CHAPTER THREE

EARLY CHRISTENDOM

So powerfully did the transformational grammar of the new religion, Christianity, change the western world that Arnold Toynbee has described the church as "the chrysalis out of which our Western society emerged."[1] Historians have both praised the church for preserving the artifacts of the pagan cultures it converted and faulted it for absorbing too many of their elements into its life's blood. While Pitirim Sorokin regarded the resulting fusion as a genuine synthesis, others have just as firmly maintained that Christianity created an unstable syncretism, pointing to the Renaissance and the Enlightenment as evidence of cultural disintegration and growing secularization.[2] But this has always been a source of disagreement, even among Christians themselves, and the debate continues unabated.

Each new school of thought or theory of history--for example, Augustine, Dante, Gibbon, Burckhardt, Spengler, and Toynbee--has signaled a new point of departure for evaluating the story of its own generation.[3] Every redefinition of the present or future requires a revision of the past.

History provides no clear answer as to whether the survival of pre-Christian institutions, literature, and art forms represents a vindication of these pagan cultures or attests even more to the transforming power of Christianity. But despite periodic revivals of

nature cults, Teutonic folklore, Druid rituals, and similar atavisms, attempts to turn back the clock have never enjoyed more than limited success. Perhaps it is best to conclude that the transformations are still continuing and that their significance will become clearer only after many more revisions of the past.

Early Christian art, literature, and music certainly bear the imprint of the cosmopolitan life of the Roman Empire.[4] But more importantly, the church itself first had to pass through a trial by fire before serving as a crucible for refining and recreating the stagnating Roman world. In doing so, the church imparted a forward momentum to what has become western--and now world--history.

Rise of the Roman Empire

The civil government and religion of ancient Rome grew out of an early monarchy which, according to tradition, was overthrown and replaced by a republic in 509 B.C. Afterwards, the traditional power of sovereignty--the *imperium* once exercised by the king--was shared by two consuls, each of whom was elected to office for a year. Among the prerogatives of the *imperium* was the *auspicium*--the taking of auspices or omens--in order to discover whether the gods favored or opposed particular public acts. A separate college of augurs supervised the auspices. For the Romans, religion was social in character and a special branch of administration--directed by a college of priests--supported its public celebration. This college of priests was headed by a popularly elected *pontifex maximus*--the "great bridgemaker" between man and the gods--who took responsibility for the public

calendar and who appointed the chief celebrant of the the sacrifices, the rex sacrorum. Special priestly fraternities were given charge of particular ceremonies.[5]

Roman religion was animistic in origin, political in orientation, and highly liturgical in its celebration. It embraced a variety of cults, including the popular household cults, but had more of a practical than a moral or inspirational appeal. Above all, religion symbolized unity in the state and the family. By encouraging the most exacting standards in the performance of rituals, this civil religion promoted a strong sense of duty and respect for law. Indeed, the priests were both custodians of religious law and, like clerics during the Middle Ages, experts in legal transactions. Their influence in public affairs was considerable.[6]

As Rome grew in its power and reach, foreign cults began to be introduced; the syncretism of Roman religion likewise increased, as did public skepticism. The numbers of priestly colleges multiplied even as respect for religion declined. Public as well as private rites fell into decay and disrepute. Licentious religious practices, such as the Saturnalia and the Bacchanalia, grew in popularity and came to be tolerated by the authorities. Educated Romans like Cicero, however, were drawn instead to the skeptical rationalism of the Stoics, who cultivated philanthropic and cosmopolitan ideals but did little to stem the demoralization that was overtaking the republic.[7]

The Caesars

A period of increasing turmoil began during the the tribunates of

the Gracchus brothers (133-132 and 124-121 B.C.) and climaxed with the dictatorship of Sulla (82-79 B.C.) following a military coup. It was not many years later that Julius Caesar began advancing his ambitions by first recognizing and then feeding a growing popular hunger for religious worship and lavish spectacle. After being elected aedile in 65 B.C., Caesar used this office of public works to great effect as the master of public games. Two years later, he was elected pontifex maximus for life and inaugurated a career of acquiring public offices to support his climb to power. Following a civil war, during which his army defeated the forces of the Senate, Caesar set Rome on the road to empire when he assumed dictatorial powers, encouraged a religious revival centered upon himself, and displayed the public munificence of a monarch. As Arthur E. R. Boak and William G. Sinnigen have noted:

> Honors to match his extraordinary powers were heaped upon him, partly by his own desire, partly by the servility and fulsome flattery of the Senate. He was granted a seat with the consuls in the Senate, when not a consul himself; he received the title of parent or father of his country (parens or pater patriae); his statue was placed among those of the kings of Rome, his image was placed in the temple of Quirinus; the month Quintilius, in which he was born, was renamed Julius (July) in his honor; a new college of priests, the Julian Luperci, was created; a temple was erected to Caesar's Clemency and a priest (flamen) appointed for the worship there; and he was authorized to build a house on the Palatine with a pediment like a temple. Most of these honors he received after his victory over the Pompeians in Spain in 45.[8]

Caesar hoped to heal the Roman world by pursuing a generous policy of conciliation, clementia, toward his opponents. His policy succeeded better than he ever knew. Even after his assassination, his memory still commanded public reverence and divine honors continued to be heaped upon him. Ethelbert Stauffer comments:

> The Roman people glorified the dead Caesar in a unique passion-liturgy, which echoes the ancient eastern laments for the

> death of the great gods of blessing, and many of whose motifs show an astonishing connexion with the Good Friday liturgy of the Roman mass. 'Those whom I saved have slain me,' they sang in the name of the murdered man. And Antony declared before the temple of Venus, where the son of the goddess lay in state: 'Truly the man cannot be of this world whose only work was to save where anyone needed to be saved.'[9]

Octavian, (43 B.C.-14 A.D.) who was Julius Caesar's grandnephew and adopted son, capitalized on his family name by converting it into a lifelong mission to remake the fallen republic into an empire with himself as its imperator. Although he did not hold a definite office or title at first, Octavian, who later took the name Augustus, came to be known as the princeps, the first among citizens. In a bid to revive the ancient virtues, Octavian resorted to social legislation designed to restore family life, reestablished the priestly colleges, repaired the crumbling temples and shrines, and redirected the new religious impulses into serviceable channels. Syncretism became more prevalent. A policy of official tolerance or indifference enabled oriental religions to win acceptance even in Rome, except for those cults that unduly disturbed the peace and morals of the citizenry.[10]

In deference to Roman custom, Augustus was careful not to covet royal prerogatives or divine honors, although he did not discourage the growth of an imperial cult in the provinces as a means of binding the empire to himself. The provincial councils were eventually given the responsibility for maintaining this cult of Roma and Augustus, as it came to be known, which had the advantage of linking them more directly to the Principate. Consequently, the emperor came to be worshipped throught the empire.

