THE GELASIAN THEORY FROM A COMMUNICATION PERSPECTIVE: DEVELOPMENT AND DECLINE [*]

La teoría Gelasiana desde la perspectiva de la comunicación: desarrollo y decadencia

Sophia MENACHE[**]
University of Haifa

RESUMEN: El presente artículo analiza los principales enunciados de la teoría Gelasiana y su transmisión en la Edad Media. Se ha puesto un énfasis especial en los distintos canales de comunicación que sirvieron tanto a la curia papal como a sus adversarios para propagar su credo con respecto al balance ideal entre el *regnum* y el *sacerdotium:* la realeza y el prelado. Aunque la teoría Gelasiana tuvo una influencia limitada en el medioevo temprano, ambas partes del conflicto trataron de involucrar amplias audiencias hacia el siglo XIV. Esta tendencia alcanzó su culmen durante el reinado de Felipe el hermoso, en su conflicto con el Papa Bonifacio VIII.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Dos espadas. Canales de comunicación. Propaganda política. Asambleas políticas. Querella de las Investiduras. Gelasio I. Gregorio VII. Inocencio III. Bonifacio VIII. Felipe el Hermoso.

ABSTRACT: This paper analyzes the principal postulates of the Gelasian theory and its transmission throughout the Middle Ages. Special emphasis is laid on the several communication channels that were used by the papal curia and its adversaries to spread their respective creeds with regard to a suitable balance between *regnum* and *sacerdotium*. Though the Gelasian theory enjoyed but very limited scope in the Early Middle Ages, each of the conflicting sides appealed to broader audiences toward the fourteenth century, a trend

---

that reached its zenith during the reign of Philip the Fair, King of France, in his struggle with Pope Boniface VIII.

KEYWORDS: Two Swords. Communication Channels. Political Propaganda. Political Assemblies. Investiture Controversy. Gelasius I. Gregory VII. Innocent III. Boniface VIII. Philip the Fair.

The relationship between the papacy and the secular powers in the Middle Ages has attracted the attention of historians for generations. Of the many facets of political history, however, the communication perspective remains, to a great extent, *terra incognita.* Besides a few works on the field[1], much research has still to be done. Such a *lacuna* undoubtedly reflects the many methodological problems inherent in the research of communications in medieval society; the main impediment being the lack of relevant documentation as to the available communication channels and, no less important, the scope of the audience as well as the time gap between emission and reception. In a pioneering book written about twenty years ago[2], I analyzed the most important channels of communication in the Middle Ages and their main promoters, among which the papal curia and the royal courts played a most important role. The present paper focuses on the message and the communication channels developed in medieval society by both the apostolic curia and its secular counterparts in order to spread their respective creeds with regard to the most suitable balance between *regnum* and *sacerdotium.* From the rich thesaurus of available documentation, the so-called "Gelasian theory" –enunciated by pope Gelasius I in his letter to the Eastern Emperor Anastasius in 494– has been selected as case-study. This choice is amply justified because of the primordial role of the Gelasian theory in shaping the theoretical foundations of the many political crises that characterized medieval society and, consequently, its long-standing

---

[1] See, for example, RICHTER, M., «A Paradigm of Oral Culture», in BANNIARD, M. (ed.), *Langages et peuples d'Europe: Cristallisation des identités romanes et germaniques (VIIᵉ-XIᵉ siècle),* Toulouse, CNRS, Université de Toulouse, 2002, pp. 179-186, p. 179; MENACHE, S., «Communication Changes in the Crusader Period: Transmission of News Between Europe and the Levant», in *Kommunikation zwischen Orient und Okzident, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Realienkunde des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit,* Wien, Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994, vol. 17, pp. 69-90; MORRIS, C., «Propaganda for War: The Dissemination of the Crusading Ideal in the Twelfth Century», *Studies in Church History,* 1983, vol. XX, pp. 79-101.

[2] MENACHE, S., *The Vox Dei: Communication in the Middle Ages,* New York, Oxford University Press, 1990, passim.

influence[3]. Since the theoretical/ideological aspects of Gelasius's premises have been profusely researched[4], our investigation concentrates on those postulates that left their mark on the development of medieval political ideology from the fifth century onwards and the means of their transmission.

Gelasius's creed appears in the opening clause of his letter, when he claims that "this world is [principally] governed by two [orders], the sacred *auctoritas* of the priests and the royal *potestas*". Gelasius held that for all that the sacerdotal aura made the ecclesiastical hierarchy of great consequence, it could not nullify the differentiation between king and priest. Indeed, just as the political leader was bound "to obey, not to rule over the religious order", for in these matters he is under the jurisdiction of the clergy, so "the priests knowing that the power is given [to Caesar] by Providence, obey his laws in all that pertains to the public order"[5]. Gelasius's declarations herald a long series of papal attempts to undermine the fundaments of the Byzantine monistic tradition, which empowered the emperor with both political and religious authority[6]. Dividing the representation of God on

---

[3] KANTOROWICZ, E., *The King's Two Bodies,* Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1957, pp. 456-457; ULLMANN, W., *Law and Politics in the Middle Ages,* London, Hodder and Staughton, 1975, pp. 129 ff.; WILKS, M*., The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1963, pp. 303 ff.; TOUBERT, P., «La doctrine gélasienne des deux pouvoirs. Propositions en vue d'une revision», in FONSECA, C. D., VITO, S., *Studi in onore di Giosuè Musca,* Bari, Edizione Dedalo, 2000, pp. 519-540; SASSIER, Y., «*Auctoritas pontificum et potestas regia:* faut-il tenir pour négligeable l'influence de la doctrine gélasienne aux temps carolingiens?», in CAROZZI, C., TAVIANI-CAROZZI, H. (eds.), *Le pouvoir au moyen âge: ideologies, pratiques, representations,* Aix-en-Provence, Publications de l'Université de Provence, 2005, pp. 213-236.

[4] From the rich bibliography on the subject, see, MACCARRONE, M., «*Sedes apostolica–vicarius Petri:* La perpetuità del primato di Pietro nella sede e nel vescovo di Roma (secoli III – VIII)», in *Il primato del vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio*, Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1991, pp. 275-362; CARON, P. G., «Les limites entre le pouvoir civil et le pouvoir ecclésiastique dans l'interprétation médiévale de l'épitre gélasienne (C. 10, D. XCVI)», in *Études de civilisation médiévale, IXe-XIIe siècles. Melanges offerts à Edmond-René Labande à l'occasion de son départ à la retraite et du XXe anniversaire du C.É.S.C.M. par ses amis, ses collègues, ses élèves,* Poitiers, CESCM, 1974, pp. 105-116; COTTRELL, A., «*Auctoritas* and *Potestas*: A Re-evaluation of the Correspondence of Gelasius I on Papal-Imperial Relations», *Medieval Studies*, 1993, vol. LV, pp. 95-109.

