the emancipation of the Church. He it was who advised, and perhaps even penned the famous canon of the Roman Council, held under Nicholas II, in 1059, which fixed the mode of electing the Sovereign Pontiff by the cardinals, with the consent of the people, and made the approval by the emperor a mere personal privilege to belong to those emperors only, to whom it would be specially granted by the Pope." 13

13. Spalding, Rev. M.J., op. cit., p.237.

He knew well the difficulties that would beset one who should endeavor to govern the Church as became an upright and conscientious pope. He therefore protested against his own elevation to the papacy, but to no avail. Gregory still saw a way out. Assuming only the title of Bishop-elect of Rome, he, according to the last decree on papal elections which required the approbation of the emperor, wrote to Henry IV of Germany, informing him of what had taken place, and begging him not to approve the choice of the Romans.

"'But should you', he went on to say, 'deny my prayer I beg to assure you that I shall most certainly not allow your scandalous and notorious excesses to go unpunished.'....'I have indeed', said he, 'been elected by the people, but against my will. I would not, however, allow myself to be forced to take priest's orders until my election should have been ratified by the king and princes of Germany.'" 14

14. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.482, 483.

Henry IV was so pleased with this manner that he ordered the consecration to go on, which was performed on the feast of the Purification, 1074. This is the last instance of a papal election being ratified by the German king, and emperor-elect.

Gregory VII gave Henry IV the personal privilege to consent to his elevation to the papacy -- for that was the only right the king possessed under the Law Concerning Papal Election promulgated by Pope Nicholas II in 1059 -- and in turn received the king's approbation. Thus Gregory VII entered his pontificate at peace with the world. This was not to last, for Gregory believed his position demanded of him, like

the prophet Ezekiel of old, to --

"Cry aloud, do not cease, as a trumpet
lift up your voice, and announce to my
people their sins." 15

Gibb, Eleanor, op. cit., p.557.

The first step in his reform was to obtain freedom of the Church. This could only be done by freeing the members -- primarily the clergy -- from dependence on princes and from solicitude for the things of the world.

"In whatever direction one turns his eyes -- to the West, to the North, or to the South -- everywhere are to be found bishops who have obtained the episcopal office in an irregular way; whose lives and conversation are out of harmony with their calling; who go through their duties, not from love of Christ, but from motives of worldly ambition. There are no longer princes now who set God's honor before their own selfish ends, or who allow justice to stand in the way of their ambition." 16

16. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.484.

If he was to correct this evil, the clergy must be reformed. In the first Lenten synod at Rome in 1074, Gregory revived the old decrees against incontinency for this was the only means of restoring and preserving the moral purity of life which the state of the clergy demanded. In the second Lenten synod in 1075 simony was assailed for it was closely connected with the sin of incontinency. To eradicate simony, the practice of lay investiture was condemned in these words,

"If any person should accept a bishopric or an abbacy from the hands of a layman, such one should not be regarded as a bishop or an abbot, nor should he enter the Church

until he had given up the place thus illegally obtained....the same rule should apply to the lower offices of the Church, and that any person, even if he were emperor or king, who should confer an investiture in connection with any ecclesiastical office, should be cut off from the communion of the Church." 17

17. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.487.

Gregory VII firmly believed that reform must work from the center to the circumference of the Christian world. Decrees of synods are dead letters, unless the diocesan councils would enforce them. If the bishops refused to hold these councils, papal legates would be sent to convene the council and call all those suspected of simony before them. The German bishops opposed this policy, and openly declared that Gregory's ambition was one of world conquest, not of reform.

Ever since Gregory VII had been raised to the papacy he had striven to develop in Henry IV a sense of responsibility, and to promote the harmonious working of the spiritual and temporal powers -- each of which could work best when enjoying complete freedom -- for the benefit of mankind. Henry IV nevertheless continued to keep about him as advisers those worthless favorites who were excommunicated by Pope Alexander II. When the Saxons had given Henry IV a setback, he wrote to Gregory VII and voluntarily agreed to mend his ways and asked for the Pope's forgiveness. In other words he sought the friendship of the Pope in time of adversity.

"The pope thought that not a little had been done when Henry professed sorrow for the simony of which he had been guilty,

and sought and obtained absolution from the general censures pronounced against all such as were guilty of that sin. Besides, he promised to remedy certain abuses at once, and professed the utmost devotion to the Pope....The fact was that, so far as personal, or, indeed, any other kind of real reforms were concerned, Henry was not in earnest. His worthless counsellors, or rather companions of his base pleasures, were not dismissed; nor were any serious efforts made by him to be just, either towards the Church or towards the Saxons." 18

18. Mann, Horace K., The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages, VII, p.75-6.

At the Lenten Synod in 1075 Gregory VII excommunicated five of Henry's councilors for advising the King to sell church offices. Gregory thereupon wrote Henry a letter informing him of the excommunication of five councilors, and the decree prohibiting lay-investiture.

"However, lest this decree should appear to you unduly severe, we have instructed those of your subjects who are here (*fideles tui*) to beg you not to allow the change of a bad custom to disturb you, but to send to us some of the good and wise men of your country. If they can show how, without sacrificing God's honour, or endangering our soul's salvation, we can modify the decree of the Fathers which has been promulgated, we will willingly follow their opinions. And even if we had not made you this friendly offer, it would have been proper, before you violated the apostolic decrees, to have shown us in what we had aggrieved you or detracted from the honour which is your due. But your after conduct proclaimed how much you care for our admonitions, or for the observance of justice." 19

19. Ibid., VII, p.80.

Before this letter and private embassy reached Henry, the

pope found that his worst fears were well-grounded -- that Henry was indifferent to reform and to the Church's interest. Every letter to Henry from Gregory had contained an urgent exhortation that he should reform the abuses of Milan. The archbishop of Milan did not want reform, so leaned to the temporal overlord, the king of Germany. In 1067 Henry IV had vested a man of his own choice, a certain Godfrey, with the archbishop's ring and staff. In 1075 with the regularly elected archbishop, Atto, in exile at Rome, Henry was displeased with the inabilities of Godfrey, so disregarding both, he now invested Tedald in

"an extraordinary proceeding, and one altogether unheard of, that a city which has one bishop elect, and a second consecrated, should have a third bestowed upon it." 20

20. Mann, H.K., op. cit., VII, p.83.

Early in January, 1076, Henry received the papal letter urging him to change his course of life, and threatening him with excommunication by reason of his personal crimes if he did not. Henry had just humbled his enemies at home, and the nobles had promised to elect his son Conrad as his successor -- when this unexpected opposition came from Rome. On January 24, 1076, Henry called a diet of the bishops and abbots on whom he could rely at Worms, and forthwith declared Gregory deposed. He dispatched a messenger to the Pope with a letter addressed in such terms,

"Henry, King by the grace of God and not by the will of man, to Hildebrand, no longer Pope, but a false monk." 21

21. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.496.

Gregory had just opened the Lenten Synod on February 14, 1076, when the messenger arrived. Gregory remained calm, in the midst of the tumult that the letter created, and, on the following day pronounced Henry excommunicated and incompetent to govern either in Germany or Italy, and released his subjects from their oath of fealty.

"Through thy (St. Peter's) favour I have received from God the power of binding and of loosing in heaven and in earth. Relying on this, for the honour and defence of thy Church, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and by thy power and authority, I forbid to King Henry, who through unexampled pride has rebelled against thy Holy Church, the government of the whole realm of Germany and of Italy; I absolve all Christians from the oaths which they have taken or may take to him; and I decree that no one shall obey him as king, for it is fitting that he, who has endeavoured to diminish the honour of thy Church, should himself lose that honour which he seems to have. And because he has scorned the obedience of a Christian, refusing to return to the Lord, whom he had driven from him by his communion with the excommunicate; by spurning, as thou knowest, the admonitions given by me for his own safety's sake; and by severing himself from thy Church in the attempt to divide it, I, in thy stead, bind him with the bond of anathema; thus acting in confidence on thee, that the nations may know and acknowledge that thou art Peter, that upon thy rock the Son of the living God hath built his Church, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (St. Matt. xvi, 18). 22

22. Mann, H.K., op. cit., VII, p.100-1.

The news of Henry's excommunication and suspension of exercise of royal authority created a great commotion in Germany. Henry and his councilors -- secular and spiritual -- were avoided by the people. On October 16, 1076, the great

ones of the empire held a diet at Tribur. They decided to have Gregory VII hold a diet in Germany, as only he could judge Henry, on February 2, 1077 at Augsburg. If Henry was still under the ban of excommunication, on the anniversary day of the ban, he was to lose his dignity forever for the ancient law of the empire forbade further administration to those who had been excommunicated for better than a year.