Ernest Barker took notice of the Roman emphasis on political

salvation and argued that political unity came to be equated with and dependent on loyalty to Caesar:

> The general religious reformation of the Augustan age inspired Virgil: it had little abiding result in the mass. But the worship of the deified ruler continued and grew. Caligula and Nero pretended to a present divinity; but generally the emperor was elevated to the rank of divus, and made the object of a cult, after his death; and during his life it was his genius which was held to be sacred. Here was found the basis of allegiance. The oath of officials and soldiers was associated with the genius of the present emperor and the divi Caesares of the past.[11]

Similarly, as the empire expanded, political unification required a common citizenship which, in turn, required the abolition of national and class differences. Military service became a chief avenue to Roman citizenship. In due time, suffrage was extended to provincials. Emperors such as Hadrian and Septimius Severus deliberately abolished privileges exclusively enjoyed by Italians, at first extending Roman colonization throughout the empire and then admitting provincials to citizenship. These policies came to fruition with the Edict of Caracalla of 212 A.D., which granted Roman citizenship to all freeborn members of communities within the Empire. Hand in hand with a common citizenship, a common legal system--the ius gentium--was extended throughout the empire.

The emerging imperial system gave practical expression to the ancient Stoic dream of reason, as Ernest Barker observed:

> In its passion for equality . . . imperialism came close to Stoicism, which proclaimed the equality of citizen and alien, man and woman, bondman and free, while it cherished a peculiar regard for the sapiens who had attained to high rank in the service of Reason.[12]

The Empire Within

The birth of Christianity in Judea on the frontiers of the empire introduced a discordant note in the imperial program of universal harmony under the pax Romana. Perhaps it was also the Roman kind of peace Jesus had in mind when he told his disciples: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matt. 10:34). The Christian insistence on holiness in worship and the exclusiveness of the truth claims of Christ (John 8:32, 14:6) could only bring further division to a world Christians still regarded as separated from God by sin. If Christianity was to conquer, it first had to divide. The faithful were instructed to forsake competing allegiances as part of the cost of serving their Lord (Luke 12:51-53, 14:25-35). This requirement precluded participation in the state religious observances.

The elevation by Christians of a particular religious belief over the interests of the public order represented a disturbing novelty for the pragmatic Romans, who were accustomed to a tradition that viewed religion simply as a means to bind society to the natural order. What interested the Romans was not belief but loyalty. Their toleration had its limits.[13]

Popular hostility provoked by the withdrawal of Christians from the public life of their communities led to trouble almost from the start. The exclusion of non-Christians from communion celebrations and other Christian gatherings stirred suspicions of conspiracy and even accusations of child murder.[14] Several instances of mob violence are recorded in the New Testament, including a protest in Ephesus by

craftsmen whose trade in idols suffered as a result of Christian proselytizing (Acts 19). It is no wonder that Christians came to be regarded as troublemakers by the authorities. According to Tacitus, Nero (54-68) used this bad reputation against them by blaming them for setting the great fire in Rome in the summer of 64 A.D. After that incident, it became common to identify Christians as sorcerors. The authorities charged many of them with odium generis humani: hatred of the human race.[15] As Boak and Sinnigen indicate, such religious crimes were severely punished:

> The Romans regarded worship of the state gods, including participation in the imperial cult, from a political standpoint and considered refusal to share in such worship as treason (maiestas). For this the punishment was death. It was furthermore a proof of atheism, which might also be regarded as treasonable. On the other hand, the Christians looked upon the question as a matter involving their souls' salvation. They felt that to worship the state gods and acknowledge the divinity of the princeps would be to commit idolatry and sacrilege. They could pray for the emperor but not to him. These attitudes could not be reconciled. On another ground the Christians were for a time liable under the law of treason, namely, as forming unauthorized religious associations.[16]

By contrast, Judaism, though equally troublesome, was generally tolerated as a religio licita--a licensed religion--despite its similar refusal to worship the state gods. It was an exception that proved the rule. Leo Pfeffer has remarked the limits of Roman toleration:

> Only the Jews were able to escape. Their adherence to Mosaic monotheism, which prohibited any form of idolatry, made it impossible for them to participate in emperor-worship. The Romans could destroy their temple, burn their cities, and scatter them throughout the empire, but it could not overcome their recalcitrance. Ultimately, a modus vivendi was arrived at: the Jews were not required to pray to the emperor, but only for him, and to contribute, like all other citizens, to the upkeep of the public temples.[17]

Perhaps more indicative of the main purpose behind these laws was the regulation that licensed religions were not permitted to

proselytize.[18] Like the Christians themselves, the Romans actively discouraged competing loyalties. Roland Bainton believes that the most threatening aspect of Christianity for the Romans was its rapid spread through mass conversions, such as those described in the Book of Acts (Acts 2:41; 4:4). If Christians continued to reject the imperial cult, the Roman government "would be confronted with one of three alternatives; to exterminate the Christians, to abandon the imperial cult and secularize the state, or make Christianity itself the state religion."[19]

> The conflict became sharper than in the case of Judaism for the Christians added to the Jewish formulation "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord" the further confession, "Christ is Lord." Not only the God of heaven and earth but a malefactor crucified by the government of Rome was declared to have an authority exceeding that of the emperor of Rome. The cult of Christ and the cult of Caesar were incompatible.[20]

Official persecution of Christians probably did not begin until the time of Nero but was then pursued sporadically for the next two centuries, although directed mainly at the church leadership. Trajan legalized the persecutions and outlawed the profession of Christ's name. Offenders were ordered to recant by reviling Christ and worshiping the emperor. Those who refused were put to death. But Roman policy appears to have varied from emperor to emperor, and provincial governors were generally left to their own discretion.[21]

