

Hierocratic Theory of Pope Innocent IV

*Chun-Chul Chang

The idea of papal power maintained by Innocent IV achieved its great significance in the canonist tradition of medieval history, as did that of pope Innocent III. In actuality, Innocent IV had faithfully followed the canonical tradition already permeated by the works of great canonists such as Innocent III. But it was Innocent IV who began to distance himself from the dualistic attitude of Innocent III toward hierocratic papalism. Accordingly many historians of medieval political history concern themselves with how much these two popes shared a common understanding, or how their thoughts differ from each other's.

Walter Ullmann considered that both popes entertained ambitions to achieve universal secular power. It seemed to him that the monistic papal authority was completed during Innocent III's pontificate, although some contemporary canonists supported the autonomous power of secular ruler. Furthermore he thought that Innocent III could be a faithful follower of his predecessor's theocratic theory.¹⁾ But Maccarone, Mochi Onory, Friedrich Kempf, and Helene Tillmann disagree with Ullmann's view.²⁾ All of them

1) Walter Ullmann, *Medieval Papalism: The Political Theories of the Medieval Canonists* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1949) 119-22.

2) Michele Maccarrone, *Nuovi studi su Innocenzo III* (Roma: Nella sede dell'istituto, 1995); Mochi S. Onory, *Fonti Canonistiche dell'idea moderna dello*

point to the fact that Innocent III definitely distinguished the boundary of power between sacerdotium and temporalium. On these perspectives Giovanni Cantini took a further step. After reviewing in detail the source materials in referred to Innocent IV, he collected for the first time the materials which showed the conflicting affairs in the relations between church and state. Upon this practical work he concluded that Innocent IV was also a dualist, and that fundamentally there is a continuity from Innocent III to Innocent IV in the theory of papal power.³⁾

On the other hand, Brian Tierney denied the usage of the terms, 'monistic' and 'dualistic', when used to categorize papal political concepts.⁴⁾ He argued that both popes, having the canonist tradition in common, differed from each other only in the ways in which they legitimated the theory of papal authority.

From the various interpretations of the scholars above mentioned, two possibilities can be conjectured. Firstly, two Innocentian popes had contradiction in their thoughts. Accordingly it seems the written

stato (Miland: Pubblicazioni dell'Universita Catolica del Sacri Cuore, 1951); Friedrich Kempf, "Die Papstliche Gewalt in der mittelalterlichen Welt," *Miscellanea Historiae Pontificae*, XXI(1959): 117-169; Hellene Tillmann, "Zur Frage des Verhaltnisse von Kirch und Staat in Lehre und Praxis Papst Innocenz III," *Deutsche Archiv fur Erforschung des Mittelalters* (Munster/Koln: Bohlau-verlag, 1952) 136-81; Brian Tierney, "Continuity of Papal Political Theory in the Thirteenth Century: Some Methodological Considerations," *Mediaeval Studies*, XXVII (1965): 229.

3) Joannes A. Cantini, "De Autonomia Judicis Saecularis et de Romani Pontificis Plenitudine Potestatis in Temporalibus Secundum Innocentium IV," *Salesianum*, 23 (1961): 407-80.

4) Tierney 229.

Novit - ratione peccati

*venerabilem - the canonist
- received the sword
from the pope
distinguish between canon election
and confirmation
examination.*

materials which illustrated their ideas are inconsistent. Secondly, it can be said that critics did not understand the real intentions behind the texts, because they could not approach and analyze those materials effectively. Brian Tierney says a few difficulties which are related to the latter possibility as follows. First, a difficulty is pointed out in the abuse of the terms, 'dualistic' and 'hierocratic' for characterizing medieval ideals. Second, another difficulty consisted in anachronistic attempts to force medieval thought into the mould of modern concepts of sovereignty. The third difficulty arises from a widespread disposition to consider the various papal pronouncements as mere attempts to define a static existing structure of public law. In fact they become intelligible and must be seen as self-consistent only when they are understood as dynamic attempts to bring about a change in an existing system, to initiate the processes of historical development that the popes regarded as desirable. Finally, the modern interpretation of thirteenth century papal thought inadequately emphasizes the medieval doctrines that assumed that general consent was necessary to bring about licit and effective change in an existing structure of laws and rights.⁵⁾

Tierney concluded that the opposing schools employed the terms 'dualism' and 'hierocratic' in order to emphasize the differences in the modern dispute over the medieval ideas. To define precisely the consistency of these two Innocentian popes in the enforcement of papal supremacy is very complicated, although it remains an

5) Tierney 230.

interesting topic for inquiry. Only if when we keep in touch with the the papal pronouncements of these popes and compare their ideas, will it be possible to get close to the essentials of their ideas.