Henry, after a vain attempt at conciliation, feared that things might go worse with him if he waited for the diet to decide his fate. He hastily set out for Italy, and thereby anticipated Gregory's arrival in Germany, to obtain absolution from his excommunication at any cost before the expiration of the year of grace. In what had now become a race for his crown, Henry crossed the Alps in the bitter winter weather, and accosted the Pope at Canossa. Gregory VII was suspicious of Henry's good faith, so for three days Henry -- having laid aside his royal insignia -- waited, fasting in the snow-covered inner court. At last Gregory was moved -- partly by the King's humiliation -- by the assurances of his friends. On January 28, 1077, the pope granted him absolution requiring as a condition precedent

"that he should appear before the proposed assembly, which was to be presided over by the Pope, where an opportunity would be given him to reply to the charges of his opponents; that upon the issue of this court should depend his right to the kingdom, and that in the meantime he should observe no state, retain no mark of dignity, and should exercise no acts of regal power. Should he violate any of these conditions, he would again incur all his former ecclesiastical penalties." 23

23. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.501-2.

Unfortunately, Henry was seduced by the flatteries, promises, and threats of the Lombards, and disregarded the obligations of his oath. The princes were irritated at Henry's faithlessness, and determined to meet at Forchheim, near Bamberg on March 13, 1077, with the intention of electing Rudolf of Suabia king and asked the pope to be present at it.

"But if it was Gregory's earnest wish to preside at Forchheim, it was not really that either of Rudolf or Henry. The former, anxious apparently to be elected king himself, did not desire the presence either of an impartial judge or a rival; nor did the latter desire that the good understanding between the Pope and the princes should be strengthened. Hence he would neither go to the diet himself nor give the Pope a safe conduct." 24

24. Mann, H.K., op. cit., VII, p.125-6.

In spite of the remonstrance of Gregory, the assembly chose Rudolf of Suabia as king, after exacting from him a promise to guarantee the free election of bishops and not to make the kingdom hereditary. On March 26, 1077, Rudolf was crowned king in the cathedral of Mainz.

"Henry, after hastily arranging matters in Italy, returned to Germany, and was shortly surrounded by all his former adherents; while Rudolph, on the contrary, was shamefully deserted by the very persons who had been most prominent in having him elected. Gregory maintained an attitude of neutrality toward both competitors for the crown. It was his desire to decide between them in conjunction with the spiritual and temporal princes of Germany, and, as both parties counted on his support, they mutually agreed to guarantee him a safe-conduct coming to and returning from Germany." 25

25. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.503.

A fierce civil war ensued. Because of the unusually complicated affairs in Germany and the fierce partisan feeling, Gregory VII sought to compromise affairs -- always advocating a conciliatory policy, believing that a peaceable adjustment of the difficulty was still possible.

"Taking things all in all, Gregory felt that he could no longer remain an inactive spectator of events, and that there was now a call upon him to interpose his authority. Accordingly, in a numerousyattended synod, held at Rome in 1080, Gregory renewed the sentence of excommunication and deposition against Henry, the author of so many and so great evils, absolved his subjects from the obligations of their oath of allegiance, and declared, in unequivocal terms, that Rudolph was the true and only King of the Germans." 26

26. Alzog, *op. cit.*, II, p.506.

Henry retaliated on the feast of Pentecost, 1080, by declaring Gregory was deposed and expelled from his see. The council of Brixen then elected an anti-pope in Clement III, who then excommunicated King Rudolph.

Henry and Rudolph met in the battle on the Elster on October 15, 1080. Rudolph, although victorious, died from a mortal wound. Henry then believed he could subjugate Italy. After a three year siege Rome fell.

"Gregory retired to the castle of St. Angelo, where he remained shut up, and repelled every advance of Henry looking to a reconciliation, until the latter should have made amends for his past conduct. Henry offered to recognize him as lawful Pope, and to surrender Guibert into his hands for punishment, if Gregory would consent to crown him emperor. Gregory replied that he would never absolve Henry, or place the crown upon his head, until he should have made the most

ample satisfaction for the insults and outrages he had offered to God and His Church. The Pope added: 'Were I willing to turn aside from the path of justice, I might obtain from Henry greater concessions than were ever granted to any of my predecessors. But I have no fear of the threats of wicked men, and am prepared to die, rather than consent to what my conscience can not approve.' 27

27. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.507.

On March 21, 1084, after Henry was assured that Gregory would not brook a reconciliation, Henry presented Clement III to the people as his pope. On Easter Sunday Henry received the imperial crown from the hands of Clement III.

Finally Robert Guiscard, the Norman ruler of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, recalled his pledge of fealty to the pope. He marched on Rome and liberated Gregory VII. After much carnage and bloodshed, the Normans withdrew to Salerno, taking Gregory VII with them. There on May 25, 1085, having loved justice, he died in exile.

"Though he died heartbroken, he was successful in the task that he had undertaken and completed the work which he had begun. In the great scope of his work it can be seen how he made victory for the Papacy possible in the new struggles which his pontificate evoked....If he left to his successors the heritage of a bitter struggle, unforeseen but nevertheless partly provoked by him, he left to them also a reformed Papacy, a Church purged of its abuses." 28

28. Gibb, Eleanor, op. cit., p.568-9.

CHAPTER IV.

The Reign of Innocent III

"Would that I might have the happiness of seeing, before I die, the restoration of that glorious age of the Church when the Apostles cast out their nets, not in search of silver and gold, but to make hauls of precious souls." -- St. Bernard of Clairvaux

1. Migne, Ser. Lat. T 182, p.430.

The one great mission in the life of Gregory VII seemed to be to throw off the yoke of feudal servitude which bound the Church -- regain the liberty of the Church, secure the freedom of ecclesiastical elections and the full exercise of ecclesiastical functions. Although he was unable to accomplish this end, Gregory VII succeeded in focusing the attention of all upon the cancerous growth within the Church; it was left to his successors to cut out these evils.

In 1095 the Council of Clermont sought to establish between bishops and secular princes the general duties of subjects and rulers. With this as their objective, the Council forbade the bishops to take the homagium or oath of fealty to either the king or the feudal lord.

"It was argued that the homagium was dangerous to the liberties of the Church, inasmuch as the bishops were placed by it in a condition of absolute dependence on the feudal lord, and bound to render him service under all circumstances. If they objected to the performance of these feudal duties from even religious motives, their refusal would be regarded as a violation of the homagium, and viewed in the light of a felony." 2

2. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.514.

This same council gave birth to a new movement that was to unite the disinterested forces of Christian nations, and by the common bond of faith engage in the great struggle against the enemies of the Church and their race. It was at this council that Pope Urban II proclaimed the first crusade -- a movement religious in origin and religious in its aim.

"She (the Church) had succeeded in inspiring the men of every rank and walk of life with a truly Christian spirit. She had taught them to set a higher value on the unseen blessing of Heaven than on the fleeting possession of earth, and, in the performance of their duty, to act from the dictates of an upright conscience, and not by compulsion and restraint. And so faithful were they to their lessons, and so enthusiastic in carrying out her teachings, that at her bidding princes and people, seizing arms, rushed as one man to the conquest of that land hallowed by the presence of our Savior, and the consummation of the work of Redemption." 3

3. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.518.

The contest about lay-investiture in Germany was settled after nearly fifty years by the Concordat of Worms on September 23, 1122. The articles of the concordat were confirmed by the Ninth Ecumenical Council in 1123, and were substantially as follows -- 1) Emperor surrendered the right to invest the bishops with ring and crosier; instead he would invest the bishops with their fiefs -- with the royal prerogatives and privileges attached to them -- by the scepter six months after their election. If it was a German bishop, he was to be invested with the temporalities of his see before his consecration, while the Burgundian and Italian bishops

could only be invested with the temporalities of their sees after their consecration. 2) Emperor granted fullest freedom in the election and consecration of bishops as the Church law requires, but he reserved for himself the right to have the elections take place in his presence. 3) Emperor shall restore to the Church all the possessions and regalia of St. Peter. 4) Bishops promised fidelity to the emperor, and 5) in case an election be contested the emperor would abide by the judgment of a provincial synod.

"The Concordat therefore established a via media, marked out a middle course, which satisfied both parties. It gave to Church and State what rightfully belonged to each, and refused to each what was not justly its due. But, in doing so much, it did more; it sowed the seeds of mutual distrust between Church and State, and eventually brought about their estrangement." 4

4. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.537.

In 1125 Lothair was elected emperor. Fearing that the election of bishops might not be perfectly free if conducted in his presence, he abolished the practice. He also demanded of the bishops after their consecration an oath of fidelity instead of the homagium. Under the twelve year reign of Lothair harmonious relations existed between the empire and the papacy.

Upon the death of Lothair, Conrad III, Duke of Suabia, was elected. With him begins a new dynasty, namely the family of Hohenstaufen or the Waibling, because of the proximity of the first seat of the family to the village of Waiblingen. Being of an aristocratic temperament it was but

natural that Conrad III plan an expedition to Rome which would restore what he thought were imperial rights and prerogatives. What his uncle had planned, Frederick Barbarossa carried out. Hence for the next century a struggle ensues between the Papacy and the emperor.