By the third century of the Christian era, more systematic proscriptions were adopted. Septimius Severus (193-211) favored a policy of religious syncretism and was even prepared to admit Christianity into the Roman pantheon. But after being rebuffed in this attempt, he issued an edict forbidding conversions to Christianity and

Judaism. The persecutions under Severus were followed by a time of comparative peace during which the church prospered and even owned property like any duly licensed corporation. But the years 249-260 were marked by particularly severe persecution after Decius and Valerian inaugurated what Roland Bainton has called a "policy of extermination."[22] Decius (249-251) required all residents to offer a sacrifice to the Roman gods and secure a certificate of compliance subject to official inspection. Valerian (253-258) summoned church officers for immediate trial and even had Christians harried out of the catacombs. According to Kenneth Scott Latourette:

> Christians were threatened with the death penalty if they so much as went to any of the meetings or services of the Church or even visited a Christian cemetery. Apparently the point of the measure against Christian conventicles was that they were still illegal, and the reason for action against Christian cemeteries was that, to have organizations which were within the law, Christians had formed themselves into burial associations, bodies which could obtain legal recognition.[23]

Following the capture and enslavement of Valerian by the Persians, his son, Gallienus (253-268), issued an Edict of Toleration in 261. Thus began a generation of peace for the church, during which the Christians grew greatly in numbers and influence. Except for a brief period of persecution under Aurelian (270-275), Christians were allowed to worship without interference. All this while the empire was crumbling under the strain of economic and military disorder. Small farms gave way to large estates--latifundi--that employed slave labor. The treasury was depleted by the expense of quelling the incessant riots and border wars. Nearly a score of emperors rose and fell during the fifty years from 235 to 285.[24]

Finally, an experienced military commander, Diocletian (284-305),

emerged as sole emperor in 285 and steered a new course toward political and economic centralization. Diocletian skillfully neutralized potential rivals by creating a system of shared leadership: the Tetrarchy, or Sacred College. He strengthened the military and the bureaucracy, then brought their power into check with a new secret police. He met the expense of maintaining this garrison state by introducing a brutal system of tax farming, then forcing the curiales--municipal councilmen--to make up any deficits. Sons were required to follow their father's occupations. Monetary reform was soon followed by stringent price controls. Norman Cantor depicted Diocletian as an eastern potentate:

> He worked to reform the imperial system and produced a great totalitarian structure similar to that of Egyptian despotism, with Constantine putting the finishing touches to this monstrous edifice. The emperor was elevated to a sacred position in the oriental manner, with an elevated throne, diadems, and imperial robes, according to the established court rituals of the orientals.[25]

Toward the end of his reign, Diocletian suddenly moved with unparalleled severity against the church, which by then had become a "state within a state" that reached even into the imperial family. A series of edicts were issued in 303 and 304, ordering the burning of Christian churches and books, the removal of Christian officeholders, the imprisonment of clergymen, and the imposition of compulsory sacrifices. These persecutions continued for several years after Diocletian left office. According to a contemporary historian, Eusebius of Caesarea, the soldiers soon grew weary of the slaughter. In the judgment of Charles Norris Cochrane, Diocletian's reign conclusively demonstrated the bankruptcy of the old order:

> For, with his abdication in 305, the Sacred College, which was the crown and apex of his administrative system, dissolved into discordant and warring factions; and, six years later, the edicts of persecution were suddenly revoked. Making a virtue of necessity, various emperors and aspirants to the purple embarked upon a competition in which they sought to outbid one another for Christian support.[26]

Following a long period of civil strife, Constantine (307-337)--the son of a member of Diocletian's Tetrarchy--triumphed over the last of his rivals after having his soldiers carry a Christian insignia into battle. From that day onward, the interests of church and state became increasingly entangled.

The Two Sovereignties

"As history both before and after proved, the state could not conquer religion by force; it could achieve its purpose only by collaboration, alliance, and corruption."[27] This remark by Leo Pfeffer indicates a danger that perennially confronts the church, but it also implies that the contest is an unequal one in which the state holds the higher terrain. This was definitely not the case at the time when Constantine embraced the cause of the church as his own and brought an end to the official persecutions. By that time, the church already held the higher moral ground. The empire was foundering. Morale was low. By contrast, the remarkable steadfastness of many Christians in the face of martyrdom had made a favorable impression on the general populace. The proscriptions became unenforceable in many parts of the empire. Christians were hidden by their neighbors or received protection from government officials, including a member of the Tetrarchy. By 311 even the mortally ill emperor Galerius (305-311), who was held responsible

for initiating the persecutions, finally conceded Christians the right to practice their religion and rebuild their churches, stipulating only that they pray for his well-being and not offend the public order.[28]

The Constantinian Establishment

The admission of the church to full legal rights under the empire was concluded in 313 with the Edict of Milan, which removed all legal disabilities that had been placed on Christians, restored Christian officials to their former status, guaranteed freedom of religious assembly, provided restitution of lands and buildings that had been confiscated, and recognized the church as a corporation with a right to own property.[29] Within a few years, the church exercised unaccustomed power and influence through the favor shown by Constantine. But end of its outlaw status soon posed a new set of challenges to its integrity and independence. M. Searle Bates provides a capsulized account of this sudden reversal of roles:

> Favor was soon advanced to privilege and privilege to prestige that approached exclusive power. For Constantine considered Christianity as a means of unifying the complex empire and, in turn, required of loosely organized churches an approach to uniformity. Within seven years from the first legal toleration great edifices were erected under imperial auspices, the clergy were freed from the public burdens that weighed so heavily on others of means and standing, and private heathen sacrifices were forbidden. Two years later urban populations were forbidden Sunday work.[30]

Only a universal church could provide the kind of religious foundation required by a universal empire. The habit of state-supported religion has ever proven a difficult one to break. No firm precedent for religious liberty had ever been established. Wars and persecutions had left the state exhausted and in need of a new basis for political

unity. Christianity was the natural choice to fill this vacuum. The eventual marriage of church and state, however, radically altered the character of each. If, as Ernest Barker maintains, the empire was to be united on the basis of a community of religion,