[5] *Famuli vestrae pietatis*, Ep. 12 to Anastasius, *Decretum Gratiani,* c. 10, D. XCVI, *Corpus Iuris Canonicum* [hereafter *C.I.C.*]*,* Friedberg, 1897, reprint Graz, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt 1959, vol. I, p. 340. See, also, ULLMANN, W., *Das Papsttum an der Wende der Spätantike zum Mittelalter,* Stuttgart, Anton Hiersemann, 1981, pp. 21, 42; on translation problems with Gelasian terminology, see, LEUPEN, P. H. D., «The Sacred Authority of the Pontiffs», in NIP, P. et al. (eds.) *Media Latinitas: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Occasion of the Retirement of L. J. Engels*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1996, pp. 245-248.

[6] STRASSLE, P. M., «Krieg und Frieden in Byzanz», *Byzantion: Revue internationale des études byzantines,* 2004, vol. LXXIV, pp. 110-129; NICOL, D. M., «Byzantine Political Thought», in BURNS, J.

earth between two realms, Gelasius further defined the sphere of action of each, which was prescribed by their respective objectives: the political rule being the sole prerogative of the emperor, the religious authority being the monopoly of the priest[7]. Both orders, Church and Empire/Kingdom, existed in a state of parallelism in this world, yet they were directed toward different goals. The political leader is in charge of the public order while the priest is occupied with the salvation of souls. Each receives his authority directly from God, in accordance with St. Paul's recognition of the divine source of political authority (*Romans* XIII: 1- 2). Each order is, in principle, independent of the other, yet the division of labour between them is not absolute: the ruler, who receives the sacraments from the priest, depends on him in spiritual matters; the priest, for his part, depends on the ruler and obeys him in all issues pertaining to the public order.

Both Dvornik and Carlyle approached the Gelasian theory as resulting from the development of Christianity and the Church in Late Antiquity, which demanded cooperation between the two powers[8]. The decline of the Western Roman Empire and ultimately the deposition of Romulus Augustulus in 476 created an authority vacuum as well as a political challenge in the West, with which the Bishop of Rome had to deal and ultimately to confront. This perspective provides a suitable answer to the inevitable question, How was the Gelasian theory, though formulated within a pre-feudal framework, so suitable to feudal Europe? Approaching the Gelasian theory as a response to the series of political upheavals that occurred simultaneously with the decline and eventually the fall of the Western Roman Empire provided a convincing explanation of its persistence. The survival of the emergent German states depended to some degree upon the cooperation to which Gelasius aspired. It was a rather utopian cooperation among strong, long-standing rulers, be they emperors or popes; yet it was possible, even desirable, between the popes –scions of the Roman heritage but deprived of political support– and the German kings, who were backed by military power but who lacked ideological and dynastical legitimacy. The ambiguity of Gelasius's terminology and the absence of a clear dividing line between king and priest harmonized with the political situation of the Early Middle Ages, when both popes and kings could rely on Gelasius for irrefutable proof of their otherwise contradictory points of view. The ideological

H. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought, c. 350-c. 1450,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 51-82.

[7] On the different interpretations of Gelasius's postulates, see NELSON, J., «Gelasius I Doctrine of Responsibility, a Note», *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 1967, vol. XVIII, pp. 154 ff.

[8] DVORNIK, F., «Pope Gelasius and Emperor Anastasius I», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 1951, vol. XLIV, pp. 111-116; CARLYLE, R. W., CARLYLE, A. J., *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West,* Edinburgh, W. Blackwood, 1962, vol. I, pp. 186 ff.

spectrum covered by Gelasius's letter, furthermore, bridged biblical traditions, that of Republican Rome and that of the Church Fathers, all of them integral components of the Carolingian Empire. As to the development of the Church, as Walter Ullmann pointed out long ago, Gelasius's rulings constituted the *Magna Carta* of the medieval papacy[9]; indeed, they provided the ecclesiastical establishment in general and the papacy in particular with ideological legitimacy and a wide field for political manoeuvring.

From a communications perspective, the question still stands, To what degree did the Gelasian theory permeate medieval thought and through what channels? One should note in this regard the complete lack of reference to Gelasius's postulates for the three-hundred years that followed the papal declarations. The silence of the sources hints at the weight of the historical/political milieu in shaping the spread and influence of the Gelasian theory: the relative weakness of both the papacy and the emerging German monarchies between the sixth and eighth centuries relegated the relationship between king and pope to a marginal position. No wonder, therefore, that the whole matter received full attention with the emergence of the Carolingian Empire, with a *novus David* and "thirteenth apostle*"* threatening the status and role of the Bishop of Rome. Notwithstanding the papal initiative of the *Renovatio Imperii,* Charlemagne's strong position and prestige actually avoided any real confrontation between the new emperor of the West and the Bishop of Rome. The new state of affairs was clearly reflected in the letter that Charlemagne sent to the elected pope, Leo III, in 795, in which the king declared: "It is our duty, with God's help and mercy, to defend the Church of Jesus Christ everywhere, from without against the attack of the pagans and the destruction of heretics; from within, to strengthen recognition and acknowledgment of the Christian Faith. You, most Holy Father, are expected to raise your hands towards heaven, as Moses did, and to help through your prayer to [bring about] the victory of our armies"[10]. The conclusion is rather clear: five years before the imperial coronation, the King of the Franks broke the balance inherent in the Gelasian theory. By seeing himself responsible not only for the political/military development of his kingdom but for the defence of the Church and the Christian Faith, as well, Charlemagne thus inherited the Byzantine political tenets and left to the pope the rather theoretical function of asking for God's mercy. However, the

---

[9] ULLMANN, W., *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages,* London, Methuen, 1972, p. 33.

[10] ALCUIN, *Epistolae*, in DÜMMLER, E (ed.), *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, vol. II, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (hereafter *M.G.H.),* Berlin, Weidmannschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1895, nº. 93, pp. 137-138.

relationship between *regnum* and *sacerdotium* did call for new approaches during the tempestuous reign of Charlemagne's heir, Louis the Pious[11].

Gelasius's pronouncements served as a source of legitimacy for the Carolingian clergy at a time when it was striving to redefine relations between the emperor and the ecclesiastical elite. In a letter to Louis the Pious, the bishops of the realm stressed the desirability of separating the two orders of Christendom[12]. Shortly afterwards, Jonas d'Orléans, too, cited Gelasius to assure the desired coordination between Church and State, both being organs of the Christian society headed by the Christ. Although Gelasius recognized the superiority of the clergy at the sacramental level, Jonas went one stage further in concluding that this spiritual superiority endowed the clergy with both the right and even the duty to supervise all activities of the political leader[13]. Hincmar of Rheims, too, who also relied on Gelasius, asserted the superiority of priests, the anointing ceremony proving clerical supremacy over the anointed king or emperor[14]. Gelasius's postulates were further used by Servatus Lupus, abbot of Ferrières, to legitimize his demand that the political leader become the executive arm of the Church's commands[15].

The foregoing examples hint at the distortion of the political balance inherent in the Gelasian theory as a result of the decline of political authority during the

---

[11] SUCHAN, M., «Kirchenpolitik des Königs oder Königspolitik der Kirche? Zum Verhältnis Ludwigs des Frommen und des Episkopates während der Herrschaftskrisen um 830», *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 2000, vol. CXI-1, pp. 1-27; FRIED, J., «Ludwig der Fromme, das Papsttum und die fränkische Kirche», in GODMAN, P., COLLINS, R. (eds.), *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives of the Reign of Luis the Pious (814-840),* Oxford-New York, Clarendon Press, 1990, pp. 231-273.