Innocent IV not only inherited the canonical legacy of his predecessors, but also he had been trained in academic canonical tradition. In the process of forming his perspective, he reviewed the large volumes of canonical works which had accumulated for almost a century. Although he faithfully followed the canonical tradition, it is certain that his ideas profoundly modified Innocent III's thought.

Here it can be suggested whether Innocent IV's interpretation basically deviated from the analysis of canonists and Innocent III. Then, How much did Innocent IV differ on the relation of pope and emperor from his predecessor?

Contemporary political circumstances required Innocent IV to arm himself with ideological argument against the emperor as much as some other popes devoted to the enforcement of papal authority. Definitely his struggle against Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick II was a significant political event of his pontificate from the papal point of view. It was this struggle that gave him a motivation to collect and to review the canonistic materials relevant to papal superiority amassed by his predecessor canonists. It was offensive activity for the purpose of preparing Frederick's deposition and legitimizing it, while it was defensive against Frederick's rebuke, "the assumption of papal power in temporal affairs is an usurpation unfounded on divine or human law."⁶)

From the political aspect the Innocent IV's especial monument is a gloss on *Ad apostolicae sedis*⁷⁾ which reproached Frederick and gave a full account of his deposition.⁸⁾ The deposition theory mixed three points. First is the ideas enforcing papal power which was based on *Alius item*⁹⁾, and the theoretical tradition of papal superiority from pope Gregory VII to decretalists that was intensified through *Venerabilem*¹⁰⁾. Second is the assumption of binding and loosing power which is a basis of *imperium sacerdotis*. Last is his consideration of the political implications of the papal position as *vicarius Christi*.¹¹⁾

The idea of classical text, *Alius item* is found in the memorandum of Lyon council, *Consultatio*.¹²⁾ At the time, Innocent IV

6) M. G. H., *Constitutiones et Acta Publica* II: 362.

7) Norman P. Tanner S. J. (ed), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 1: *Nicaea I to Lateran V* (Washington D. C.: Seed and Ward and Georgetown UP, 1990): 278-283.

8) W. E. Lunt, "The Sources for the First Council of Lyons, 1245," *English Historical Review*, (January, 1918): 73; M. Tangle, "Die sogenannte Brevis nota über das Lyoner Council von 1245," *Mittheilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, xii: 247-9; Walter Ullmann, "Some Reflection on the Opposition of Frederick II to the Papacy," *Archivio Storico Pugliese* (1960): 3-26; Karajan, "Zur Geschichte des Councils von Lyon 1245," in die *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophische-historische Classe*, ii (Vienna, 1851): 67-118; M. G. H. *Brevis nota* no. 401: 513-16.

9) Aemilius Friedberg, *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, (Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1956), Pars Prima: *Decretum Gratiani* C.15 q.6 c.3.

10) Aemilius Friedberg, *Quinque Compilationes Antiquae* (Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1956) Comp. 3.1.6.19.

11) J. A. Watt, "The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century: The Contribution of the Canonists," *Traditio* 20 (1964) 240; J. A. Watt, "The Use of Term 'Plenitudo potestatis' by Hostiensis," *Proceeding of the Second International Congress of Medieval Canon Law* (Rome, 1965): 162-87.

suggested two questions: "what is the principle of king's deposition, and whether Frederick II can be punished due to his sin." For these questions the supposed writer of *Consultatio*, Hostiensis emphasized the canonical *dictum* that emperor's sinful behavior could not be remedied, and that this fact had a possibility to destroy the solidarity of the Christian world, then the emperor could be deposed. Hostiensis considered that the papal power to depose the emperor was based on the binding and loosing power. These dual subjects were fundamentally urged in the interpretation of *Alius item* and *Venerabilem*. Emperor Frederick II admitted papal power not only to bind and loose, but also to crown the emperor. But he denied that the pope could depose the emperor, punish kings by confiscating their power, and judge rulers in the temporal affairs. Innocent IV's reply to the emperor's view occurs in his decretal *Aeger cui lenia*¹³⁾ with which he defended himself against the attack of the emperor inferring the canonistic theory and justified the deposition theory.¹⁴⁾

This defensive attitude had its basis in pope Gregory VII's commentary on *Matthew* 16:18, "Nothing lies outside the apostle's

12) J. A. Watt, "Medieval Deposition Theory: A Neglected Canonist Consultatio from the First Council of Lyons," *Studies in Church History*, 2 (1965): 197-214.