> . . . Christianity, with its aspiration towards the Gentiles and its vision of an oecumenical Church, was ready to constitute the basis. It offered itself as a world-religion to hold together on the ground of religious unity an empire which was doomed to dissolution if it sought to remain on the ground of political unity. The emperors accepted the offer. They became the powers ordained of God for the guidance of things temporal in a new empire now conceived as a Christian society. They did not realize, nor did the Church itself realize, that as the Christian society elaborated its own principle of life, a new ecclesiastical emperor would arise in the Pope, and a new struggle of Church and State would ensue, in which secular emperors and kings would seek to vindicate an independent political sphere against the claims of a theocracy. These results lay in the future. What happened in the reign of Constantine and his successors was that the essential unity of the empire should henceforth be found in a common allegiance to the Christian creed.[31]

Although Christianity places a strong emphasis on personal responsibility and self-government, the pressures of prolonged persecution favored a trend away from independent congregational church polities toward a centralized episcopal system. Bishops and deacons, while still freely chosen by the congregations, were entrusted with increasing authority. By the fourth century, a clear distinction between clergy and laity was firmly entrenched.[32]

Constantine, who professed the faith, developed a close working relationship with the church hierarchy and even regarded himself as the "bishop of external affairs," even though he was not baptized until the last year of his life. During his reign, Christian slaves were emancipated, bequests to churches were legalized, and members of the clergy were exempted from military and municipal duties. The German

church historian, Augustus Neander, has shown that the results of this last policy were, at best, a mixed blessing:

> This unconditional exemption of the clergy from those civil duties was destined to prove, however, the source of many evils both to church and state; since it was the natural consequence that numbers, without any inward call to the spiritual office, and without any fitness for it whatever, now got themselves ordained as ecclesiastics for the sake of enjoying this exemption;--whereby many of the worst class came to the administration of the most sacred calling:--while, as the same time, the state was deprived of much useful service.[33]

In particular, members of the curial class--who were middle-class landholders--were saddled with oppressive tax burdens they endeavored to foist upon others. Some took advantage of the clerical immunity to escape from them, while the wealthier gentry bought their way into the imperial Senate, where they enjoyed a tax exemption. Constantine simply continued the earlier taxation and public service programs. The consequences were disastrous, as Cantor has concluded:

> The "reforms" of Diocletian and Constantine did hold the fort for a century until the church was strong enough to take over leadership of society in the fifth century. However, the cure was really worse than the disease as far as the empire was concerned.[34]

Constantine and his successors also established a precedent for "caesaropapism"--the supremacy of the imperium over the sacerdotium, the state over the church--by summoning church councils and supporting various factions in church disputes. Constantine's son, Constantius (350-361), was notorious in this regard because of his support of the Arian heresy and his persectuion of pagans. But it is wrong to assume that the church simply became an appendage of the state. Although the emperor retained the office of pontifex maximus for a considerable time yet, John W. Burgess noted in his study of the sanctity of law that

> . . . the principle of discrimination between church and civil

> office had become so fixed in the consciousness of nearly all Christians as to bring to naught any attempt of the Caesars having for its the extablishment of a claim on their part that through their office as Pontifex Maximus they transmitted God's will to men for their government.[35]

At this early stage, the church had not become sufficiently centralized for the development of an office to replace this position, as it later did through the papacy.

According to Marcellus Kik, "the initiative . . . for civil meddling with internal affairs of the church came through the clergy rather than the Emperor."[36] The Council of Nicaea was called by Constantine in the year 325 to resolved the Arian controversy. The Arians, who sought the intervention of the state on their behalf, found their views strongly condemned, instead. One result was that offenses against the church were classified as crimes against the state, setting a precedent for a long history of interference with religious liberty by the state. Even so, the Nicene Council preserved the independence of its deliberations, notwithstanding Constantine's personal role. In Cochrane's view, this "served to indicate that, in the organized Church, the empire was confronted not merely with a 'corporation,' a creature of the state, but with a co-ordinate, if not superior, spiritual power."[37] Indeed, church leaders like Athanasius, Ambrose, and Augustine proved more than equal to the task of asserting the power of the church over the state when necessary. On one occasion, Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, excommunicated Emperor Theodosius (378-395) for ordering reprisals against the citizens of Thessalonica following a riot in that city in 390. The emperor, a baptized Christian, was not readmitted to communion until, at last, he repented in public. This incident

foreshadowed later public humiliations of kings by popes, as at Canossa in 1077.

It was under Theodosius that Christianity--in its orthodox or Nicene form--achieved the privileges of the state religion in 381. Gratian (367-383), a colleague of Theodosius who had earlier declined the robe of pontifex maximus, abolished most of the privileges of the old state priesthood and withdrew the subsidy for its support.[38] Ever since the reign of Constantine, official policy had wavered between the suppression of paganism, the favoring of various Christian sects, and a general toleration toward all religions. Theodosius, however, proved more decisive than his predecessors and passed legal measures against Christian heresies and paganism that carried severe penalties. Temple property was confiscated by the state. Religious images were destroyed by Christian monks. The loose alliance between the political and ecclesiastical authorities that had prevailed until that time was brought a step closer to organic union. Although religious persecution was kept to a minimum. Even in the one instance where it briefly resurfaced, it was censured by Ambrose and other church leaders. But many of the old religious customs habits persisted, especially the Roman bent toward syncretism. Theodosius, for example, was posthumously enrolled among the gods by a grateful Senate. Cochrane concludes that the imperial policy of this period betrayed "a fatal confusion of ideas."

> For to envisage the faith as a political principle was not so much to christianize civilization as to 'civilize' Christianity; it was not to consecrate human institutions to the service of God but rather to identify God with the maintenance of human institutions, i.e. with that of the pax terrena. And, in this case, the pax terrena was represented by the tawdry and meretricious empire, a

> system which, originating in the pursuit of human and terrestrial aims, had so far degenerated as to deny men the very values which had given it birth; and was now held together only by sheer and unmitigated force. By so doing, it rendered the principle purely formal while, at the same time, it suggested the application of conventional 'political' methods for its realization. While, therefore, under governmental pressure, the empire rapidly shed the trappings of secularism to assume those of Christianity, it remained at heart profoundly pagan and was, to that extent, transformed merely into a whited sepulchre.[39]

The Uneasy Partnership

A new phase in the relationship between church and state began with the official establishment of the Christian--or Catholic--Church in the Roman Empire. In their mutual struggle for power and self-preservation, the balance between them tilted first to one side, then the other. Sanford H. Cobb identified five stages of development in their relations:

> 1. That of Alliance, from Theodosius and Augustine to Gregory the Great.
> 2. That of ecclesiastical effort for supremacy, from Gregory the Great to Charlemagne.
> 3. That of the distinct Supremacy of the State, from Charlemagne to Hildebrand.
> 4. That of Church Imperialism, from Hildebrand to Boniface VIII.
> 5. That of Nationalism, from the time of Boniface VIII to the present day.[40]

As with each subsequent phase of their relationship, the initial alliance was an uneasy one in which the boundaries between church and state were repeatedly tested to determine a workable separation of powers between them. By 399, the church had won recognition of its general right of sanctuary.[41] A few years later, Augustine, the bishop of Hippo, laid the foundation for a Christian theory of the state by relating the church's struggle with the state to the larger contest between two cities: the city of God and the city of man. He believed

that Christianity provided the true basis for the commonwealth toward which the empire was being drawn:

> So long . . . as the heavenly City is wayfaring on earth, she invites citizens from all lands and all tongues, and unites them into a single pilgrim band. She takes no issue with that diversity of customs, laws, and traditions whereby human peace is sought and maintained. Instead of nullifying or tearing down, she preserves and appropriates whatever in the diversities of divers races is aimed at one and the same objective of human peace, provided only that they do not stand in the way of the faith and worship of the one supreme and true God. . . . Thus, the heavenly City, so long as it is wayfaring on earth, not only makes use of earthly peace but fosters and actively pursues along with other human beings a common platform in regard to all that concerns our purely human life and does not interfere with faith and worship.[42]

This heavenly city is not identified with either church or state by Augustine, although his views have been used to support a variety of positions. In fact, Augustine believed that both cities are mingled, like tares and wheat, in this world until they are finally separated at the last judgment. Christians are citizens of both cities because human nature is twofold: physical and spiritual.[43] Jesus is the Lord of both realms.

During the fifth century, the papacy began to come into its own. The bishop of Rome grew in prominence as a political figure by filling the power vacuum left by the weakening of imperial control over Italy and the western provinces, which were falling under the domination of successive groups of nomadic invaders.

Pope Leo I (440-461) took the offensive to consolidate the powers of his office as bishop of Rome--the only western patriarchate--and strengthened the authority of the church during the middle years of the fifth century. In 448, Leo wrote his famous Tome upholding the orthodox position on the nature of Christ as true God and true man. After

suffering a temporary setback, he called the Council of Chalcedon into session in 451. R. J. Rushdoony asserts that the doctrine of the trinity as defined at the Council laid the "foundation of western liberty" while it resolved the ancient problem of the one and the many:

> Since both the one and the many are equally ultimate in God, it immediately becomes apparent that these two seemingly contradictory aspects of being do not cancel one another but are equally basic to the ontological trinity, one God, three persons. Again, since temporal unity and plurality are the products and creation of this triune God, neither the unity nor the plurality can demand the sacrifice of the other to itself. Thus, man and government are equally aspects of created reality. The locus of Christianity is both the believer and the church; they are not independent of or prior to one another.[44]

By the end of the century, Pope Gelasius I (492-496) had redefined the relationship of church and state by enunciating the "two swords" doctrine:

> The spiritual power keeps itself detached from the snares of this world and, fighting for God, does not become entangled in secular affairs, while the secular power, for its part, refrains from exercising any authority over Divine affairs. By thus remaining modestly within its own sphere, each power avoids the danger of pride which would be implicit in the possession of all authority and acquires a greater competence in the functions which are properly its own.[45]

But entanglements were not so easily avoided in practice and Gelasius has sometimes been interpreted as implying the final authority of the church over the state.[46] Joseph Lecler, has commented on the continuing importance of the doctrine:

> The division of sovereignty is a permanent antidote against every tyrannical will. Thanks to it, authority has to become again what it was before the fall: no longer a brutal and selfish domination, but a service rendered for the sake of the common good.[47]

In the East, the emperor, Justinian (527-565), introduced oriental pomp and splendor to the imperial court during his long reign and briefly checked the decline of imperial power. Deeply interested in

theological questions, Justinian took a role in religious controversies and tended to dominate the church leaders in the capital city of Constantinople, or Byzantium. He intensified the trend toward caesaropapism that introduced a new extreme of oriental despotism into the eastern or Byzantine empire.

The emperor is perhaps best remembered for the codification of Roman law in the Codex, Novellae, Institutiones, and Digestum, which were later known collectively as the Corpus Iuris Civilis when reintroduced into medieval Europe in the twelfth century and which gave renewed impetus to the theory of absolute monarchy. Justinian and later emperors liberalized the law of slavery and reformed family law by equalizing the position of women before the law, requiring consent of both spouses for marriage, stiffening divorce requirements, and restricting the absolute paternal authority--patria potestas--over children.[48]

But Justinian was unable to hold the West, despite his reconquest of Italy early in his reign. Three years after his death, the rift in the empire became permanent. Again, the church rose to the challenge. By the end of the sixth century, the centralization of the church hierarchy had begun to mature under Pope Gregory I (590-604), who asserted the jurisdiction of the Roman patriarchate over all others and himself as the apostolic successor of Peter.[49]

The Byzantine Empire

The Byzantine empire increasingly showed the effects of a neoplatonism that deprecated the mundane at the expense of the spiritual

realm. While veneration of icons became increasingly popular in the East and the West, it became an issue of especial political significance in the East as a phase of the struggle between church and state.

By perpetuating the imperial cult, the emperors claimed to be priests as well as kings and proclaimed that the empire was the visible kingdom of God on earth. Rene Guerdan characterized the later Byzantine emperors as icons themselves:

> Such megalomania had inevitable consequences: when the real sovereign is pure spirit, what can the emperor of flesh and blood in fact represent? He must necessarily be a materialization, a symbol: the materialization in our tangible world of an incorporeal substance, the symbol by which it can express itself here below. So it is that we find a State which had for its monarch neither a god nor a man, but an actor, a figurine. The Byzantine Empire was, in effect, nothing but the great scene of a spectacular drama, a mystery or passion play, in which the consecrated dynast as the leading character played through the centuries the part of Christ.[50]

Veneration of the emperor's image--like the genius of Caesar--was supplemented by efforts to destroy the rival images of the church.[51]

In 725, Emperor Leo III (717-741) issued the first edict against images and touched off the iconoclastic controversy, which grew into a dispute between the emperor and the pope as both sides sought to assert ultimate religious authority. The destruction of religious images became an important part of the imperial plan to reduce the independence of the church. In 753, Constantine V Copronymous (741-775) pursued a vicious policy of confiscating the monasteries, secularizing their buildings, and persecuting monks and nuns. R. J. Rushdoony summarizes the imperial program as follows:

> As Ladner pointed out, the imperial party, with reference to the church, saw that "narrowing the extension of Christ's government in the world widened the extension of the emperor's worship." The iconoclastic controversy was a phase of a larger imperial program.