[12] *Episcoporum ad Ludovicum Imperatorem Relatio,* in *Leges, M.G.H.,* vol. II, n° 196, ii, 29. CLERQ, C. DE, «La législation réligieuse franque depuis l'avènement de Louis le Pieux jusqu'aux fausses decretals», *Revue de droit canonique*, 1954, vol. IV, pp. 371-404; 1956, vol. VI, pp. 144-162.

[13] JONAS D'ORLÉANS, *De institutione regia,* I, in DUBREUQ, A. (ed.), *Patrologia Latina* [hereafter *P.L.*], vol. CVI, p. 285; *Les idées politico-réligieuses d'un éveque au XIe siècle: Jonas d'Orléans et son de institutione regia, etude et texte critique,* Paris, J. Vrin, 1930; DELARUELLE, E., «Jonas d'Orléans et le moralisme carolingien», *Bulletin de literature ecclésiastique*, 1955, vol. LV, p. 129, 221; DUBREUQ, A., «Le *De Institutione Regia* de Jonas d'Orléans», *Information historique*, 1993, vol. LV-2, pp. 52-56.

[14] HINCMAR DE REIMS, *Ad episcopos regni De Institutione Carolomanni,* c. I, *P. L.*, vol. CXXV, p. 1007; see, also, BUC, P., «Text and Ritual in Ninth-Century Political Culture», in ALTHOFF, G. et al. (eds.), *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography,* Washington, German Historical Institute, 2002, pp. 123-138; NELSON, J. L., «Hincmar of Rheims on King-making: The Evidence of the *Annals of St. Bertin,*861-882», in NELSON, J. L., *Rulers and Ruling: Families in Early Medieval Europe: Alfred, Charles the Bald, and Others,* London, Aldershot, Variorum series, 1999, n. XVII, pp. 16-34.

[15] *Lupi abbatis Ferrariensis Epistolae,* in *M.G.H., Epistolarum,* vol. 4, n. 33, p. 93; MARSHALL, P. K., «The *Codex Bernensis* of the Letters of Servatus Lupus Abbot of Ferrières», *Revue bénédictine,* 1981, vol. XCI, n. 1-2, pp. 164-169.

reign of Louis the Pious thus reflecting again the close interaction between theory and political developments. From a communications perspective, it is important to note the main channel used by ecclesiastical spokesmen in the Early Middle Ages, be they members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy or the pope himself: namely, letters. By their very essence, letters did not enjoy a wide audience but focused on a narrow circle: the main recipient and his close advisors[16]. Still, letters enjoyed a unique and most prestigious status in the framework of Early Christianity and beyond, and left their mark on the development of the Catholic Church. One should note in this regard the persistent influence of the New Testament Epistles, which were canonized as part of the Christian liturgy around 150 AD, and provided a communication channel between the average believer and his Father in heaven[17]. The Gelasian theory itself –based as it was on the pope's letter to the Eastern emperor– hints at the receptiveness of the ecclesiastical elite to papal correspondence. Unfortunately, most of our sources focus on later periods, especially from the eleventh century onwards, when it is relatively easier to follow more closely the development of papal correspondence, its audience, and no less important the scope and schedule of its transmission[18]. The lack of further documentation leads one to conclude that the ecclesiastical message in the Early Middle Ages essentially appealed to the Church elite, not only because of its content but also because of its communication channels[19].

---

[16] Though some research in recent years has been carried out on correspondence in the Early Middle Ages, much of it focuses on matters of style and content, and less on the channels of communication, their scope, and transmission procedures. See, for example, RUBENSON, S., «Arguments and Authority in Early Monastic Correspondence», in CAMPLANI, A., FILORANO, G. (eds.), *Foundations of Power: Conflicts of Authority in Late-Antique Monasticism,* Leuven, Peeters, 2007, pp. 75-85. See, also, CONSTABLE, G., *Letters and Letter-Collections,* in *Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental* (17), Turnhout, Brepols, 1976.

[17] BOUREAU, A., «The Letter-writing Norm, A Medieval Invention», in CHARTIER, R., BOUREAU, A., DAUPHIN, C., *Correspondence: Models of Letter Writing from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century,* Cambridge, Polity Press, 1997, pp. 26-36.

[18] See, for instance, the illuminating studies by ZUTSCHI, P. N. R. on the Avignon Period: «Some Early Letters of Pope Clement V (1305-14) in the Public Record Office», *Archiv für Diplomatik,* 1987, vol. XXXIII, pp. 323-35; ID., «The Letters of the Avignon Popes (1305-1378), A Source for the Study of Anglo-Papal Relations and of English Ecclesiastical History», in JONES, M., VALE, M. (eds.), *England and Her Neighbours, 1066-1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais,* London, Hambledon Press, 1989, pp. 259-275; ID., «The Political and Administrative Correspondence of the Avignon Popes, 1305-1378: A Contribution to Papal Diplomacy», in *Aux origines de l'état moderne Le fonctionnement administratif de la papauté d'Avignon,* Rome, École française de Rome, 1990, pp. 371-384.

[19] One should note in this regard the growing gap in fluent communication of the kind and scope that characterized Late Antiquity. On the extent and function of letters in the administration and socio-cultural life of the Late Roman Empire, see, HORVATH, A. T., «Some Aspects of the Roman Empire's

True, the relationship between pope and emperor, or even in more general terms between Church and State, was indeed a matter of controversy within clearly defined socio-political circles, those that pertained to the upper classes by birth and occupation. Still, the very existence of the Church and, ultimately, the formation and evolution of a *societas Christiana* –namely, a society whose ideals and norms of conduct were dictated by the Christian faith and which was consequently ruled by the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the pope at its head– were dependent on, if not the result of, the Church's success in spreading its message among larger audiences. In particular, the Christian mission and the much-expected Christianisation of the German populations depended on the acceptance of the apostolic message by large areas of Europe. Such state of affairs further required a fluent dialogue between the papal curia and its legates be they monks or members of the secular clergy[20]. The conclusion is rather clear: communication channels were the product of and reflect the socio-economic and political arena from which they emerged and to which they in turn appealed. The isolation characteristic of the Early Middle Ages thus left its mark on both the channels of communication and the rather narrow audience of the ecclesiastical message[21].

The eleventh century, which saw more active participation of different authors from outside the ecclesiastical order, provides in this regard a clear demarcation line in the evolution of the Gelasian theory and its diffusion in contemporary society. Of the many permutations of the period –first and foremost demographic growth and economic expansion[22]– one should mention the growing weight of Roman law in

---

Correspondence in Latin in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries A. D.», in *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis,* 1999, vols. XXXIV-XXXV, pp. 269-277.