"Always desirous of augmenting the influence of his family by powerful alliances, he (Frederick Barbarossa) had his son, Henry VI, married to the princess, Constance (daughter of King Roger I), who, on the death of William II (her uncle), without issue, became the sole heiress to the Two Sicilies. By this union the Pope lost his strongest and most faithful ally, and the house of Hohenstaufen, now in possession of southern Italy, would, if the imperial and Sicilian crowns were worn by one person, become predominant over the whole peninsula." 5

5. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.569-70.

In 1189 Henry VI was on his way to take possession of the Two Sicilies, which was a papal fief, which his wife Constance had inherited, when Henry VI heard of the death of his father, who was drowned while on a Crusade. Henry's policy as ruler was one of extreme cruelty and tyranny, and his treatment of the Papacy foreboded a season of unusual danger and trial. He had just succeeded in having his three year old son, Frederick II who was still unbaptized, elected as his successor to the German crown, when Henry VI died suddenly in 1197. This premature death of the emperor threw Germany in a state of unrest, which ultimately culminated in civil war. Now that the empire was deprived of its emperor, the pope was looked upon to guide the empire through this perilous state until a successor was elected. Just as the

empire mourned the death of Henry VI, the Catholic Church, a few months later, mourned the death of the octogenarian, Pope Celestine III.

After the interment of Celestine III on January 8, 1198, the cardinals met in secret conclave and unanimously elected the thirty-seven year old Cardinal Lothaire the Head of the Universal Church. The conclave would not listen to his tearful objections, but placed the pontifical mantle on his shoulders, and gave him the name of Innocent III. At the time of his election Innocent III was only a deacon, so he waited until the Saturday of Ember Week -- which was one of the usual days for conferring holy orders -- before he was ordained to the priesthood. On the following day, February 22, 1198, he was consecrated bishop, and thereupon was proclaimed chief bishop and universal pope.

"His first thoughts were directed to the reformation of the Papal court; the restoration of the Pope's temporal power; the deliverance of Italy from the rule of the stronger; the separation of the Two Sicilies from Germany, which he regarded as an essential condition to the independence of the Church; and to making the influence of the Head of the Church....felt throughout the length and breadth of Christendom." 6

6. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.574.

Innocent III began his pontificate with abolishing the abuses that had crept into the Roman court. He forthwith restored the Papal supremacy in Rome by personally conferring investiture on the imperial prefect, after first demanding an oath of obedience from him.

When Innocent III assumed the papal crown, he was not content with being sovereign of Rome and of the Patrimony of St. Peter, as far as he controlled it. Rather he was determined to recover all of the lost rights of the Papacy.

"Innocent states very plainly the reason of his anxiety to recover control over the Patrimony of the Church. 'The liberty of the Church,' he wrote, 'is best provided for where the Church of Rome has full power in temporals as well as in spirituals (this refers merely to the Papal States). For, since the Apostolic See is the Mother and Mistress of all the churches in proportion as it more firmly restrains those subject to its temporal power from injuring churches and ecclesiastics, the more does it rebound to its prejudice and to that of all the churches if it preserve not the churches in its own Patrimony in their proper condition of liberty.'" 7

7. Mann, op. cit., XI, p.99.

The Lombard cities, upon the death of Henry VI threw off the yoke of German oppression, and, seeing that submission to Innocent III brought them prosperity, they sought his protection. He concluded an alliance with the Tuscan cities, whereby the pope's sovereignty over the Matildan inheritance was recognized. Through this alliance the Tuscan cities were subordinated to papal authority, and thereby provided for their own freedom, and the defense of the Church against the aggression of the Emperor.

Having regained most of the possessions which had been wrested from the Church by Henry VI, Innocent turned his attention to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, which Henry VI had held as a vassal to the pope. According to the will of

Henry VI, supreme direction of the kingdom was left to the Pope.

"My wife, the empress, and my son, Frederick, shall give to the lord pope and the Roman Church all the rights which these were wont to receive from the kings of Sicily, and they shall give security to the lord pope, just as the kings of Sicily were accustomed to give to the Supreme Pontiff and to the Roman Church. If perchance my aforementioned wife should die first, let my son hold his rightful position, and if my son should die without heir let the kingdom of Sicily devolve upon the Roman Church. If however our son should die first, our beloved consort shall retain the kingdom during her lifetime, and after her death the Kingdom of Sicily shall revert to the Roman Church." 8

8. Mathews, Shailer, Select Medieval Documents, p.105.

Upon the request of the empress, Innocent III confirmed to her and her son the kingdom of the Two Sicilies in November 1198.

"But before he consented to do so he insisted on the empress's renouncing the exceptional ecclesiastical privileges which Hadrian IV had been compelled to concede. Innocent justly maintained that they were inconsistent with proper ecclesiastical freedom. Despite all her efforts, for the great Norman lady was very loathe to lose any of the privileges enjoyed by her predecessors, Constance was compelled to yield. Freedom of episcopal election was once more restored to Sicily, and the Pope resumed his right to send legates there at his pleasure." 9

9. Mann, op. cit., XI, p.139.

Shortly thereafter on November 27, 1198, Constance died. The high regard in which she held Innocent III is reflected by the great confidence she reposed in him by making him the guardian of her young son.

"The ability displayed by Innocent in the administration of the government of Sicily during the minority of Frederick and the pains he was at to give the young prince an education suited to his high destiny, fully justified the trust placed in him by Constance." 10

10. Alzog, op. cit., p.576.

After he was assured of his position at home, Innocent III notified the Christian world that he had been elevated to the Papacy. France was one of the first to be informed, and Innocent warned Philip Augustus that if he would continue to disregard the laws of the Church, a break was bound to occur.

"Innocent's determination not to allow life or death or the favor of anyone whomsoever to separate him from the observance of strict justice, and his regret that he could not be everywhere at once and do everything himself, sprang from the conviction that it was his to reform the world through the paramount power of the Church.... He was set over 'peoples and kingdoms' because he was the Father of all Christians, and because kings and princes were his spiritual sons. Hence he felt that he had a father's right and power to correct wrongdoing in his family, if that wrong were done even by the most distinguished of his sons. But if he believed that the 'paterna potestas' over kings and peoples was his natural and acknowledged right, he wished to exercise his parental authority rationally and in accordance with the dictates not merely of justice but of mercy. He was, therefore, most careful not to exercise his repressive powers without real reason, and to forbid his subordinates to exercise the power of excommunication without good and sufficient cause." 11

11. Mann, H.K., op. cit., XI, p.58-9.

At the sudden death of Henry VI in 1197, two claimants

arose for the kingship of Germany. One was Philip, the brother of the deceased king, and son of Frederick I. The other was Otto, duke of Brunswick. Frederick II, although elected when a child of three was now disregarded because there was a need of a mature and strong ruler, and many were not desirous of making the kingship hereditary. Both aspirants were aware of the advantages that flow from the formation of an alliance with one or more of the crowned heads of Europe. Philip was elected on March 8, 1198, and crowned king of Germany on September 8, 1198 at Mainz by Archbishop of Tarantaise. He immediately made an alliance with Philip II, king of France. This alliance was born from the friendly relations that existed between the present king's father and brother -- Frederick I, and Henry VI. Otto, Duke of Brunswick, was elected king June 8, 1198, and crowned on July 12, 1198 at Aachen by the Archbishop of Cologne. Although Otto was elected by few princes, he was crowned at the right place by the Archbishop who traditionally placed the crown on the head of the king-elect. It was only four years later (1202) that he allied himself with his uncle, John of England,

"for the purpose of guarding and defending his (Otto's) empire and his rights and of giving him faithful counsel and aid in maintaining his rights." 12

12. Thatcher and McNeal, A Source Book for Medieval History, p.228.

Prior to this time, the late King Richard II of England, the brother of the present English king, wrote Innocent III in July and August 1198 -- a few months after the election of

Otto -- asking the Pope to recognize Otto as emperor-elect. The untimely death of King Richard the following April (1199) deprived Otto of this persistent advocate before the papal court. These alliances besides adding greater prestige to the claims of each, also secured for them an advocate before the papal court, since the recognition of either one by the pope as Roman king would automatically cause that candidate to be a petitioner for the imperial crown.

The two kingly claimants sought the purple toga of the Roman king. Both knew that the recognition by the pope would make their cause successful. Therefore both were determined to win this recognition by taking oaths which would qualify them as defenders of the Church, protector of right and justice. Otto of Brunswick took his vow at Neuss (known as the Oath of Neuss) as early as June 10, 1201. Being a member of the Welfic minority, one is not surprised at some of the promises made by Otto, namely -- 1) the retaining and defending of Sicily for the pope, 2) the restoration of peace between Otto and Philip of France, and 3) to follow the advice of the pope concerning the affairs of the Tuscan and Lombard League. These promises will be proper to Otto, because these were some of the reforms he would introduce contrary to the national policy of his predecessors. Otto then vows to protect and preserve all the possessions, honors and rights of the Roman Church to the best of his power. He then deals at great length as to the extent of these possessions, as well as those which he sought to restore. This expression of fealty would be borne out by other acts of obedience and honor which he

would show to the pope. What is more, he promised to aid the pope in defraying his expenses if he became involved in a war for his sake. In view of the fidelity of Otto and that of his house to the Church, as proclaimed by his oath, Innocent III recognized Otto July 3, 1201.