> As Finlay noted, "It embraces a long and violent struggle between the government and the people, the emperors seeking the central power by annihilating every local franchise, and even the right of private opinion, among their subjects. . . . The emperors wished to constitute themselves the fountains of ecclesiastical as completely as that of civil legislation."[52] The undergirding philosophy of the struggle was Hellenism.

The leaders of the powerful monastic party in the East eventually recovered the privileges and wealth of the monasteries after the threatened to declare the independence of the church from the state. The regent Theodora finally rescinded the iconoclastic legislation in 842.

Paul Lemerle believes the iconoclastic controversy hastened the political and religious split between the two halves of the empire:

> When Pope Stephen II was instructed by Constantine V to seek help against the Lombards from Pepin the Short, he turned traitor to the cause of the heretic emperor. In 754 he contrived to have recognized his personal right to administer the territories of Rome and Ravenna, which had been reconquered by Pepin. This meant the loss of Italy for the empire.[53]

It was during this period that disagreements between the eastern and western churches were intensified by a dispute over the Nicene Creed, which culminated in a final schism in 1054.[54] Byzantium resisted the advance of Islam for four more centuries before it fell but the relations between East and West were never healed.

The Holy Roman Empire

The dangers posed by repeated barbarian invasions on the Italian peninsula and the Byzantine emperors' inability to offer protection compelled the papacy to take a more independent political course. When Pepin the Short (741-768), the major domus--head of the palace--of the last Merovingian monarch, decided to create a new kingdom of the Franks

in the West, he sought the approval of the church. An accommodation was reached which strengthened the hand of both the Pope and the new king. Pepin was anointed as the Patrician or Defender of the City of Rome, then drove the Longobardi out of Ravenna, the civil capital, in 755 and bestowed it and six urban districts on the papacy. Pepin's son, Charles, was later summoned to assist Pope Leo III (795-816), who had been forced to flee Rome in 799 after a riot. The following year, Charles--Charlemagne as he came to be known--was crowned as the first western emperor by the grateful pontiff. Charlemagne (800-814) was deeply influenced by Augustine's concept of a Christian commonwealth and envisioned the global extension of the church by means of the new empire.[55]

Charlemagne's successors fell far short of showing his aptitude in leadership and the Frankish empire never went much beyond the planning stage. The attempt to wed all Christendom into one earthly realm was never consummated. But a later duke of Saxony, Otto I (936-973), revived the original idea when he demanded coronation as emperor at the hands of the reigning pontiff (962). By so doing, Otto acknowledged the symbolic importance of the cooperation of the empire and the church as God's chosen vehicles to rule the earth. Thus began the migratory Holy Roman Empire--the First Reich--and its vision of a universal new Jerusalem.[56] John W. Burgess maintains that the "emperors recognized the necessity of the consecration and coronation of <u>each</u> emperor by the bishop for his empowerment to interpret the divine commands and execute them in secular matters."[57] The bishops similarly recognized the hereditary descent of the imperial office as an equivalent to apostolic

succession. The emperor claimed the title "Vicar of Christ."[58]

The Papal Revolution

For this concept of dual sovereignty to work effectively, there remained the problem of institutionalizing the selection of the pope. This was accomplished through the papal curia. The prestige of the papacy had lately declined as it came to be regarded as a sinecure for ambitious families. Rival factions, precursors of the Guelphs and Ghibellines, struggled to control the see. A succession of popes and anti-popes followed the removal of Pope John XII (955-963) by Otto, whom John had crowned. Profligacy and degradation riddled the papacy as the second millenium began.[59]

Pope Leo IX (1049-1055) began introducing reform with the help of monks associated with the abbey of Cluny, a center of monastic reform since the early tenth century. Leo expanded the circle of cardinals and surrounded himself with activists. Within a short time, a new class of celibate clergy--the spiritual or regular clergy--was created for the sake of attacking such age-old problems as simony and clerical unchastity. It was with such troops at his command that Hildebrand, the youngest of Leo's reforming cardinals, was later able to set the stage for the period of the papacy's greatest power and, after being elevated to the papacy by popular acclamation, set in motion the great clerical revolutions of the following two centuries. Hildebrand took the name Gregory VII (1073-1086) to vindicate an earlier pope, Gregory VI, who had been deposed by the emperor.[60]

In 1075, Gregory issued the Dictatus Papae, a manifesto proclaiming

virtually unlimited authority for the papacy. He attacked the sacramental conception of kingship and claimed that he alone could use the imperial insignia. Furthermore, he asserted the primacy of the pope in mundane as well as spiritual affairs, the infallibility of the Roman church and the pope, and claimed authority to depose emperors, ordain all clerics, and absolve subjects from their fealty to unjust rulers.[62]

Thus began a new period of struggle within and between church and state--popularly know as the Investiture Contest--that profoundly altered the course of European politics. Not long afterwards, Pope Urban II (1088-1099), launched the first of a dozen crusades--in 1095--in an effort to reunite Christendom. Urban began by declaring a truce--the "Truce of God"--in all wars of Christians against Christians.[61] In several kingdoms, war propagandists inflamed popular passions with accounts of Moslem and Jewish atrocities. Milton Himmelfarb believes that European Jews, who up until then had been active proselytizers, were terrorized into passivity by the crusaders as systematic persecutions began.[63]

The issue that became most identified with this dramatic energizing of religious and political militancy was lay investiture: the control of church appointments by kings and local magnates. From the viewpoint of the church, lay investiture subjected church officers and church property to the feudal authority of civil rulers. Like simony, which involved the purchase or sale of church services, sacraments, and offices, the practice was thought to usurp spiritual powers entrusted to the church, bringing corruption into the Body of Christ. From the viewpoint of the ruler, the authority for lay investiture was based on a

divine ordinance given to Otto I and his brother, the archbishop Bruno.[64] But more important were the practical considerations behind the jurisdictional issue. The state bureaucracies were then staffed by clerics, who were the lawyers of the day. The subjection of the secular clergy to monastic rules meant weakening the control of rulers over their own civil servants.