[20] As to the many problems and challenges of the papal mission abroad, see the illuminating letter of Pope Gregorius I to Augustine, the first bishop of Canterbury, c. 601, in *Bedae venerabilis presbyteri operum*, pars IV, sect. III, *Anglo Saxonis Historia Ecclesiastica,* in *P.L.*, vol. VC, cols. 70-71. See, also, WORMALD, P., *Bede and the Conversion of England: The Charter Evidence,* Jarrow Lecture, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 1984; MAYR-HARTING, H., *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England,* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991, passim. On the different aspects of Gregory's correspondence, see, VALLE RIBEIRIO, D., «O Oriente e o Occidente na correspondencia de Gregorio Magno», *Signum,* 2002, vol. IV, pp. 153-179; MARTYN, J. R. C., «Six Notes on Gregory the Great», *Medievalia et Humanistica,* 2003, vol. XXIX, n.s., pp. 1-25.

[21] See, for example, the forms and purposes of Ambrose's letter writing in the second half of the fourth century, as well as its impact on contemporary scholars, including St. Augustine of Hippo, in LIEBESCHUETZ, J. H. W. G., «The Collected Letters of Ambrose of Milan Correspondence with Contemporaries and with the Future», in ELLIS, L., KIDNER, F. L. (eds.), *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity: Sacred and Profane,* Aldershot, Ashgate, 2004, pp. 95-107.

[22] Any attempt to cover the topic would be rather unfeasible. Of the rich bibliography on the subject, see, FOSSIER, R., «The Rural Economy and Demographic Growth», in LUSCOMBE, D., RILEY SMITH, J. (eds.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History, c. 1024-c. 1198,* Cambridge, Cambridge

the emerging universities, most especially in the framework of faculties of law devoted to the study of *utriusque iuris*[23]. The struggle between emperors and popes in the context of the Investiture Contest[24] further strengthened reliance on the Gelasian theory to clarify the otherwise unstable relations between the two main orders in Christendom. Yet, the use of the two-sword symbol played a major role in widening the rift between Church and State and actually weakened, if not annulled, the principle of cooperation and harmony that lay at the heart of the Gelasian theory.

Gottschalk of Aachen (1076) had tried to substantiate the Gelasian principle of the division of power by using the evangelical symbol of two swords (*Luke* XXII: 38) as a suitable allegory of the division of tasks between king and priest: the task of the royal sword being to fight the enemies of Christ but also to impose discipline on the clergy; the prelates' sword being consequently limited to instil the faithful with obedience to the commands of the political leader, the anointed king[25]. According to Gottschalk, once this rather biased division of labour was accomplished, the renewed cooperation and harmony between *regnum* and *sacerdotium* would bring about the fulfilment of God's will as established in the Gospels (*Matthew* XXII: 21)[26]. The two-sword metaphor became thereafter the emblem of the imperial camp, which used it as a means of refuting the radical papalist exegesis of the Gelasian theory. In a rebuttal of Pope Gregory VII's arguments regarding the absolute superiority of the clergy in all spheres[27], an anonymous treatise published around 1090 further stressed two principles, both

---

University Press, 2004, pp. 11-46; WAREHAM, A., «The Feudal Revolution in Eleventh-Century East Anglia», *Anglo-Norman Studies,* 2000, vol. XXII, pp. 293-321; WHITE, S. D., «The Feudal Revolution – Comment», *Past and Present,* 1996, vol. CLII, pp. 205-223.

[23] PENNINGTON, K., «The Practical Use of Roman Law in the Early Twelfth Century», in LUTZ-BACHMANN, M., FIDORA, A. (eds.), *Action and Science: The Epistemology of the Practical Sciences in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries,* Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 2008, pp. 11-31; CHIODI, G., «Roma e il diritto romano consulenze di giudici e strategie di avocati dal X al XII secolo», *Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull Alto Medioevo,* 2002, vol. IL, pp. 1141-1254.

[24] For a general socio-political perspective, see, TELLENBACH, G., *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest,* Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1940, trans. BENNET, R. F., Oxford, B. Blackwell, 1970, passim.

[25] KEUPP, J., «Die zwei Schwerter des Bischofs. Von Kriegsherren und Seelenhirten im Reichsepiskopat der Stauferzeit», *Zeitscrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 2006, vol. CXVII-1, pp. 1-24.

[26] Ep. n. 13, in *Epistolae Henrici IV,* ERDMANN, C. (ed.), *M.G.H., Deutches Mittelalter, Kritische Studien Texte,* vol. I, 1937, p. 19.

[27] See, in this regard, Pope Gregory VII's letter to Bishop Hermann of Metz, in *Registrum Gregorii VII,* CASPAR, E. (ed.), *M.G.H., Epistolae Selectae,* II, VIII, 21, p. 553. The same approach appears in *De solutio juramentorum* of Bernold de Constance, in *Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis XI et XII, M.G.H.,* vol. I, op. 12, c. iv.

---

taken from Gelasius, namely, the divine source of imperial power and the prelates' duty to obey the emperor in regard to everything pertaining to the *ordo publicae disciplinae*[28].

The use of the Gelasian theory to defend the independence of political leaders vis-à-vis the papal offensive spread beyond the imperial camp and served the spokesmen of the English and French monarchs, as well. Thus, Hugh of Fleury (1102-1105) cited the Gelasian theory as proof of the divine source of royal power and as justification for the desired division of labour between king and pope. Inspired by another work of Gelasius, the *Thomus de anathematis vinculo*[29], he further claimed that, historically, only prelates had served in both spiritual and temporal functions. However, knowing human frailty, Jesus Christ had prescribed the division of power in His magnificent dictum (*Matthew* XXII: 21). Yet, Hugh found it difficult to persevere in the divine command, and he, too, confused the boundaries between the two orders in acknowledging the king's right to control the clergy within the boundaries of his kingdom[30].

The resumption of the struggle between pope and emperor in the early thirteenth century again placed the Gelasian theory at the focus of political argument. Frederick II showed some loyalty to Gelasian principles when he declared his recognition of the divine right of the two powers within the sphere respectively controlled by each one[31]. Frederick's example was further followed by some of his supporters, who, like those of Henry IV in the past, considered the Gelasian theory to be a powerful shield against any attempt at papal intervention or control over the two swords[32]. The papalist interpretation of the Gelasian theory –i.e., its radical exegesis– won however some support outside the papal curia, among the high clergy and members of the monastic orders. Among the most important speakers on behalf of the radical interpretation of the Gelasian theory,

---

[28] *Libelli de lite, M.G.H.,* vol. ii, 187, 231. See, also, ZAFARANA, Z., «Ricerche sul *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda*», *Studi Medievali,* 1966, vol. VII, pp. 691-700. The imperial claims were qualified by A. Fliche as a step toward the idea of sovereignty, a quite premature conclusion in light of the authors' wide identification with the Gelasian theory at this early stage; see, FLICHE, A., «Les théories germaniques de la souverainété», *Revue historique,* 1917, vol. CXXV, pp. 1-67.

[29] GELASIUS I, *Thomus de anathematis vinculo,* in SCHWARTZ, E. (ed.), *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma,* München, 1887, 14.5-23.

[30] HUGONIS MONACHI FLORIACENSIS, *Tractatus de regia potestate et sacerdotali dignitate,* I, 1, 2, c. 7, in *Libelli de lite, M.G.H.,* vol. II, pp. 468-471.

[31] HUILLARD-BREHOLLES, J. (ed.), *Historia Diplomatica Frederici Secundi,* Paris, Henricus Plon, 1852-1861, reprints Torino, Erasmo, 1963, vol. IV, p. 410.