Upon hearing that Innocent III, through his papal legate, the bishop of Praeneste, had recognized Otto as king of Germany a number of the adherents of Philip of Suabia sent a letter to Innocent questioning his right to so interfere --

"Where did you, O Sovereign Pontiff, ever read, where did you O holy fathers, the cardinals of the universal Church, ever hear that your predecessors or their envoys meddled with the elections of the Roman Kings by either acting as electors themselves or by examining as judges the value of a choice already made. We do not believe that you can furnish a single instance....With sorrow therefore we the whole body of the above named princes reveal to you, that the Bishop of Praeneste against all legal order intruded himself into the election of the Roman King.

Nor are we able to see in what capacity he unwittingly images to act. He either acts as elector or as judge. If as elector, why did he look for a chance in the absence of witnesses to overturn veracity by lying and virtue by crime? How could, by a singular act of injustice, that part of the princes -- which forms the majority and excels in dignity -- be disregarded? If as a judge, he could not have that capacity. If the election of a Roman king is divided, there is no higher judge, by whose verdict it can be made unanimous; it must be amended by the voluntary action of the voters....But if you wish to pose as a judge, there is no excuse for you. We can draw your own sword against you, because in the absence of the other party a judge's verdict has no force." 13

Now that the position of Innocent III was questioned, he forthwith drafted a reply, "Venerabilem fratrem nostrum". Innocent III does not address the writers in common, nor the bishops whom he must consider the most guilty in this unwarrantable reaction against his decision, nor the King of Bohemia, who had received his title from the excommunicated Philip. He addresses it to the next named secular prince, the Duke of Zähringen, who it seems from the conclusion of this letter -- in spite of his joining in the protest of the princes -- had shown himself disinclined towards Philip.

"Among other things intimated to us in that letter, they insisted on the assertion that our venerable brother, the Bishop of Praeneste, legate of the Apostolic See, acted either as elector or as judge: -- if as elector, he applied his sickle to a crop not his own, and by meddling with the election he detracted from the honor of the princes; if as judge, he evidently proceeded unlawfully in the absence of one of the parties, which he had no right to declare contumacious, because it had not been summoned. But we, who are by the duty of our apostolical office the debtors of all in matters of justice, have no desire to usurp the rights of the princes, as little as we wish our own rights to be usurped by others." 14

14. Reg. Imp. No. 62; M.L. 216, 1065 ff.

Innocent III then makes it clear in what relation he considers the empire to stand to the papacy. 1) The German princes have the right to elect their king, who is afterwards to become emperor. 2) This privilege was given them by the Apostolic See when it transferred the imperial dignity from the Greeks to the Germans in the person of Charlemagne. 3) The

right to investigate and decide whether a king thus elected is worthy of the imperial dignity, belongs to the Pope alone, whose office it is to "anoint, consecrate and crown him" as emperor; otherwise it might happen that the Pope would be obliged to "anoint, consecrate and crown" as emperor one who was excommunicated, a tyrant, a heretic or a pagan. 4) Since the Church stands in need of a patron and defender, the princes should elect one upon whom the Pope can bestow the imperial dignity. 5) In case of a double election, the Pope must exhort the princes to come to an agreement. If after warning and long waiting they have not reached an agreement, they must ask the Pope to arbitrate, who by his own accord and by virtue of his office decide in favor of one of the claimants. The Pope's decision need not be based on the greater or less legality of either election, but on the qualifications of the claimant.

Therefore the Bishop of Praeneste, the legate of the Apostolic See did not act as judge or as elector.

"He acted, however, as proclaimer. He proclaimed the person of the duke unworthy, and proclaimed the person of the king (so called because Innocent III had recognized him as king of Germany) fitted for the imperial dignity. His verdict was based on the merits of those elected, more than on the efforts of the electors." 15

15. Reg. Imp. No. 62; M.L. 216, 1065 ff.

Therefore in the choice of their king the German nation was not restricted. The pope, though, was prevented by the dignity and importance of the imperial crown from bestowing

it upon any candidate who, even though elected by the Germans, lacked the necessary qualifications.

Within the next two years, Otto's power spread rapidly, but, through his own imprudence and imperiousness he lost many of his followers. These joined the banner of Philip and once more Philip held the balance of power. Still an excommunicated man, he once more appealed for recognition. To demonstrate his change of heart, he took an oath in 1205, which resulted in the lifting of the ban of excommunication and again placing him in a favorable light. Philip promised to give satisfaction to God and to the Church for his offenses (satisfaction as commanded by the pope), even to the extent of going on a crusade. If God should favorably look upon the crusade by having him return victorious over the Greeks to such an extent that he or his brother-in-law should come in control of the Greek empire, then the Greek Church will be made subservient to the Roman Church by him. Philip then boldly struck at the cancerous growth which afflicted the Church in Germany. He would abandon the policy of his predecessors in opposing the pope for the sake of political expediency. Instead he would actually work for the eradication of these evils which sprung up from lay-investiture, and simony -- 1) He would not practice the former abuse, like the holding of the land of a deceased abbot or bishop, so that he could receive the revenues. 2) He would allow the elections to be held in a canonical way. 3) He would aid the pope in having the independent monasteries become regular, and 4) he would compel the clergy to lead a decorous life, proper to their

calling. Philip readily acknowledged the supremacy of the pope in spiritual matters. He also appreciated that the Church had to be independent in its possessions, so he vowed to restore to the Churches all the possessions which were unjustly seized or held, and at the same time promised to no longer disturb them in their possessions. He would decree that any one or all of his subjects who would be excommunicated by the pope would be under the ban of the empire. Philip besought the pope to look upon him as a faithful and devoted son and defender of the Roman Church. To cement forever this league of peace and friendship between himself and the pope, Philip was willing to give members of his family in marriage to that of the pope's family.

It is well to digress for a few moments in order to evaluate the oaths taken by Otto and Philip. For clarity it is well to again repeat that Otto was a Welf, and therefore friendly to the plans of extending the papal authority. Philip was a Hohenstaufen and a Ghibelline, and therefore opposed to anything that would run counter to the imperial power. It is therefore obvious that Philip's oath should be more comprehensive, and less specific than that of Otto. Philip though repeated the essential promises of Otto. One might say that Otto renewed some of his Welfic promises, as a preface to those promises whereby he sought to gain the title of "defender of the Church, protector of right and justice". Philip, an excommunicated prince, prefaced his oath with a plea of forgiveness. Then he vowed to forsake the hostile attitude of his house (Hohenstaufen) against the Church and

to give up certain abuses practiced by former rulers in connection with the death of prelates. With the new strength that comes to a prodigal son Philip declares that he always wants to retain the peace and friendship of the pope, since those are the fruits that arise from being a devoted and faithful son.

Innocent III sought to bring about a truce, and then secure a settlement through negotiations between the claimants and their parties. In the midst of these negotiations -- while at the same time plans were being formulated for a last and decisive appeal to arms -- Philip was slain, the victim of one of his private wars. Otto was then recognized by the whole country. He went to Rome to receive the imperial crown. Before he was crowned by the pope, he again took a solemn oath. He repeated the sworn promises of former days, to guarantee to the Church freedom of ecclesiastical elections, freedom of appeals to Rome, and freedom of management of all spiritual affairs. Furthermore he would aid the Church in maintaining or regaining the Patrimony of St. Peter, and would respect the rights of the Sicilian child, Frederick, in Sicily. Otto was then crowned Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation on October 4, 1209. Otto speedily broke his promises to the Pope, and proceeded to reclaim the territories that had belonged to Matilda and the rights he had foresworn. In 1211 Innocent III pronounced excommunication against Otto IV. This did not stay Otto in his endeavor to join Sicily with the German kingdom, so at the Diet in Nuremberg Otto was deposed in 1212 -- the princes and barons were

absolved from their oath of allegiance to the emperor. Otto was deposed, not because Innocent III was desirous of removing this ungrateful son from power, but because the ancient law of the empire forbade anyone to continue in the administration of affairs of state, if he had been under the ban of excommunication for better than a year. Otto was aware of this law, and sought not to stay its effect -- his loss of dignity forever -- by having the ban of excommunication lifted. Innocent III had no other choice, but to declare that the imperial throne was vacant. The German princes now turned to Frederick II, king of Sicily, who now was twenty years old. Frederick II took the usual oath -- never to unite the kingdoms of Germany and the Two Sicilies -- and then was supplied with the necessary funds by his guardian, Innocent III. Frederick II was crowned king on July 5, 1215 at Aachen, the traditional place of coronation.