At the time of Gregory's election to the papacy, the young German emperor, Henry IV (1056-1106), was seeking to continue Otto's program to unite Germany under the Frankish monarchy but met resistance from the nobility, led by the Saxons. After defeating the Saxon barons, Henry was preparing to create a unified German state when he received a papal decree from Gregory prohibiting lay investiture and threatening to remove him if he failed to comply immediately. With the support of the German clergy, Henry sent a barbed reply to Rome and demanded the pope's resignation:

> Henry, king not by usurpation but by God's grace, to Hildebrand, henceforth no pope but false monk,--Christ has called us to our kingdom, while he has never called thee to the priesthood. Thou hast attacked me, a consecrated king, who can not be judged but by God himself. Condemned by our bishops and by ourselves, come down from the place that thou has usurped. Let the see of St. Peter be held by another, who will not seek to cover violence under the cloak of religion, and who will teach the wholesome doctrine of St. Peter. I, Henry, king by the grace of God, with all of my bishops, say unto Thee--"Come down, come down."[65]

Gregory promptly deposed the emperor and threatened to excommunicate anyone who supported him. Within months, Henry found himself isolated. The German nobility took advantage of the opportunity to reassert its electoral powers. Then, in the dead of winter in 1077, Henry traveled to northern Italy, where the pope was staying in a castle near Canossa owned by the Countess Mathilda of Tuscany, whose immense

holdings were later donated to the church and became the papal states. Henry stood outside the castle in the snow for three days until Gregory's hostess and his godfather prevailed upon the reluctant pope to grant an audience. As a result, Henry was restored--thwarting Gregory's hope for a decisive victory--and the struggle continued. Indeed, Henry succeeded in having Gregory deposed several years later after taking Rome in 1084. But the following year, one of Gregory's supporters drove Henry out and sacked the city.

Time showed that both sides lost more than they won. Cantor writes that, on the one hand, the incident "dealt a fatal blow to the ideology of theocratic kingship" but, on the other hand, it also cast doubt on the good intentions of the papacy and propelled the kings of western Europe along a more independent course.[66] The Investiture Contest ended indecisively decades later with the Concordat of Worms in 1122 but its ramifications took centuries to clarify. Roman law was revived and the reorientation of church and state gave rise to new, centralized institutions. Out of the dying dream of empire, nationalism began to emerge.

Notes

[1]Arnold J. Toynbee, A Study of History, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1935), p. 58.

[2]William Carroll Bark, Origins of The Medieval World (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1958), pp. 101, 124-25.

[3]Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, Out of Revolution: Autobiography of Western Man (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1938), pp. 699-705.

[4]Donald Jay Grout, A History of Western Music (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1960), pp. 18-23.

[5]Arthur E. R. Boak and William G. Sinnigen, A History of Rome to A.D. 565, 5th ed. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965), pp. 68-70.

[6]Ibid., pp. 95-99.

[7]Ibid., pp. 169, 260-61. See Ernest Barker, Church, State, and Education (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957), pp. 6-11; E. L. Hebden Taylor, The Christian Philosophy of Law, Politics and the State (Nutley, N. J.: The Craig Press, 1966), pp. 117-36.

[8]Ibid., p. 238.

[9]Ethelbert Stauffer, Christ and the Caesars: Historical Sketches, trans. by K. and R. Gregor Smith (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press), p. 52.

[10]Boak and Sinnigen, History of Rome, pp. 269-71, 279-82.

[11]Barker, Church, pp. 19-20.

[12]Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[13]Tertullian took pains to deny that any disloyalty was intended by Christians: "We must needs respect the Emperor as the chosen of the Lord, so that I might say that Caesar is more ours than yours, appointed as he is by our God." T. M. Parker, Christianity and the State in the Light of History, Bampton Lectures (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1955), p. 1.

[14]Boak and Sinnigen, History of Rome, pp. 399-400.

[15]Ibid., p. 400.

[16]Ibid., p. 400.

[17]Leo Pfeffer, Church, State, and Freedom, revised ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), p. 11.

[18]J. Marcellus Kik, Church and State: The Story of Two Kingdoms (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1963), p. 27.

[19]Roland H. Bainton, Early Christianity (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1960), p. 23.

[20]Ibid., p. 23.

[21]Boak and Sinnigen, History of Rome, pp. 400-01; Kik, Church and State, pp. 30-37.

[22]Bainton, Early Christianity, p. 27.

[23]Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History of Christianity (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953), p. 89.

[24]Norman F. Cantor, Medieval History: The Life and Death of a Civilization (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), pp. 28-29. See Thomas Prince, A Chronological History of New-England in the Form of Annals (Boston: Kneeland & Green, 1736), pp. 36-38.

[25]Ibid., p. 29.

[26]Charles Norris Cochrane, Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine (London: Clarendon Press, 1940; Oxford University Press, 1957), pp. 175-76.

[27]Pfeffer, Church, p. 13.

[28]Stauffer, Christ, p. 262; Boak and Sinnigen, History of Rome, pp. 431-32. Henry Bettenson, ed., Documents of the Christian Church, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 15, excerpts the text of Galerius's Edict of Toleration.

[29]Cochrane, Christianity, p. 176.

[30]M. Searle Bates, Religious Liberty: An Inquiry (New York: International Missionary Council, 1945), p. 134.

[31]Barker, Church, p. 35.

[32]Latourette, History of Christianity, p. 133. See Verna M. Hall, comp., The Christian History of the Constitution of the United States of America: Christian Self-Government, American Revolution Bicentennial Edition, ed. Joseph Allan Montgomery (San Francisco: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1975), pp. 18-20.

[33]Augustus Neander, General History of the Christian Religion and Church, vol. 3, trans. Joseph Torrey (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1852), p. 85.

[34]Cantor, Medieval History, p. 29.

[35]John W. Burgess, The Sanctity of Law: Wherein Does It Consist? (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1927), p. 18. See also Cochrane, Christianity, p. 335, on the sanctity of law.

[36]Kik, Church and State, p. 42.