13) Constantine Höfler, *Albert von Beham und Register Papst Innocenz IV* (Stuttgart: Gedruckt Auf Kosten Des Literarischen Vereins, 1847): 86-89; Peter Herde, "Ein Pamphlet der päpstlichen Kurie gegen Kaiser Friedrich II. von 1245/46 ('*Eger cui lenia*')," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* XXIII (1967): 468-538; Carlo Dolcini, <EGER CUI LENIA> (1245/46): INNOCENZO IV, TOLOMEO DA LUCCA, GUGLIELMO D'OCKHAM," *Rivista di Storia Della Chiesa in Italia* XXIX (1975): 127-148.

14) Höfler *Aeger cui lenia* 86-92: Watt 241-42.

judicial power." Furthermore Innocent III and Innocent IV related it to the phrase of *Jeremiah* 1:10. These three popes interpreted a phrase of St. Paul "one who can judge the higher (spiritual) has necessarily judicial power to the lower (secular)" in the same meaning as above. Through *Aeger cui lenia* Innocent IV especially emphasized the papal right to judge sin and to excommunicate sinners, and the loss of emperor's secular judicial power due to his sin. This is basically Gregory VII's view. But the understanding about the legal relation of the pope to the emperor had changed so far since Gregory VII. Gregory recognized that the relations between pope and emperor were fundamentally different from those between pope and other rulers. But its precise definition was not attempted officially anymore before Innocent III. Innocent III considered that the papal power to depose the emperor's status was a natural consequence of the pope's confirmation of the emperor's election. It was because he thought confirmation of king implied an adequate examination of the emperor candidate. *Aeger cui lenia* systematically developed the Innocent III's concept about the relation of pope to emperor.¹⁵⁾

Aeger cui lenia referred to the emperor's subordination to pope. This was an argument for the political significance of *vicarius Christi*. It means that pope continues the *eternum Christi pontificium* in himself, and acts as a vicar for God's providential management of the temporal world.¹⁶⁾ According to it, the pope's obligation is to

15) Watt 242-43; Walter Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London, 1955): 431, 481-2.

perform the function of a general legate with temporal representative authority as the king of kings.¹⁷⁾ This decretal shows that such a papal power can be seen in history: at first legal feature of Jeremiah and Melchisedech, and then at the time of legal perfection by the vicar of Christ. This was the core of Innocent IV's ideas to be developed for his deposition theory. He was concerned with 'regimen unius persone'¹⁸⁾ among other things. He thought that the creator of human kind delegated His work of preserving the peaceful order in this world to His legate who was only ruler having divine responsibility. Thus, since the authority of Christ to depose the rulers could not be disturbed, so there is no one who can oppose God's legate.¹⁹⁾

Innocent IV made up for the concept of 'regale sacerdotium' in *Aeger cui lenia*. The pope needed to make it clear, because Frederick argued that papal power in secular affairs had no basis in Bible beside pope's own arbitrary definition. Innocent stressed that such temporal power of the pope was a fundamental principle of the divine

16) Herde, *Eger cui lenia* 518: "Non minoris quidem, immo longe maioris potestatis esse credendum est eternum Christi pontificium in fundalissima Petri sede sub gratia ordinatum..."

17) Herde, *Eger cui lenia* 517: "Generali nampue legatione in terris fungimur regis regum,"

18) Innocent IV, *Apparatus* ad 2.14.2.: "Nam non videtur discretus dominus fuisse ut cum reverentia eius loquitur, nisi unicum post se talem vicarium reliquisset qui hec omnia posset. Fuit autem iste vicarius eius Petrus, Math. xvi. ultra medium, et idem dicendum est de successoribus Petri eum eadem absurditas sequeretur si post mortem petri humanam naturam a se creatam sine regimine unius persone reliquisset,"

19) Watt 244.