When Innocent III began his pontificate, Philip Augustus of France had been living in adultery for two years. In 1193, the day after the marriage, he put aside his lawful wife, Ingeborg, and sought to have the marriage declared void because he had married a near relation (the great-grandfather of Philip Augustus, was brother to a Danish princess who was an ancestress of Ingeborg). Finally in June 1196, he attempted a marriage with Agnes of Meran. On May 17, 1198 Innocent III sent him a strong letter telling him to consult his honor and his eternal salvation, and take back his wife. Since the king persisted in his evil ways on January 12, 1200, the papal interdict was solemnly pronounced. On September 7, 1200,

Philip Augustus put away the adultrous, and took back his queen, whereupon the edict was removed. Instead of treating Ingeborg as his queen and mistress, he kept her practically a prisoner. In August 1210, the adultrous Agnes died, and Philip Augustus had the children he had by her declared legitimate by Innocent III.

"There is no doubt that he (Philip Augustus) profited by every turn of politics to put pressure on the Pope. Knowledge of this line of action on the king's part had its effect on Innocent. It rendered him cautious in the unceasing efforts which he made on Ingeborg's behalf; though it must be borne in mind that, since Philip was no longer living in adultery, the Pope was not in the same position to act as vigorously against him as he had been before." 16

16. Mann, H.K., op. cit., XII, p.100.

Philip again made Ingeborg a prisoner, and for the next twelve years he used every means to secure a divorce. During this time the weary game went on.

"On the one side we see Innocent continuing to console the outraged lady, and refusing, despite his political difficulties, to allow himself to be bullied into granting a divorce; and on the other side we see Philip endeavoring to put every kind of pressure on the Pope in order to force him to grant the divorce -- promising for instance, to marry the daughter of the landgrave of Thuringia if he could make the Pope free him from Ingeborg." 17

17. Ibid., XII, p.105.

In 1213 Philip finally accorded to her the rights that were hers both as a queen and as a wife. In this struggle with Philip, Innocent III succeeded as far as he could. He re-

fused to grant an illegal and dishonest divorce, but by means of the interdict forced Philip to recognize Ingeborg as his lawful wife. More than that Innocent could not do -- he could not compel Philip to live with his wife, or give her more than the necessaries of life.

Philip Augustus, pursuing the policy of his predecessors, sought to conquer the English possessions on the continent. When Richard the Lionhearted died, he was succeeded by John Lackland. The disgusted nobles of Anjou, Maine and Touraine espoused the cause of Arthur, the son of Geoffrey (John's elder brother). In an uprising in Poitou, Arthur was captured by John, and there is little doubt that he died at the hands of his uncle, being drowned in the Seine. In 1203 Philip summoned John as his vassal to appear before his court in France. John refused, and he was declared guilty of treason and felony, and condemned to forfeit his lands in France.

John was also, like Philip, involved in matrimonial difficulties. In August 1169 he married Isabel of Gloucester, a cousin within the third degree, without dispensation. After eleven years of married life, Isabel of Angouleme took his fancy. So he forthwith had his first marriage decreed a nullity and took Isabel as his wife, although she was already espoused to Hugh Lusignan, one of John's vassals.

"From 1202-6 he (John) constantly incurred Innocent's displeasure, and received many letters urging him not to interfere with the liberties of the Church, and threatening him with one kind of ecclesiastical censure or another for his.... 'ill-treatment of clerics'." 18

In 1205, when Archbishop Hubert of Canterbury died, John came into open conflict with Innocent III. The younger monks, to prevent royal interference, elected Reginald as archbishop hurriedly and at night. Enraged John ordered the election of John de Gray, and the older monks complied for the sake of peace. Both parties appealed to Rome, and both abbots were rejected -- Reginald because he was irregularly elected, and de Gray because he was unfit. A delegation of fifteen monks from Christ's Church, authorized to act in the name of the whole community, went to Rome and upon the recommendation of Innocent III elected Cardinal Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury. On July 17, 1206 the pope himself consecrated the Primate-elect of England. John refused to allow Langton to enter England, so Innocent threatened to put the country under interdict. He waited two years longer before formally cutting John off from the communion of the Church in 1210.

"From a general interdict over John's territories, the Pope had proceeded to personal excommunication of the iniquitous monarch. From personal excommunication he passed in 1212 to declaring him deposed from his kingdom....Innocent then wrote to Philip of France urging him to undertake the task of deposing John, and declaring that, if he expelled him, he and his heirs should be kings of England, and that he would make a general appeal to the fighting men of Europe to help avenge the insult which John 'had cast on the universal Church', offering them the same privileges as were offered to those who fought in the Holy Land." 19

19. Mann, H.K., op. cit., XII, p.134.

Fear now overcame John, when he visioned the great

armament which was being gathered by the man who had deprived him of nearly all his Continental possessions. Aware of the hatred of his people, he finally wavered. He asked Innocent to send a legate, through whom he (John) would make amends for all the wrongs he committed against the universal Church. He received Pandulph on May 13, 1213, and accepted the peace formula. By this John -- 1) swore to admit the Archbishop of Canterbury to his see 2) granted a free return and full restoration to all exiles and prisoners -- lay and clerical -- who had suffered for the Church. The pope in turn promised to lift the interdict and the excommunication, and to allow the returning bishops to swear again fealty to the king. This was not all. Two days later, on May 15, 1213, John solemnly resigned his crown and his realms into the hands of the papal legate. He in turn received them back again to be held by fealty and homage as a vassal of the Pope. John did this of his own free will in order to save his crown from Philip Augustus and with the consent of the barons, who saw in it a means of humbling the king's insolence and pride. The interdict was lifted in December 1213.

John now made one final attempt to recover his former possessions in France with the help of his allies. On July 27, 1214, was fought the battle of Bouvines, which was disastrous to John's policy. He returned to England and seeing the barons leaguings together against him, on February 2, 1215 John granted freedom of canonical election and vowed to take the Cross. Deserted by all John was forced to sign the Magna

Carta presented by the barons on June 15, 1215. Both parties then appealed to the Pope, as their feudal superior.

"Innocent III upon the appeal of both parties rejected the Magna Carta because the barons had defied the king with force of arms at a time when John, having promised to join a Crusade, stood under the Truce of God. England having become a fief of the Holy See, the king could not give away the rights of the crown without the consent of his feudal superior. Besides, the Pope was ill-informed about affairs in England and unduly influenced by his legates in England who, gained over by John, reported more favorably about him than he deserved. Innocent promised, however, to take care that the crown should be content with its just rights, and the clergy and the people should enjoy their ancient liberties." 20

20. Guggenberger, A., op. cit., I, p.364.

Spain and Portugal were still busy holding the Saracens in check. Still Innocent III did not hesitate to force Alphonso IX, King of Leon, to break off the marriage he had entered into with his niece. Pedro II, King of Aragon, was summoned to Rome to receive the regal crown, only after he had promised to make payments of annual tribute. Sansho I, King of Portugal, was made to place his kingdom under the protection of the Holy See, for failure to pay the annual tribute promised by his father. On July 16, 1212 Alfonso VIII, King of Castile, with the aid of the three sovereigns met the Saracens at Las Navas de Tolosa and succeeded in ending Saracen supremacy in Spain. Among all four sovereigns and the Pope,

"there were the usual cases, matrimonial and clerical, on which he (Innocent) had to adjudicate, and the ordinary appeal to which he had to listen." 21

21. Mann, H.K., op. cit., XII, p.169.

Throughout his whole pontificate Innocent III espoused the cause of the Crusades. In this regard Innocent III followed the example of his predecessors, especially Urban II, who one hundred years before had sounded the clarion call at the Council of Clermont in 1095, when he said,

"This royal city (Jerusalem) situated at the center of the earth is now held captive by the enemies of Christ and is subjected, by those who do not know God, to the worship of the heathen. She seeks, therefore, and desires to be liberated and ceases not to implore you to come to her aid. From you especially she asks succor, because as we have already said, God has conferred upon you, above all other nations, great glory in arms. Accordingly undertake this journey eagerly for the remission of your sins, with the assurance of the reward of imperishable glory in the kingdom of heaven." 22

22. Ogg, Frederick A., Source Book of Medieval History, p.286-7.

It was not only a desire of Innocent III to emulate his predecessors, but he was primarily animated by a lively faith, which caused him to labor for the success of the Crusades.

"In the affliction of the Holy Land, which the Lord has purchased by His precious Blood, we are ourselves deeply afflicted, and our grief will be daily renewed, until we shall have learnt that it has been restored to its former liberty. Although the care of all the churches is upon us at every instant, still our chief anxiety and that of our brethren is for the liberation of the Lord's sepulchre, and we are for ever engaged in exhorting all men to assist it." 23

23. Mann, H.K., on. cit., XI, p.232-3.

Innocent III was aware of the condition that existed in

the Christian countries. Bitter animosity existed between Philip Augustus and Richard and John of England, which would prevent either of them from going on a Crusade. Germany was in the throes of a civil war due to the double election of Philip of Suabia and Otto of Brunswick, so the pope had no hope of an emperor marshalling the forces of Europe against the Moslem Turk. Yet undaunted by these difficulties Innocent continued to push forward the interests of the Crusades.