[32] CAESARIUS VON HEISTERBACH, *The Dialogus on Miracles,* (trans. and ed. SCOTT, H. and SWINTON, C.), New York, 1929, I, p. 111; new ed. NOSGES, N., Turnhout, Brepols, 2009.

one should mention Bernard de Clairvaux[33], Hugues de St. Victor[34], John of Salisbury[35], in the twelfth century and St. Bonaventura[36] in the thirteenth, all of whom left their personal input on medieval theology.

However, the claim to superiority based on the clergy's sacramental status and the resulting demand for indirect papal control of the two swords was also seen as over-reaching, an unnecessary ecclesiastical abuse of the desired harmony between the two universal political institutions of Christendom. Even among those thinkers who harboured reservations about the imperial point of view, there were some, especially among the canonists, who advocated a return to Gelasian moderation. Partisans of a more moderate perspective of the Gelasian theory numbered Gratian[37], Ivo of Chartres[38], Cardinal Deusdedit[39], Huguccio of Pisa[40], Stephen of Tournai[41], and Rufinus, who conceived the Gelasian theory as a demand for non-intervention, each order being prohibited from trespassing on the other's domain: *Nec apostolicum secularia, nec principem ecclesiastica procurare oportet*[42]. Pope Innocent III, as well, in his letter to Emperor Alexius of Constantinople, recognized the Gelasian principles of the divine source of both secular and priestly authorities and the desirability of their separation. However, by using the symbolism of the sun (priesthood) and the moon (kingship), the pope hinted at the superiority of priest over prince, an allegorical reflection of Innocent's well-known recognition of the

---

[33] BERNARD DE CLAIRVAUX, *De consideratione,* IV, c. 3, 7, in *P.L.,* vol. CLXXXII, col. 776.

[34] HUGH OF ST. VICTOR, *De sacramentis christianae fidei,* II, 2, c. 4, in *P.L.,* vol. CLXXVI, col. 417.

[35] JOHN OF SALISBURY, *Policraticus* (WEBB, C., ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1909, I, p. 515.

[36] ST. BONVAVENTURA, *Quaestiones disputatae de perfectione evangelica,* IV, 3, in *S. Bonaventura Opera Omnia,* Quaracchi, Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1882-1902, vol. IV, p. 812; See, also, WINKELMANN, E. (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita saeculi XIII et XIV,* Innsbruck, 1885, reprint Aalen, Scientia Verlag, 1964, vol. II, p. 698.

[37] *Decretum*, XCVI, in *C.I.C.,* 6, I, p. 1340.

[38] IVO OF CHARTRES, *Decretum, P.L.* vol. 162, IV, p. 188, 190; HOFFMAN, H. , «Ivo von Chartres und die Losung des Investiturproblems», *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters,* 1959, vol. XV, pp. 393-440.

[39] CARDINAL DEUSDEDIT, *Collectio canonum,* (VON GLANVELL, E. W., ed.), vol. IV, p. 41, 97. See, also, FOURNIER, P., «Les collections canoniques romaines de l'epoque de Gregoire VII», *Mémoires de l'academie des inscriptions et belles letters,* 1920, vol. XLI, pp. 344-345.

[40] HUGUCCIO OF PISA, *Summa,* d. XCVI, c. 6, fol. 171, verso. Cited by ULLMANN, W., *Medieval Papalism: The Political Theories of the Medieval Canonists,* London, Meuthen, 1949, p. 144.

[41] STEPHANUS TORENACENSIS, *Summa decretorum, introductio*, (VON SCHULTE, J. F., ed.), Giessen, 1891, pp. 1-2.

[42] RUFINUS, *Summa Decretorum,* (SINGER, H., ed.), D. XXII, c. 12, reprint Paderborn 1902, Aalen, Scientia, 1963, pp. 47-48.

priority of the *spiritualia* over the *temporalia;* still, such precedence did not by itself allow any arbitrary intervention in each other's field. And, indeed, the moderate interpretation of the Gelasian theory found support among the most outstanding theologians in the second half of the thirteenth century. Both Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas supported Gelasius's tenets as the ideal means of neutralizing the more radical positions in both papalistic and anti-papalistic camps[43].

The debate about the most suitable division of labour involving Church and State between the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries was further characterized by a conscious attempt to broaden the audience of each of the conflicting camps through the intensive use of treatises, letters, a new evangelical exegesis, and a continuous appeal to the authority of an infallible past, all strategies common to both the papal curia and the imperial court[44]. Rhythmic prose became an exact technique, known as *cursus romanae curiae.* Letters continued to offer an important communication channel in parallel to the emergence of epistolary rhetoric manuals. The first treatise on epistolary rhetoric was written by the Benedictine monk Alberic of Monte Cassino at the end of the eleventh century and the first "epistolary encyclopaedia" (*Summa dictaminis*), written by Bernard of Meung, appeared about 1190[45]. Treatises and pamphlets complemented the missives, reflecting the more pluralistic character of the authors, among them canonists and lawyers in general[46]. In contrast to the monastic nature of previous authors, these writers were in a closer contact with broader sectors of contemporary society in the framework of the emerging universities, especially the faculties of Roman and

---

[43] Albertus Magnus in his Commentary to II Sent., dist. 44, art. 6, in *Alberti Magni…Opera Omnia ex ed. Lugdunensi,* (BORGNET, A., ed.), Paris, 1890-1899; THOMAS AQUINAS, *Scriptum super Sententiis,* (MANDONET, R., ed.), liber II, D. XCVI, Paris, 1929, vol. II, p. 1134. ESCHMANN, O. P., «St. Thomas on the Two Powers», *Medieval Studies,* 1958, vol. XX, pp. 177-205.

[44] JEANNIN, P., «La diffusion de l'information», in CAVACIOCCHI, S., (ed.), *Fieri e mercati nella integrazione delle economie europee secc. XIII-XVIII,* Firenze, Le Mounier, 2001, pp. 231-262; KNAEPEN, A., «Le recours à l'antiquité dans les écrits de la querelle des investitures», in SANSTERRE, J. M. (ed.), *L'antiquité du passé dans les sociétés médiévales*, Bruxelles, Institut historique belge de Rome, 2004, pp. 369-384; MÜNSCH, O., «Fortschritt durch Propaganda? Die Publizistik des Investiturstreits zwischen Tradition und Innovation», in JARNUT, J., WEMHOFF, M. (ed.), *Vom Umbruch zur Erneuerung? Das 11. Und beginnende 12. Jahrhundert–Positionen der Forschung,* München, 2006, pp. 151-167.

[45] BOUREAU, «The Letter-writing Norm», p. 36, 24, 37.

[46] On the new character of treatises as shown in the prose of Vincent of Beauvais, see, SCHNEIDER, R. J. «Vincent of Beauvais, Dominican Author: From *compilatio* to *tractatus*», in LUSIGNAN, S., PAULMIER-FOUCART, M. (eds.), *Lector et compilator: Vincent de Beauvais, frère prêcheur, un intellectuel et son milieu au XIIIe siècle,* Grâne, Créaphis, 1997, pp. 97-111.