law, a part of divine plan for man, and the last step in divine providence initiated from the human creation.²⁰⁾ However the ideas that God had His will to provide human destiny through a series of political unfoldings was a common sense in the thirteenth century. Innocent IV explained in detail the political history provided by God for His people. He said that God Himself ruled His people without any mediator at first, but since the Flood He had chosen ministers to rule His creatures, among them Noah was the first who was entrusted with dual functions of priest and lawgiver as a people's minister. God ruled the temporal world, delegating the ruling obligation to patriarchs, judges, kings, and these types of representatives persisted until the age of Christ.²¹⁾ Therefore he considered the papal rule of Christendom as the direct continuance of the rule by Jewish priests over Israelite. In the incarnation of the savior the '*naturalis dominus et rex noster*' resumed this office for

20) Herde, *Eger cui lenia* 536: Deus enim, licet primum non multos potentes elegerit, potentes tamen non abicit, cum et ipse sot potens et iusti divites fuisse noscuntur in ecclesia primitiva, quibus apostolus vel dominus per apostolum non sapere sublime precepit. Nos quoque, etsi preferamus paupertatem ex spiritu, que inter affluentes divitias cum difficultate nutritur, divitiarum tamen non usum in culpa fore dicimus sed abusum.

21) Innocent IV, *Commentaria: Apparatus in V libros Decretalium* (Frankfurti, 1570) ad 2.2.10.: "Et tempore Noë coepit Deus creatures suas regere per ministros duo, primus fuit Noë, de quo fuerit rector populi, ex eo apparet, quod sibi dominus gubernatorem Archæ per quam ecclesia significatur commisit... In hac autem vicaria successerunt Patreuchæ, Iuduces, Reges, Sacerdotes, & ali; qui pro tempore fuerunt in regimine populi Iudæorum, & fic euravit vsque ad Christum, qui fuit naturalis dominus, & Res noster;... Et ipse Iesus Christus vicarium suum constituit Petrum & successores suos, quando ei dedit clasues Regni coelorum;..."

himself, and he completed and translated it to Peter and the other successors. So Innocent argued that the incomplete priesthood of Old Law was completed by Christ, and that the priesthood transmitted to Peter through Christ, carried the power to minister and rule in the time of Old law, which was now committed to Peter. So it is his conclusion that the pope as a vicar of Christ continued to practice the kingly power which Christ himself practiced for humankind.²²⁾

From *Aeger cui lenia* we can see Innocent IV showed new perspectives as follows, although he was still remaining in the curial tradition. First, the imperial power of pope is prime and naturalistic. Because '*verus homo verusque deus,*' Christ was '*verus rex ac verus sacerdos,*' not only *sacerdotium* but also kingly power to establish kingdom were committed to the apostolic see by him.²³⁾ The two keys which he possessed were the mark of emperor in heaven and on earth coincidentally.²⁴⁾ While Innocent III fervently quoted the Constantine Donation for the evidence of secular power of the pope, Innocent IV depended mainly upon the Biblical sources without considering the Donation any more because he realized that Donation

22) Watt 245-46: Innocent IV, *Apparatus* ad 2.2.10.: "Quod ab eo teneat regnum, sed de plenitudine potestatis qua habet, quia vacarius est Christi." Hostiensis added *Esaih xxxiii, xxii*, quoting the Innocentian context in his commentary.

23) Höfler, *Aeger cui lenia* 88: "Dominus enim Iehsus Christus, Dei filius, sicut verus homo verusque deus, sic secundum ordinem Melchisedech verus rex ac verus sacerdos existens, quemadmodum patenter ostendit nunc utendo pro hominibus honorificentia regiae majestatis, nunc exequendo pro illis dignitatem pontificii apud Patrem, in apostolica sede non solum pontificalem sed et regalem constituit monarchatum, beato Petro ejusque successoribus terreni simul ac ecclesie imperii commissis habentis.

24) Höfler, *Aeger cui lenia* 88.

was unreliable for the papal power.

Second, Innocent IV thought that the emperor Constantine took part in the christian community of church and gave up all his possessions, recognizing them illegal. He maintained that one who would be punished to hell was not permitted by God the power to execute.²⁵⁾ Here we can find that the concept of 'Heilsgerechtigkeit' initiated by Laurentius Hispanus was adapted to the argumentation of papal curia.