Cardinal Peter of Capua was instrumental in having Philip Augustus and Richard of England enter into a five year truce. Three months thereafter Richard died. The letters and preachers which Innocent had sent out were instrumental in rousing the people of many lands. Like the first crusade, this Fourth Crusade (1201-5) was under the leadership of the nobility, since none of the kings were desirous of taking the Cross.

"Contrary to their vows the leaders went to the assistance of the dethroned emperor at Constantinople. Another usurper, however, repudiated the treaty with the crusaders and attacked them treacherously. The crusaders with much ado took the city by storm, deposed the emperor, and replaced the Greek by a 'Latin Empire'." 24

24. Betten, Rev. Francis S. and Kaufmann, Rev. Alfred, Modern World, p.265.

Innocent III was indignant, when he heard of the Crusaders seeking first their own temporal advantages. Their conduct had caused him to fail, just where he had hoped to succeed.

"'without having any jurisdiction or power over the Greeks', cried the Pope, 'you rashly violated the purity of your vows; and, turning your arms not against the Saracens but against the Christians,

you applied yourselves not to the recovery of Jerusalem, but to seize Constantinople, preferring earthly to heavenly riches." 25

25. Mann, H.K., op. cit., XI, p.267.

Although the Fourth Crusade was such a miserable failure, Innocent did not lose heart. He was encouraged in 1212 when Frederick II, upon being crowned, took the Cross, as well as by the Spanish victory over the Moors at Las Novas de Tolosa. He planned for a second Crusade, which was approved and endorsed by the great Lateran Council in 1215, but he died a year before the new Crusade left the shores of Europe.

In the midst of his relations to the princes of Europe Innocent III never lost sight of the one great object in view. He convoked the Twelfth Ecumenical Council (IV Lateran) at Rome in November, 1215, to review all that had been done, as well as lay plans for what still had to be performed. Although not agreeing fully with what Innocent III had done in his relations to the princes of Europe, the council passed a vote of confidence in his policy and thereby placed a stamp of approval on his policy, whether in the Church or in the State.

On his way to make peace between the Italian cities, Pisa and Genoa, so as to interest them in a Crusade, he contracted a fever, and apparently recovered, when the fever again laid him low. He died at Genoa on July 16, 1216.

"Such was the energy, the activity, and the influence of Innocent, that he was always prepared to come to the relief of the oppressed, and was always present, when needed in any quarter of Christendom, either personally or by legates." 26

26. Alzog, op. cit., II, p.583.

CHAPTER V.

Evaluation of these two Champions

"After the words of the apostle 'If I, yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ' (Gal. i, 10), we may not put aside the law of God for the sake of anyone, nor for man's favor leave the path of rectitude." -- St. Gregory VII. 1

1. Mann, H.K., op. cit., VII, p.72.

Try as one may, he can not escape from drawing the logical comparison between these two champions, Gregory VII and Innocent III. Having advanced so far, one must make some evaluation of them. It is a fact that such a comparison can never be exact because of the incalculable human element. One can neither be certain of this person's motives, nor be able to measure the full influence which the other exerted. The chief difficulty in evaluating the policy and personal qualities of both, is no doubt the difference in surroundings, in the kind of royal or imperial power which each had to face. Nevertheless, a conclusion must be drawn from the material already presented.

On April 22, 1073 the Archdeacon Hildebrand was elected to the Papacy and he thereupon took the name of Gregory VII. At the time of his election, Hildebrand was in the early fifties, since he was born about 1020. At an early age he was entrusted to his uncle, the abbot of the Church of S. Maria Aventinense in Rome, who trained him in learning and virtue. Here he came in contact with the famous abbots of

the motherhouse of Cluny, and here he no doubt laid the foundations of those virtues and strength of character, which he later displayed so advantageously. It is to be noted that his education was received in the City of Rome.

"He saw the Papacy in its degradation and was to participate in every stage of its recovery. He received minor orders (reluctantly, he tells us) and was attached in some capacity to the service of Gregory VI....With him he went into exile in 1047, and spent two impressionable years in the Rhine district, then the center of the advanced reform movement of the day, and it was probably at this time that he received the monastic habit. In 1049 Leo IX, nominated Pope by Henry III, was filling the chief places in the Papal Curia with leading reformers especially from this district; on his way to Rome he took with him the young Hildebrand, whose life was for the future to be devoted entirely to Rome and the Papacy. With every detail of papal activity he was associated, in every leading incident he played his part; his share in the papal councils became increasingly important, until at last he was the outstanding figure whose qualifications for the papal throne none could contest.

By Leo IX he was made sub-deacon and entrusted with the task of restoring both the building and the discipline of the monastery of St. Paul without the walls. Later he was sent to France to deal with heresy in the person of Berengar of Tours, whose views he condemned but whose person he protected. By Victor II he was given the important task of enforcing the decrees against simony and clerical marriage in France, where in company with Abbot Hugh of Cluny he held synods at Lyons and elsewhere. With Bishop Anselm of Lucca he was sent by Pope Stephen IX to Milan, where the alliance of Pope and Pataria was for the first time cemented; and from Milan to Germany to obtain the royal assent to Stephen's election. He had a share in vindicating the independence of papal elections against the turbulence of the Roman nobles at the election of Nicholas II, and again in the papal Election Decree which was designed to establish this independence for

the future. By Nicholas he was employed in initiating the negotiations which lead to the first alliance of the Papacy with the Normans in South Italy. In the same year (1059) his appointment as Archdeacon of the Roman Church gave him an important administrative position; shortly afterwards occurred the death of Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, and Hildebrand took his place as the leading figure in the Papal Curia. To his energy and resolution was due the victory of Alexander II over the rival imperial nominee, and he held the first place in the Pope's councils during the twelve years of Alexander's papacy. The extent of his influence has been exaggerated by the flattery of his admirers and by the abuse of his enemies. He was the right-hand man, not the master, of the Pope; he influenced, but did not dominate Alexander." 2

2. Cambridge Medieval History, V, p.52.

In a word Gregory VII's preparation for his pontificate consisted of an experience of a quarter of a century during which he had been actively employed in various important affairs by his papal predecessors.

On the other hand Cardinal-deacon Lothaire was elected Pope on January 8, 1198, and thereupon took the name of Innocent III. At the time of his election to the papacy he was only thirty-seven years old. Like Gregory VII, he also received his early education at Rome.

"A young man of some means, Lothar had studied theology at Paris under Peter of Corbeil, law at Bologna under Uguccio of Ferrara, the most celebrated of Italian decretists. He was first actively connected with the Curia during the pontificate of Lucius III, thanks, no doubt, to his uncle, the future Clement III. During the short reign of Gregory VIII he was made sub-deacon, and later on in the

time of Clement III Cardinal-deacon of SS. Sergius and Bacchus (1187). Celestine III's elevation brought the Orsini, enemies of the Scotta, into prominence, and Lothar suffered temporary eclipse....In the Curia he was probably then the young radical who had to be suppressed for advocating drastic measures as against the caution of older heads." 3

3. The Cambridge Medieval History, VI, p.2.

It was probably not much before 1187 that Lothaire returned to Rome with a comprehensive knowledge of law and Holy Scriptures, which was to manifest itself in his every action. In contrast to Gregory VII, Innocent III's preparation was almost exclusively theoretical.

Both Gregory VII and Innocent III at the time of their elevation to the papacy were not priests. Neither of them sought or even desired the papal tiara. Both had exerted their utmost power and influence to have the Curia bestow the dignity and responsibility of the Primacy of Peter on another, but to no avail. They both then reluctantly ascended the chair of Peter, and were then consecrated priest and bishop.

Once seated on the papal throne Gregory VII began to reform the Church by the reformation of the clergy.

"If the Church was to be free, its members must be freed -- freed from dependence on princes, and from solicitude for the things of the world. Simony and clerical marriage must be wholly eradicated....Men who openly flouted the laws of the Church on this important matter of celibacy were not likely to be particular about the commandments in general.

The other great evil which was choking

the Church was simony. The princes sold bishoprics and abbacies to any who would pay their price for them, and imposed their nominees on the Church often without allowing the semblance of an election; and in turn the bishops....sold every ecclesiastical office in their power." 4

4. Mann, H.K., op. cit., VII, p.33-5.

At first Gregory VII attempted to bring about these reforms by mutual agreement and negotiation; when this did not bring the desired results, he acted by decrees, issuing his orders and demanding implicit obedience. Gregory VII called upon the laity to assist in the enforcing of the decrees by refraining from attending any services conducted by the disobedient clerics -- he thereby made the people the executors, to a degree, of his will.