Canon Law[47]. Innocent III faithfully reflects the papal awareness of the importance of the young universities in building a supportive public opinion. Indeed, the pope took care to send to Bologna some of his most important decretals –among them, *Per venerabilem* (1202) and *Novit* (1204)– to serve as learning material for the promising intellectual elite of Christendom[48]. The use of metaphors, such as the two swords and the moon and the sun further facilitated the reception of the otherwise rhetorical Gelasian message and allowed its use for different, if not opposite, goals.

The end of the thirteenth century heralds the waning of the Gelasian theory, with the unprecedented violence characteristic of the second cycle in the endless conflict between King Philip the Fair of France[49] and Pope Boniface VIII. The imprisonment of Bernard Saisset, Bishop Pamiers by royal messengers in open contravention of traditional ecclesiastical prerogatives[50], and only a few years after the first struggle on the fiscal immunity of the clergy[51], did not leave the pope with much room for diplomatic maneuvering. Boniface thus censured Philip the Fair for misgovernment and announced that his trial would be carried out during the deliberations of the forthcoming council, to be convened at Rome on 30 October 1302 (*Salvator mundi* and *Ausculta Fili*). Four archbishops, thirty-five bishops, six abbots, and several doctors answered the papal summons notwithstanding royal

---

[47] TIERNEY, B., «The Canonists and the Medieval State», *The Review of Politics,* 1953, vol. XV-3, pp. 377-388; MULDOON, J., «*Extra ecclesiam non est imperium*–The Canonists and the Legitimacy of Secular Power», *Studia Gratiana,* 1966, vol. IX, pp. 551-580; POST, G. «Some Unpublished Glosses on the *Translatio Imperii* and the Two Swords», *Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht,* 1937, vol. CXVII, pp. 403-418.

[48] BOYLE, O. P., LEONARD E., «Innocent's View of Himself as Pope», in SOMMERLECHNER, A. (ed.), *Innocenzo III Urbs et Orbis,* Roma, Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 2003, vol. I, pp. 5-19; PETERS, E., «Lotario dei Conti di Segni becomes Pope Innocent III: The Man and the Pope», in MOORE, J. C. (ed.), *Pope Innocent III and His World,* Aldershot, Ashgate, 1999, pp. 3-24. One should also note that Bologna, followed by Orléans, served as a very important centre for the creation and diffusion of epistolary techniques in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

[49] Much research has been conducted on the reign of Philip the Fair; see, for instance, the wide-ranging study by STRAYER, J. R., *The Reign of Philip the Fair,* Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1980, passim; BARBER, M., «The World Picture of Philip the Fair», *Journal of Medieval History,* 1982, vol. VIII, pp. 13-27; BESSEN, D. M., «Philip the Fair, King of France», in WOLBRINK, S. (ed.), *Great Lives from History. The Middle Ages, 477-1453,* Pasadena, Salem Press, 2005, pp. 839-842; CAUCHIES, J. M., «'Croit conseil' et ses 'ministres': L'entourage politique de Philippe le Beau», in MARCHANDISSE, A., KUPPER, J. L. (eds.), *A l'ombre du pouvoir: Les entourages princiers du moyen âge,* Genève, Droz, 2003, vol. CCLXXXIII, pp. 385-405.

[50] DENTON, J. H., «Bernard Saisset and the Franco-papal Rift of December 1301», *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* 2007, vol. CII-2, pp. 399-427.

[51] On the papal declarations and their acceptability in contemporary society, see, IZBICKI, T. M., «*Clericis laicos* and the Canonists», in SWEENEY, J. R., CHRODOROW, S. (eds.), *Popes, Teachers and Canon Law in the Middle Ages,* Itaca, Corneill University Press, 1989, pp. 179-190.

---

pressure to preclude their departure *ad liminam apostolorum*. The bull *Unam Sanctam* (18 November 1302), which was the outcome of the Council of Rome, reflects the most extreme papalist interpretation of the Gelasian theory. Though Boniface still conceded the existence of two swords, any significant distinction between them was rendered meaningless, since the pope demanded the complete submission of the temporal sword to the dictates of the Church. Both swords were to be at the complete and free disposal of the clergy, the pope at its head: "Certainly the one who denies that the temporal sword is in the power of Peter has not listened well to the word of the Lord commanding: 'Put up thy sword into thy scabbard' [*Matthew* XXVI: 52]. Both, therefore, are in the power of the Church, that is to say, the spiritual and the material sword, but the former is to be administered **for** the Church but the latter by the Church [emphasis mine]; the former in the hands of the priest; the latter **by** the hands of kings and soldiers, but at the will and sufferance of the priest". The concluding paragraph of the papal document did not leave room for doubt as to Boniface's firm determination to establish once and for ever the complete hegemony of the Apostolic See: "Therefore whoever resists this power thus ordained by God, resists the ordinance of God [*Romans* XIII: 2], unless he invents like Manicheus two beginnings, which is false and judged by us heretical, since according to the testimony of Moses, it is not in the beginnings but in the beginning that God created heaven and earth [*Genesis* I: 1]. Furthermore, we declare, we proclaim, we define that it is absolutely necessary for salvation that every human creature be subject to the Roman Pontiff"[52]. True, one may find other examples of extreme declarations of this kind that had been voiced since the times of the Gregorian Reform[53]. Moreover, by the end of the thirteenth century the papal postulates were being unambiguously voiced by Gilles de Rome, Archbishop of Bourges and former preceptor of Philip the Fair, whose book on ecclesiastical power served as the main source of inspiration for the papal bull[54]. Still, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the political implications of the papal claims were of an unprecedented nature: Boniface did not confront a vulnerable emperor with universal aspirations, but a "national" monarch with well-defined political goals, pursuing sovereignty within the borders of his kingdom[55]. No wonder, therefore, that the papal offensive did not remain without response and actually

---

[52] *Extravag. Commun.*, lib. I, tit. VIII, c. I., *C.I.C.,* vol. II, pp. 1245-1246. English translation from the *Internet Medieval Source Book*.

[53] See notes 32-35.

[54] AEGIDIUS ROMANUS, *De ecclesiastica potestate,* (SCHOLZ, R., ed.), l. I, VII-VIII, Leipzig, 1929, pp. 22-38; WIELOCKW, R., «La censure de Gilles de Rome», *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale,* 1980, vol. XXII, pp. 87-88.

[55] DENTON, J. H., «Taxation and the Conflict Between Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII», *French History,* 1997, vol. XI-3, pp. 241-264.

brought about one of the most formidable propaganda campaigns in the Middle Ages.