[37]Cochrane, Christianity, p. 209. See George Huntston Williams, "Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century," Church History, 20 (December, 1951): 21-22, on the importance of church freedom: "Caesar, merely for being a Christian, could not usurp the place of God." See Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, The Christian Future: or the Modern Mind Outrun (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946; Harper Torchbooks, 1966), pp. 145-51.

[38]Boak and Sinnigen, History of Rome, p. 500.

[39]Cochrane, Christianity, p. 336.

[40]Sanford H. Cobb, The Rise of Religious Liberty in America: A History (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1902; Burt Franklin, 1970), p. 36.

[41]Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1973, s. v. "Sanctuary," by Helen Silving.

[42]Saint Augustine, The City of God, abridged, trans. Gerald G. Walsh, Demetrius B. Zema, Grace Monahan, and Daniel J. Honan (Garden City, N.Y.: Image Books, 1958), p. 465.

[43]Cantor, Medieval History, p. 97. William Carroll Bark believed Augustine helped Christianity make a "crucial" break with the Roman view of church and state. Bark, Origins, pp. 104-06, 146.

[44]Rousas John Rushdoony, The One and the Many: Studies in the Philosophy of Order and Ultimacy (Fairfax, Va.: Thoburn Press, 1978), p. 10. See also Rousas John Rushdoony, The Foundations of Social Order: Studies in the Creeds and Councils of the Early Church (Fairfax, Va.: Thoburn Press, 1978), p. 151.

[45]Joseph Lecler, The Two Sovereignties: A Study of the Relationship Between Church and State (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1952), p. 19.

[46]Brian Tierney, The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300 (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), pp. 10-11.

[47]Lecler, Two Sovereignties, p. 21.

[48]Harold J. Berman, "The Origins of Western Legal Science," Harvard Law Review, 90 (1977): 903-04. Berman elsewhere underscores the Christian character of the laws of Justinian and his successors: "The Christian emperors of Byzantium considered it their Christian responsiblity to reform the laws, as they put it, 'in the direction of humanity'--to eliminate iniquity, to protect the poor and oppressed, to infuse justice with mercy." Harold J. Berman, "The Influence of Christianity Upon the Development of Law," Oklahoma Law Review, 12 (1959): 91.

[49]Paul Lemerle, A History of Byzantium, trans. Anthony Matthew (New York: Walker and Company, 1964), pp. 47-49, 62-64; Latourette, History of Christianity, pp. 278-83, 337-41.

[50]Rene Guerdan, Byzantium: Its Triumphs and Tragedy, trans. D. L. B. Hartley (New York: Capricorn Books, 1962), p. 18. The caesaropapism of the Byzantine Empire was largely preserved in Russia. See Nicolas Berdyaev, The Origin of Russian Communism (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1960), pp. 50-51: "The doctrine of Moscow the Third Rome became the basic idea on which the Muscovite state was founded. The kingdom was consolidated and shaped under the symbol of a messianic idea. . . . Ivan the Terrible, who was a remarkable theoretician of absolute monarchy, thought that a Tsar must not only govern the state, but also save souls." Berdyaev recognized a strong continuity between the Bolshevik and Tsarist regimes. In both cases, the church as subordinated to the state. "The monism of a totalitarian state . . . turns the state into a church." Ibid., p. 187. On the position of the church in the Soviet Union, see Vladimir Gsovski, "The Legal Status of the Church in the Soviet Union," Fordham Law Review, 8 (January 1939): 1-28; M. Searle Bates, Religious Liberty: An Inquiry (New York: International Missionary Council, 1945), pp. 2-9; Aleksander I. Solzhenitsyn, The Gulag Archipelago, 1918-1956: An Experiment in Literary Investigation, I-II, trans. Thomas P. Whitney (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), pp. 34-52. Religious oppression, however, is by no means confined to the East, as the suppression of churches in revolutionary Mexico, for example, shows.

[51]Rushdoony, Foundations, pp. 148-60.

[52]Ibid., p. 151.

[53]Lemerle, Byzantium, p. 85.

[54]Rosenstock-Huessy, Christian Future, pp. 145-55.

[55]Cantor, Medieval History, pp. 216-25; Burgess, Sanctity of Law, pp.27-30.

[56]Rosenstock-Huessy, Revolution, pp. 488-90.

[57]Burgess, Sanctity of Law, p. 36.

[58]Later popes challenged the emperors claim and transferred the title "Vicar of Christ" to themselves. See R. W. Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages (New York: Penguin Books, 1970), pp. 104-05.

[59]Latourette, History of Christianity, pp. 464-66.

[60]Rosenstock-Huessy, Revolution, p. 594. A letter by Anselm of Lucca shows "how radical the new revolutionary ideology was." Anselm argued: "A perversion introduced by the princes of the world can be no prejudice to the right form of government, through whatever length of time it may have prevailed. Otherwise, our Lord God himself would be guilty, since he left mankind in bondage to the devil, to the deformation of true government, only redeemed it by his own death after the lapse of five thousand years!" Ibid., p. 523. See also David Knowles and Dmitri Obolensky, The Christian Centuries, vol. 2: The Middle Ages (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968), pp. 165-83.

[61]On the "Truce of God" and its use of the liturgy of Holy Week as a model for restoring the peace of the land, see Rosenstock-Huessy, Revolution, pp. 506-07.

[62]Tierney, Crisis, pp. 49-50. Some scholars believe the Dictatus Papae was not a manifesto but, rather, an index to passages from existing canons. See Knowles and Obolensky, Christian Centuries, vol. 2, p. 175 n2.

[63]Will Durant, The Story of Civilization, vol. 4: The Age of Faith: A History of Medieval Civilization--Christian, Islamic, and Judaic--from Constantine to Dante: A.D. 325-1300 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950), pp. 585-92.

[64]Gerd Tellenbach, Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest (London: Basil Blackwell & Mott Ltd., 1959; New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1970), pp. 90, 134-35.

[65]T. F. Tout, "Empire Vs. Papacy: Henry IV. at Canossa," in The World's Great Events: A History of the the World From Ancient to Modern Times, B.C. 4004 to A.D. 1903, vol. 2: Mediaeval, ed. Esther Singleton (New York: P. F. Collier & Son, 1903). pp. 689-90.

[66]Cantor, Medieval History, p. 329. For a brief discussion of the jurisdictional conflicts between the ecclesiastical and secular courts, see Michael E. Tigar and Madeleine R. Levy, Law and the Rise of Capitalism (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977), pp. 30-42.