Gregory VII was determined to correct the evil of incontinency on the part of the clergy, and this could only be done by eradicating simony. But to achieve this end it was necessary to put an end to the practice of lay-investiture, and thereby withdraw, once and for all, the power of appointing nominees to spiritual offices. The second Lenten Synod (1075) decreed:

"if any person should accept a bishopric or an abbacy from the hands of a layman, such one should not be regarded as a bishop or abbot, nor should he enter a church until he had given up the place thus illegally obtained....The same rule should apply to the lower offices of the Church, and that any person, even if he were emperor or king, who should confer an investiture in connection with any ecclesiastical office, should be cut from the communion of the Church." 5

5. Alzog, John, op. cit., II, p.487.

By this reform Gregory VII evoked only a twenty-seven year struggle between Empire and Papacy which was only compromised at the Council of Worms in 1122.

The one great object which Innocent III always kept before his eyes was the regeneration and reform of both the laity and clergy of the Church. The clergy must be better than the laity, and all must be obedient to the Apostolic See, whose decrees were inviolate.

"Because Innocent believed that bishops were set to rule the Church of God, and because he knew that the subject was like the master, one of the chief tasks he imposed upon himself was the elevation of the episcopacy. He would have 'his fellow-bishops' good and zealous, as he could not be everywhere himself. It was especially with a view to being able to correct the luxury of the prelates that he adopted that simple style of living.... Sometimes their luxury, sometimes their magnificence, sometimes law suits, and occasionally no doubt personal avarice, kept some of them in constant want of money, and their impecuniosity led them into simony and into inventing devices for eluding the laws that already existed against it. But Innocent tracked them to earth." 6

6. Mann, H.K., op. cit., XII, p.268.

Innocent encouraged the local bishops to correct and reform the inferior clergy. He also strove to check the accumulation of benefices in the hands of one person, which was contrary to the decrees of the Lateran Council. Like his predecessors he also condemned clerical marriages. Innocent faced a period of monastic decay, so he set about to reform the monasteries by direct communication with the abbeys, and

by gifts of money. He viewed with favor the rise of new orders of a practical nature, whether the clerical or lay element predominated. Innocent approved of the order founded by St. Francis, which would win men to God's service through their hearts; that founded by St. Dominic, which would gain men for God's service by their minds; and that founded by St. Clare, which contained the unusual favor and privilege of poverty. It was left to the successor of Innocent III to issue the formal sanction of all three of these orders. Innocent realized that new methods of work were needed by the Church, and he did not let pass the means placed at his disposal by these three advocates of monasticism.

"These ideas were not new in the history of the Papacy. They were as much the ideas of St. Gregory VII as of Innocent and as much the ideas of St. Gregory the Great as of Hildebrand. At work during the whole lifetime of the Papacy before the days of Innocent III, they had from time to time, in the grip of a strong man, or from predisposing circumstances, received a more extended application. Under any conditions, with the leaven of such ideas at work, the government of the Church must have become more and more centralised, must have devolved more and more into the hands of the Popes. But when they had the head and heart of such a man as Lothario Conti as seed-ground, their growth in the direction of centralisation was marked. Innocent was no innovator, but he did not forget precedents; he expounded no new theories with regard to papal authority, but he showed how the old ones could be applied to fresh practical cases; and if he made no new laws, his great legal knowledge and his keen sense of justice enabled him to bring many new cases within the grasp of the old enactments." 7

It was inevitable that through the reform of the abuses in the Church both Gregory VII and Innocent III should come in conflict with the temporal rulers of their age. Because of this, it has frequently been asserted, that the aims of both were to establish a universal monarchy with the Sovereign Pontiff at its head, and all other rulers as his vassals. It was but natural that each should have his own idea and policy of the origin of civil power.

The policy of Gregory VII is admirably summed up in these words:

"Seeing the world sunk in wickedness and threatened with impending ruin, and believing that the Pope alone could save it, Gregory conceived the vast design of forming a universal theocracy, which should embrace every kingdom of Christendom, and of whose polity the Decalogue should be the fundamental principle. Over this commonwealth of nations the Pope was to preside. The spiritual power was to stand related to the temporal as the sun to the moon, imparting light and strength, without, however, destroying it or depriving princes of their sovereignty. On the other hand, temporal princes were to be obliged to bow before the supremacy of God's law, and to recognize Him as the source of their own jurisdiction and power. Should any prince refuse to render this homage, he was to be at once cut off from the body of princes composing the theocratic alliance, denied the privileges attaching to membership, and declared incapable of being the representative of God among the Christian people. Thus, when all the thrones of the earth should lean upon the Apostolic See, then, and then only, would justice, harmony, peace, and unity reign throughout the world." 8

8. Alzog, J., op. cit., II, p.489-90.

Innocent III, on the other hand, was intent upon making

the influence of the Papacy felt throughout the length and breadth of Christendom.

"The Papacy has a preeminence over royalty. The authority of the latter is exercised on earth and over the bodies of men; that of the former in Heaven, and effects their souls. Kings rule over particular countries, provinces, and lords; but Peter is superior to them all in power, and enjoys the fullness of authority, inasmuch as he is the Vicar of Him who has the supreme dominion of the world....For through this union is the faith propagated, heresy extirpated, virtue made to flourish, vices rooted out, justice preserved, iniquity held in check, peace secured, persecution abolished, and pagan barbarity subdued. It insures the prosperity of the Empire and the liberty of the Church, is an earnest of bodily security and the salvation of the soul, and guarantees the rights of the clergy and those of the State." 9

9. Alzog, J., op. cit., II, p.575.

Innocent III, like Gregory VII, looked upon the Papacy as the mother of all the churches, and hence he had to exercise unceasing care over them. Since he was the Father of all Christians he was only interested in the affairs of kings and princes as his spiritual sons.

"Hence he felt that he had a father's right and power to correct wrongdoing in his family, if that wrong were done even by the most distinguished of his sons. But if he believed that the 'paterna potestas' over kings and peoples was his natural and acknowledged right, he wished to exercise his parental authority rationally, and in accordance with the dictates not merely of justice but of mercy. He was, therefore, most careful not to exercise his repressive powers without real reason, and to forbid his subordinates to exercise the power of excommunication without good and sufficient cause." 10

10. Mann, H.K., op. cit., XI, p.59.

Ever since the grant of land made to the Sovereign Pontiff by Pepin the Short in 753, the Patrimony of St. Peter had been quite extensive. When Gregory VII was elected pope, he had no fear for his temporal independence. The emperor was the protector of the Papacy, so he in turn was to see that no injury should be inflicted upon the Patrimony of St. Peter. When Henry IV had felt the scourge of the papal anathema he marched on Rome. Gregory VII knew that the Romans were loyal to him and would resist the invader. In Tuscany, he could rely on the devotion of Countess Matilda, but against this must be set the hostility of the Lombards. Gregory VII then appealed to Robert Guiscard, Duke of Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily for protection of the Patrimony of St. Peter, and the possible need for their assistance. Robert Guiscard was a vassal of the Pope, who in distress could remind him of his oath of fealty. Guiscard did act, although his motive seems to have been self-aggrandizement at the expense of the Patrimony of St. Peter.

Innocent III, on the other hand, was a resident in the hostile city of Rome. He did not even have the loyalty of the Romans to count on to assist him. Nearly all of the Patrimony of St. Peter had been wrested from the Church by Henry VI. Innocent first restored the Papal supremacy in the city of Rome, by obtaining the oath of fidelity from the imperial prefect, before he would invest him with the powers of the office of prefect. Innocent then

"took the Lombard League under his protection; concluded an alliance with the

Tuscan cities, which he formed into a league subordinated to papal authority, and thus provided at once for their own freedom, and the defense of the Church against the aggression of the Emperor." 11

11. Alzog, J., op. cit., II, p.575.

Innocent III regarded the separation of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies from Germany as an essential condition to the independence of the Church. This he brought about when the Empress Constance, upon the death of her husband, Henry VI, asked for and obtained from Innocent III the feudal grant of Sicily, Capua and Apulia. Innocent III, therefore, had first to secure the Patrimony of St. Peter, before he could engage in the reform of the Church, while Gregory VII was blest with the whole united Patrimony of St. Peter, and two valiant defenders in Matilda of Tuscany and the Norman Robert Guiscard.

While Gregory VII and Innocent III were engaged in the reform of the Church, they did not overlook the protection that should be given to the laity. In 1074, when Gregory VII heard of the trials, hardships, and sufferings of the pilgrims who journeyed to the Holy Land, he was desirous of setting on foot a movement to assist the Christians who were suffering from the repeated blows of the Saracens. He had addressed a circular letter to all defenders of the Christian faith informing them of the terrible sufferings inflicted on the Christians by the heathen Turks.