In his no less powerful response to the papal claims, Philip the Fair decided to turn his struggle with the pope on matters of hegemony into an issue of "national defense", which, as such, called for the unconditional enrollment of all the inhabitants of the realm, laity as well as clergy. By a manipulative use of papal documents, and even their forgery, the king turned Boniface henceforth into not only a political threat to the Kingdom of France but also a heretical menace to the purity of Christendom as a whole, with the pope's religious and moral values being scrutinized *ad personam* by "the most Christian king*"* and his close ministers[56]. But Philip the Fair was not satisfied with the limited scope of a personal battle against the pope, which was so characteristic of the Investiture Contest. In a most formidable propaganda campaign, he attempted and to great measure also succeeded in transforming the conflict into a national struggle against the enemy of the realm, Pope Boniface VIII. Thus, for the first time in the history of the Capetian monarchy, Philip called for an assembly of the three estates, to be held in Paris (8 April 1302). Nobles and bishops received a personal summons while bailiffs and seneschals were required to call for the election of two or three representatives of towns who would receive full powers of representation[57]. In a deliberate attempt to broaden the struggle between king and priest beyond the personal sphere, the king was further portrayed as the faithful representative of "the whole kingdom, the nobility and all prelates, abbots, priors and doyens, provosts, procurators of chapters and monasteries, colleges, universities, and the communes of the towns of the realm"[58]. Using forged documents deliberately prepared for this purpose, Pierre Flote[59], one of the king's main advisors, reported to the assembly about Boniface's many offenses against the king and the kingdom. According to Flote, the pope's

---

[56] On the special status of the King of France in Christendom, see STRAYER, J. R., «France: The Holy Land, the Chosen People, and the Most Christian King», in ID*., Medieval Statecraft and the Perspectives of History,* Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1971, pp. 300-314; on the different aspects of royal propaganda, see MENACHE, S., «'Un peuple qui a sa demeure à part': Boniface VIII et le sentiment national français», *Francia,* 1985, vol. XII, pp. 193-208; ID., «A Propaganda Campaign in the Reign of Philip the Fair: 1302-1303», *French History*, 1990, vol. IV, pp. 427-454.

[57] PICOT, G. (ed.), *Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France,* Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1901, vol. XI, nº 1-4, pp. 1-5. See, also, DECOSTER, C., «La convocation à l'assemblée de 1302, instrument juridique au service de la propaganda royale», *Parliaments, Estates and Representation,* 2002, vol. XXII, pp. 17-36.

[58] PICOT (ed.), *Collection de documents*, nº 6, pp. 12-13.

[59] On the pope's response, see, SCHMIDT, T., «La condemnation de Pierre Flote par le pape Boniface VIII», *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen Age,* 2006, vol. CXVIII-1, pp. 109-121.

continuous and deliberate attempts to harm the independence of the realm made it imperative to take efficient measures against Boniface VIII and his detrimental policy. Thus, the obvious and also justified conclusion was to judge the pope on charges of heresy in the Kingdom of France, but with the support not only of all inhabitants of the realm but of Christendom as a whole.

Notwithstanding the unprecedented nature of such a frontal attack against the vicar of God on earth, the royal attempts to judge Boniface on charges of heresy –detailed further by another spokesman of the king's close circle, Guillaume de Nogaret– received the massive support of the third estate; in contrast, many of the nobles and prelates were more reluctant to ardently follow the royal Catholic zeal. The hesitations if not the open opposition of the upper classes led to their being summoned to two additional assemblies, in February-March and in June 1303. In parallel, Philip the Fair sent special messengers to the provinces in order to broaden support for his aggressive policy against the pope. This stage further reflects the high efficiency of the royal communications system and its ability to systematically and quickly adapt its channels according to changing circumstances[60]. The king's representatives, laity or members of the clergy, approached their public directly and reported the decisions of the Paris assembly, while adapting their appeal to the respective audiences –clergy, monks, or townsmen[61]. In exceptional cases, when support of the king's policy was denied –as it was among the Dominicans– the dissenters were ordered to leave the kingdom on the grounds that their refusal annulled *de facto* the royal protection that they had enjoyed hitherto[62]. Although the royal campaign was not altogether successful, letters of adherence from different provinces began arriving at the court from 18th July 1303 onwards. Against the vociferous support of royal policy by the townsmen, the nobility and the clergy opted, again, for a more neutral stance[63], thus reflecting the conflict of opinion over the aggressive policy pursued by the Capetian court against the pope.

The difficult position of the clergy is rather understandable because of their double allegiance: to Philip the Fair, their temporal, nearby lord, on the one hand,

---

[60] The expulsion of the Jews in 1306 and the arrest of the knights Templar in 1307 further reflect the great level of bureaucratic efficiency developed by the Capetian court. In both cases, the king's officers were able to carry out the royal command in complete secrecy throughout the kingdom, with remarkable synchronization between far-away areas. As argued by J. STRAYER with regard to the arrest of the Templars, "No modern dictatorship could have done a better job", *The Reign of Philip the Fair,* p. 286.

[61] PICOT (ed.), *Collection de documents*, nº 74-76, 111, 116-117, 120-122, etc.

[62] ID., *ibid.*, nº 124, pp. 190-192.

[63] ID., *ibid.*, nº 264-267, 378, 651-652.

and to Boniface VIII, their spiritual leader in faraway Rome, on the other. Likewise, the hesitations of the nobility hint at their fears of a centralizing royal policy, one that threatened not only ecclesiastical prerogatives but, first and foremost, their own privileged status, as well. Guillaume de Plaisans provided a faithful reflection of Philip the Fair's political creed, which raised much concern among the upper classes: "The king [of France] is emperor of his kingdom, with absolute power over sea and land. All the subjects of the kingdom are under his power. Even bishops and priests must obey the laws, rules and decisions of the king in all temporal affairs… Everything within the boundaries of the kingdom belongs to the king, at least in matters of defence, higher legislation and ownership. The king has the power to bestow, to receive and to exploit any and every possession, movable or not, which is in his kingdom for the public wealth and defence of the realm"[64]. By turning the king of France into *imperator… in regno suo*, Plaisans actually invalided any division of labor between priest and king and turned the Gelasian platform null and void. The conclusion is rather clear: more than manifesting support of ecclesiastical/papal prerogatives, the reluctance of great sectors of the upper classes to address the royal policy against Boniface VIII was meant to obviate the strengthening of the Capetian monarchy to the detriment of their own, traditional privileges.

The extremist views held by both the papal curia and the Capetian court at the beginning of the fourteenth century thus herald the waning of the Gelasian theory and hint at the meager chances for peaceful and harmonious cooperation between priest and king. The imprisonment of Boniface VIII at Anagni under severe charges of heresy (7 September 1303)[65], Boniface's premature death one month later, and the long and tortuous process against the posthumous pope[66], all these events reflect the deteriorating relationship between *regnum* and *sacerdotium.* The Church's traditional privileges, first and foremost the pope's unique status as *vicarius Dei,* could not withstand the monarchy's offensive. The emergence of national monarchies, with their pursuit of sovereignty and jealous defence of the king's prerogatives, thus relegated Gelasius's tenets to a secondary position, if any. The new state of affairs was faithfully reflected in the *Roman de Fauvel,* in which

---

[64] MOISONOBE, A. (ed.), «Mémoire relative au paréage de 1307», *Bulletin de la société d'agriculture…de la Lozère,* Mende, 1896, p. 521.

[65] COSTE, J., «Les deux missions de Guillaume de Nogaret en 1303», *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen Age,* 1993, vol. CV-1, pp. 299-326.

[66] MENACHE, S., *Clement V,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. 191-199; DENTON, J., «The Attempted Trial of Boniface VIII for Heresy», in MULHOLLAND, M., PULLAM, B. (eds.), *Judicial Tribunals in England and Europe, 1200-1700,* Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2003, pp. 117-128.