Third, the church potentially possesses secular sword.²⁶⁾ Then it was committed to rulers. Therefore that the apostolic see possesses imperial power '*prius naturaliter et potentialiter*' is definitely an aspect of christian theology. The *naturaliter* pertains to the human character of Christ, and his vicar had the same character. From such an aspect, it can be said that the theory of '*naturalis Dominus et rex noster*' was applied for the assumption of papal secular authority.

The other sources shows that Innocent IV reached a conclusion that even heathen kings should subject to the jurisdiction of *vicarius Christi*, the pope. But in spite of this conclusion, he did not explain the concrete exemplar of papal power. He generalized some cases listed by decretalists as follows: the cases of suspected secular judge or his negligence, and inability of secular judges to do justice.²⁷⁾

25) Höfler, *Aeger cui lenia* 88: "Verum idem Constantinus, per fidem Christi catholicae incorporatus ecclesiae, illam inordinatam tyrannidem, qua foris antea illegitime utebatur,..."

26) Höfler 88, *Aeger cui lenia*: "In germio enim fidelis ecclesiae ambo gladii habentur administrationis utriusque reconditi, unde quisquis ibidem no fuerit, neutrum habet..."

Considering these cases, Innocent IV argued 'the church examines the cases which can not be judged by inferior jurisdiction.'²⁸⁾

Innocent IV believed that unified christendom systematically converged its center on the papacy, and that the pope could make up for the defect of political power with the conferred kingly power in its system. This papal privileged power to cure defect, negligence, and ambiguity was the core of 'plenitudo potestatis' which Innocent assumed.

Watt asserted that Innocent IV's view on the legal relation of pope and emperor basically accepted that of Innocent III in *In Gensis* and *Venerabilem*.²⁹⁾ It is true that the thesis that the apostolic see of righteousness follow the one law in order to take responsibility for the whole christian people is consistently present throughout Innocent III's decretals. Innocent IV officially declared that the traditional principle of papal power responded to Frederick's attack.³⁰⁾

Nevertheless even if those two popes showed some similarities in their thought on papal power and its legal legitimacy, it can be said that Innocent IV proceeded considerably beyond Innocent III's views.

27) Tierney 238-39. In fact heathern rulers did not admitted the papal jurisdiction. Recognizing this situation, Innocent IV applied the same terminology which was used for explaining the papal temporal power to the christian king of France, to them. Innocent IV insisted that the pope was *de jure* the overlord not only of French king, but also of all temporal kings, although it was not *de facto*.

28) Innocent IV, *Apparatus* ad 5. 39, 49 s.v. *liberataem*: "quae per inferiores ratione iurisdictionis humanae terminari non possunt, ad ecclesiam recurratur.": Wilhelm Kölmel, *Regnum Christianum: Weg und Ergebnisse des Gewaltverhältnisse* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1970) 250.

29) Watt 246-48.

30) Watt 248.

Innocent III prudently suggested that beyond the papal state the pope had the secular jurisdiction over the *casualiter, certis causis inspectis* to be considered an exceptional case.³¹⁾ In *Per venerabilem*,³²⁾ the letter to William of Montpellier, he insisted that papal jurisdiction could not deal with religious and secular affairs in the same way. Even though he considered the pope as *judex ordinarius omnium* in religious matters, he did not intend to include various trifle feudal litigations which customarily belong to the secular ruler, in papal court. Moreover, Innocent III attempted to distinguish spiritual fullness of power from the great secular power. In contrast, Innocent IV enlarged more the boundary of papal fullness of power in secular affairs than Innocent III did.³³⁾ For instance, the former rendered the *casualiter* in regarding to the category of the pope's secular power, but the latter added '*saltem*' to it. Again where the former qualifies such power by the reference to sin (*ratione peccati*), the latter

31) Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, 214. 1132 c: "Rationibus igitur his inducti, regi gratiam fecimus requisiti, causam tam ex Veteri equam ex Novo Testamento tenentes, quod non solum in ecclesie patrimonio, super quo plenam in temporalibus gerimus potestatem, verum etiam in aliis regionibus, *certis causis inspectis*, temporalem iurisdictionem *casualiter* exercemus."; Friedrich Kempf, *Papsttum und Innocenz III: die geistigen und rechtlichen Grundlagen seiner Thronstreitpolitik*, in *Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae*, vol. xix (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1954) 258.