"Wherefore if we love God, and regard ourselves as Christians, we ought to be overwhelmed with grief at the misfortune

which has befallen so renowned an empire, and at the terrible slaughter of Christian men. But we must do more than grieve; the example of our Redeemer must move us to sacrifice our lives for them. We ourselves intend to do all in our power to help the empire. In the name, then, of that faith in which through Christ we are united by the adoption of the sons of God, we exhort you, and by the authority of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, we urge you to let the wounds and blood of your brethren, and the dire peril of the empire, stir up your sympathy, so that you may be ready to undergo the toil of bearing help to your brethren. Let us know without delay, and by reliable messengers, what the mercy of God shall move you to do." 12

12. Mann, H.K., op. cit., VII, p.63.

Europe was not ready as yet for a Crusade, so the echo to Gregory's call to "take the Cross" was but very feeble. He had to look on with anguish of heart while the Eastern Church drifted further from Rome, and the Eastern Empire was headed to destruction.

Like Gregory VII, Innocent III also desired to rescue the Holy Land from the degradations of the heathen Turks.

"In the affliction of the Holy Land, which the Lord has purchased by His precious Blood, we are ourselves deeply afflicted, and our grief will be daily renewed, until we shall have learnt that it has been restored to its former liberty. Although the care of all the churches is upon us at every instant, still our chief anxiety and that of our brethren is for the liberation of the Lord's sepulchre, and we are for ever engaged in exhorting all men to assist it." 13

13. Mann, H.K., op. cit., XI, p.232-3.

In the face of countless difficulties Innocent continued to

push forward the interests of the Crusades. He organized the Fourth Crusade under the leadership of princes and nobles. The Crusaders forgot their vows, and sought first their own temporal advantages by going to the assistance of the deposed emperor at Constantinople. Although this crusade was a failure Innocent III persevered in his endeavors to free the Holy Land from the yoke of the heathen Turk. He was instrumental in organizing the European hosts for another crusade, but died before this crusade left the shores of Italy.

Now that one has drawn a comparison between the outstanding reforms of laity and clergy and the idea and policy of an universal theocracy as expressed in the twelve year pontificate of Gregory VII with the eighteen year pontificate of Innocent III, one is in a position to draw a few conclusions as to the character of the respective men.

Gregory VII was possessed of an indomitable will, unflinching courage and persistent in a cause once espoused.

"To resolute moral courage and strength of will he added an unbounded devotion to the interests of the Church, and intellectual gifts of such eminence that he readily took in the most complicated facts, divined their solution, and applied a remedy. He was self-reliant without being presumptuous. Grave in his utterance and dignified in his conduct, he was neither vain of his personal merit nor proud of his power. His very enemies were forced to acknowledge that his morals were pure and his life above reproach....Gregory held that love should be the measure and standard of everything. Writing to the margravine, Beatrice, and her daughter, Mathilda, he says: 'The love we bear God should inspire us to love our neighbors, to succor the needy, and comfort the distressed. To act from this motive is, in my judgment, of greater merit than fasting, watching, and other good works, be they ever so numerous, because

true love is superior to all other virtues." 14

14. Alzog, J., op. cit., II, p.491-2.

Innocent III was a scholar and a high-minded, farseeing ruler of men. He was a man of stupendous intellect and indomitable energy. He had a natural capacity for ecclesiastical government, enhanced by his comprehensive knowledge of law.

"If Innocent, like Gregory VII....to whom he was eminently superior in capacity for business, and in knowledge of law and theology, had had an occasion to display his talents in difficult and trying circumstances, he would unquestionably have proved himself the greatest Pope that sat on the papal throne from the days of St. Peter to his own. And as it was, no pope ever gained for the Holy See a greater measure of influence and authority. Neither is it likely that any pope has had a deeper sense of the responsibilities, or a more exalted idea of the office of the papacy; nor has any other pope ever shown so deep an insight into human affairs, or an equal grasp of the manifold and varied relations of the world, of human thought, passion, and prejudice."15

15. Alzog, J., op. cit., II, p.585.

Although their way of accomplishing the end was different, both Gregory VII and Innocent III held the same views. In the eyes of Gregory VII and Innocent III the papacy was the only power able to check the insolence of brute force, and the violations of human and divine laws. Civil authority should be in accord with the spiritual, and both should cooperate in the defense of the Church.

"The State is the society of bodies, the Church, of souls. The former is the kingdom of men, the latter the Kingdom of God! The Church does not declare war on the State, she extends to it the hand of friendship. If the State helps the Church, she blesses it; if the State respects her liberties, she asks nothing more; if the State attacks these liberties, she sheds her blood rather than allow it. For she cannot renounce her mission. She has received charge to teach all nations. She is responsible to God for the salvation of humanity, and, with regard to this duty, every man has the right to call her to account." 16

16. Kurth, G., op. cit., p.25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Books:

Alzog, Rev. John, Universal Church History, translated by Pabisch and Byrne, Cincinnati, Ohio, Robert Clarke & Co., 1874, 3 vol.

The book treats of the work of God in the Church and by the Church, which God founded. It covers the complete history of the Catholic Church. "The Rise and Height of Papal Power in the Middle Ages, from Gregory VII to the death of Boniface VIII" (1073-1303) is the subject of vol. 2. Valuable material on the relation of both Gregory VII and Innocent III to the temporal rulers is presented.

Brann, Rev. Henry, Waifs and Strays, New York City, The Franciscan Missionary Printing Press, 1909, pp.314.

It is a collection of sermons, lectures and essays. The sermon, "The Greatest of the Popes", gives a good account of the character of Gregory VII.

Bryce, James, The Holy Roman Empire, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1905, pp.544.

It treats of the causes of the power and influence of the Empire. The old Empire is portrayed with its scheme of absolutism fully matured; the Church, rising in the midst of a hostile power, embraces and transforms the Empire; the Church restored the Holy Roman Empire after the barbaric invasions; finally, it deals with the conflict of Church and State.

The Cambridge Medieval History, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1911, 6 vol.

It is a comprehensive account of medieval times which are intended to cover the entire field of European medieval history, so that in every chapter a specialist sums up recent research upon the subject. It is intended partly for the student as a summary of ascertained facts, with indications -- not discussions -- of disputed points; and partly as a book of reference, containing all that can be required in a comprehensive work of general history. Vol. 1 treats of the Christian Roman Empire; Vol. 5 of the conflict between Church and State; and Vol. 6 of the victory of the Papacy.

Guggenberger, A., General History of the Christian Era, St. Louis, Mo., E. Herder Book Co., 1925, 3 vol.

The theme of the book is the tracing of the Primacy of the Holy See and the establishing of the independence of the Catholic Church. Vol. 1 is of special interest here because it deals of the conflict between Papacy and Empire.

Kurth, Godfrey, The Church at the Turning Points of History, translated by the Rt. Rev. Victor Day, Helena, Mont., Naegle Printing Co., 1929, pp.192.

The book deals with seven critical points in the history of the Church, from its institution to the French Revolution. The first three of these crises contain much helpful material -- "The Church and the Jews", "The Church and the Barbarians", and "The Church and Feudalism".

Mann, Rev. Horace, The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages, St. Louis, Mo., E. Herder Book Co., 1925, 15 vol.

The author endeavors to satisfy a want which existed in the English language with his full and scientific account of the lives of the Popes of the early Middle Ages. He begins with Gregory the Great (590) and will end with Martin V in 1417. At present the work has reached but to 1270. The better half of Vol. 7 deals with the life of Gregory VII. Vols. 11 and 12 develop at some length the life of Innocent III in order to show the position of the Papacy to the government of Europe, which rested on feudal principles.

Migne, Patrologiae, Series Latina, Paris, Garnier Brothers, 1878, 222 vol.

The series deals with ecclesiastical writings from the time of the apostles to Innocent III. Vol. 148 deals with Gregory VII, and vols. 214-17 deal with Innocent III.

Ogg, Frederick A., Source Book of Medieval History, Chicago, American Book Co., 1907, pp.477.

It is a collection of source material translated from the originals. Sections 45 - 55 gave valuable material on the relations of Gregory VII and Innocent III with the temporal rulers.

Spalding, Most Rev. M.J., The Church, Culture and Liberty, New York, Joseph F. Wanger, Inc., 1923, pp.265.

It is a series of essays on the liberty and culture of the Catholic Church. Chapter VI -- "The Ages of Pope Gregory VII" -- gives important material on the power of the pope to depose temporal rulers.

Thatcher, Oliver and McNeal, Edgar, A Source Book for Medieval History, New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1905, pp.380.

Translation of important medieval documents are herein given which are not elsewhere translated. Section 3 on the struggle between the Empire and Papacy was very helpful. Approximately seventy-seven documents are presented, which are very illustrative of the era as well as the leanings of the respective parties.

2. Periodical articles:

Gibbs, Eleanor, What Led to Canossa. Thought, III, 4 (1929) p.552-69.

It shows that the reforms advocated by Gregory VII were the cause of the conflict between the Papacy and Henry IV over the policy of lay-investiture.

3. Catholic Encyclopedia, New York, Robert Appleton, 1912.