Gervais du Bus described the political changes of his times, and complained that they contradicted the designs of Providence:

> *In the beginning God created*
> *The two great lights…*
> *One was the sun; the moon was the other….*
> *But, by the will of God*
> *The sun is higher in heavens…*
> *The temporal power*
> *Which, like the moon, should be inferior,*
> *Has, by a quirk of fate,*
> *Become ruler of Holy Church*[67].

The dynamic, ever-changing relationship between priest and king, Church and State between the fifth and fourteenth centuries justifies the conclusion that the acceptability of the Gelasian theory was connected to, if not the result of, the changing political structures of the times. The weakness of the German monarchies that raised in the framework of the Western Roman Empire as well as the vulnerability of the papacy in the Early Middle Ages encouraged the coexistence of the two main orders of Christendom thus bringing about the emergence and development of the Gelasian theory. From the eleventh century onwards, however, the two-sword metaphor heralded a first step against the Gelasian balance; it became an expression of the development of political entities, especially but not only the Holy Roman Empire, that were gradually paving their way to political independence. The emergence of quasi-national states and the revival of the idea of sovereignty in the fourteenth century actually made the Gelasian theory meaningless.

In parallel, and as a direct result of socio-political permutations characteristic of the Late Middle Ages, one should note the dramatic changes in the communication channels employed and the audiences appealed to by the conflicting sides in the battle between religious and secular authority. The proliferation of political treatises during the struggle between Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair has clear precedents in the Investiture Contest, especially during the reigns of Henry IV and Frederick II[68]; however, their number and scope by the beginning of the

---

[67] GERVAIS DU BUS, *Le roman de Fauvel,* (LANGFORS, A., ed.), Paris, Seuil, 1914-1919, pp. 18-20.

[68] GOETZ, H. W., «Der Investiturstreit in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung von Lampert von Hersfeld bis Otto von Freising», in STIEGEMANN, C., WEMHOFF, M. (eds.), *Canossa 1077: Erschütterung der Welt, Geschichte, Kundst und Kultur am Aufgang der Romanik.* München, Himer Verlag, 2006, pp. 47-59; SARNOWSKY, J., «'Hochmut' und 'Fall.' Die Konflikte zwischen Kaiser und

fourteenth century were unprecedented[69]. The difference, though, was more than of a quantitative nature; it was characterized, as well, by the involvement of a new kind of civil servants, the king's champions from the emerging bourgeoisie. They were the main factor in shaping a supportive public opinion in favor of the crown among the townsmen[70]. As Joseph Strayer defined it so well, the moment that the French monarchy became the main "employer" of the universities' graduates, the Church then lost its former monopoly over public opinion[71]. The assemblies promoted by Philip the Fair and the royal messengers sent throughout the kingdom to crystallize a supportive public opinion were clear manifestations of the Capetian court's awareness of the innovative nature of the king's policy, on the one hand, and of the resulting need for support from broader sectors of contemporary society, on the other[72]. In contrast to the novel character of the royal propaganda campaign, one should note the traditional nature of papal policy, which embodied not only the same message but also the same channels –papal bulls and the summoning of councils– that characterized the pontificates of Gregory VII and Innocent III, as well. In this regard, one may conclude that Boniface's fiasco was not the result of his original policy stance; on the contrary, it was the result of the pope's failure to deal with the new challenges with innovative and more suitable means of communication.

The secularization process that characterized the early fourteenth century heralds, indeed, the beginning of a new era[73], in which the Gelasian theory and the two-sword metaphor gradually became anachronisms. One of the main promoters of this change was the "national" king, who regarded himself as emperor within the bounds of his limited kingdom. True, a myth cannot so easily be uprooted, and the Gelasian theory and the two-sword metaphor appeared sporadically during the Avignon Period, as well, in the writings of Alvarus Pelagius, James of Viterbo, and

---

Papst in der Deutung durch die Geschichtsschreiber des ausgehenden Mittelalters», *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 2002, vol. LXXXIV-1, pp. 67-91. See, also, note 37.

[69] PENNINGTON, K., «Law, Legislative Authority and Theories of Government, 1150-1300», in BURNS (ed.), *The Cambridge History*, 1987, pp. 424-453.

[70] GOURON, A., «Comment Guillaume de Nogaret est-il entré au service de Philippe le Bel», *Revue historique,* 1998, vol. CCIIC, pp. 25-46.

[71] STRAYER, J. R., *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State,* Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1970, pp. 53-56.

[72] COURTENAY, W. J., «Between Pope and King: The Parisian Letters of Adhesion of 1303», *Speculum,* 1996, vol. LXXI-3, pp. 577-605.

[73] STRAYER, J., «The Laicization of French and English Society at the Thirteenth Century», *Speculum*, 1940, vol. XV, pp. 76-86; BROWN, E. A. R., «Laity, Laicization, and Philip the Fair of France», in STAFFORD, P., NELSON, J. L., MARTINDALE, J. (eds.), *Law, Laity and Solidarities: Essays in Honour of Susan Reynolds,* Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2001, pp. 200-217.

Augustinus Triumphus[74]. However, it inevitably became the voice of a distant past, without much chance of implementation. The new political ruler, motivated by concepts of sovereignty, deprived the Gelasian theory of all legitimacy, condemning it out of hand. Philip IV did not confront the Gelasian theory as reflecting an existing reality, which it was not, nor had it ever been. Regarding himself as the representative of the general good and as being charged simultaneously with the defence of the realm, the Catholic Faith, the Christian Church, and the Holy Land[75], according to royal propaganda Philip embodied a perfect totality that left no room for any other partners. It may therefore be concluded that in the early fourteenth century, swords gradually became anachronistic not only on the field of battle but in the realm of political theory, as well. The secular sword eventually won the battle for supportive public opinion and paved the way for a new period in the history of political communication. In a rather symbolic way, the older dictum of *vox populi, vox Dei* –i.e., of the Church– turned, by the force of circumstances, into *vox populi, vox Regis*: the king, actually, the *rex Christianissimus* now becoming the most faithful and suitable delegate of the will of God and of the Christian Faith on earth[76].

---

[74] Alvarus Pelagius, *De planctu ecclesiae,* ch. 52, 56, (Rocaberti, J., ed.), *Bibliotheca Maxima Pontificia* vol. III, pp. 129, 153-158; James of Viterbo, *De regimine christiano,* 2, 7, in Arquillierre, H., *Le plus ancien traité de l'église,* Paris, G. Beauchesne, 1926, p. 237; Augustinus Triumphus, cited in Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty*, p. 549.

[75] All these claims were pronounced in an anonymous sermon in the early fourteenth century; see, Leclercq, D. J., «Un sermon prononcé pendant la guerre de Flandre sous Philippe le Bel», *Revue du moyen âge latin,* 1945, vol. I, pp. 165-172.

[76] For an additional example, see, Boureau, A., «L'adage *vox populi, vox Dei* et l'invention de la nation anglaise (VIIIᵉ-Xᵉ siècle)», *Annales ESC,* juillet-octobre 1992, nº 4-5, pp. 1071-1089.