32) Friedberg, *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, Pars Secunda: Gregory IX, s *Liber Extra*, X 4.17.3.; Kenneth Pennington, "Pope Innocent III's Views on Church and State: A Gloss to *Per Venerabilem*," in *Law, Church, and Society*, ed. by Kenneth Pennington and Robert Somerville (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1977): 49-67; Brian Tierney, "'Tria quippe distinguit iudicis...'" A Note on Innocent III's Decretal *Per venerabilem*," *Speculum* 37 (1962): 48-59.

33) Kölmel 253.

extendes this qualification by the addition of '*maxime*': '*maxime ratione peccati*.'³⁴⁾

Then did Innocent IV apply such secular fullness power of the pope over both emperor and king in same degree? No, he did not. The text *Aeger cui lenia* distinguished between the powers of emperor and king. King as a spiritual superior received the fealty from his subjects and began to rule according to inheritance law.³⁵⁾

Innocent IV regarded christian rulership as the imperial power connected to pope, comparing it to king's power, *regnum*, found by God, which was based upon secular right of human world and existed independently in its function. Therefore, in accordance with it the king's power was called as potestas which had special functions of force for civil order itself.³⁶⁾ He admitted undoubtedly that secular society possessed its characteristic independence and that nonchristians could have legitimate jurisdiction and rulership.

The *plenitudo potestatis* of pope which could be executed in the secular affairs was embodied in the christian theological and ecclesiastical proclaim. It was considered that this was performed on the basis of papal supremacy under the special terms, such as the

34) Gehart B. Ladner, "Sacerdozio e Regno: da Gregorio VII a Bonifacio VIII," *Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae*, vol. xviii (Rome, 1954): 71; Höfler *Aeger cui lenia* 88: "Relinquitur ergo Romanum pontificem posse saltem casualiter exercere pontificale iudicium in quemlibet christianum, cujuscumque conditionis existat, maxime ratione peccati, ut peccatorem quemcumque, postquam in profundum vitiorum venerit per contemptum,..."

35) Kölmel 253-54.

36) Kölmel 258.

cases which had spiritual connections and in the absence of superior secular ruler. The idea that the pope could interfere in secular affairs was founded on the concept that the church included the temporal world in its systematic organization, and that the church and secular society were unified. The pope as a superior had a mission to protect this unified world, whose head could be identified the vicar of christ, who had the spiritual and secular fullness of power. This thought ascribed to the pope a position by which he could depose even the emperor and properly interfere with any case that involved heretics and Jews, and in order to protect the natural law. Upon these ideas Innocent IV assumed that jurisdiction over secular affairs was conferred on the vicar of Christ. He maintained many times that this jurisdiction included the matters that belonged to natural law. Through the spiritual and secular fullness of power, he thought that the vicar of Christ could perform the power of *jura naturali* besides the cases of canon law, when the order of human nature required the last decision. This last decision related to papal supremacy in the entangling system of spiritual order and natural order. Thus he concluded that the structure of human nature, the world of created men, required a monocephalous (*Μουοκέφαλος, Monocephalie*) order, '*unum corpus, unum caput*.'³⁷⁾ Innocent IV understood the vicar of Christ from the concept of rule of one man, '*regimen unius personae*.'³⁸⁾

37) Innocent IV, *Apparatus* ad 3.3.4.8 *pro defensione*; Kölmel 254-55.

38) Innocent IV, *Apparatus* ad 2. 14. 2. *privamecy*.

This monocephalous idea of Innocent IV originated in the theory of Alanus who emphasized papal temporal authority, indicating that Christ conferred two swords to Peter and Moses who was a prototype of the pope in the Old Testament. This made it possible to understand that the order of secular rule was involved in the church-centric order.³⁹⁾

Judging from above mentioned, Innocent IV was more positive in his extension of papal theory than his predecessor, although in regard to church and state he inherited the canonical tradition from Innocent III and Huguccio. But he did not share the extreme perspective of papal publicists in the thirteenth century. Nevertheless his hierocratic theory of monocephalous rule in canon law and his ideas applied to contemporary political circumstance in competition with the power of emperor, should be accepted. At least he consistently developed hierocratic theory. Although *Unam santam* of Boniface VIII did not have its direct basis on Innocent IV's text, it is certain that his papal theory continued in Boniface's decretal through the active controversies of the late thirteenth century.

39) Kölmel 258.