

***Corpus pontificis.***  
**Pope's Body as Element of Symbolic Communication**  
**(14 – 16. Centuries)**

There is no doubt that in our lives now the word “body” and the concepts related to it play a significant role. Ernst H. Kantorowicz once was intrigued by the “corporations”<sup>1</sup>. Recently science fiction writers, screenwriters and filmmakers have been clearly concerned with the issue of human self-identity, as in when somebody for some reason loses their body<sup>2</sup>. Political, ethical, even physiological aspects of the control over one's own and another's body have occasionally become objects of controversy under different circumstances – be it a conversation between friends or an academic discussion<sup>3</sup>. So it is not surprising that historians too from time to time reflect on the questions of the body and physicality issued by the present, and as usual address them to the past, as in his time the abovementioned Kantorowicz did.

It is evident that the “corporal” problems in this case are often associated with the issues of the nature and functions of the state, the government and the power. Perhaps, it is just an unconscious attempt to transfer into the anthropomorphic, that is an understandable dimension, those abstract, intangible, incorporeal, but still very perceptible concepts. If this is indeed the case, then similar, though somewhat less sophisticated attempts were made in the Middle Ages too. However, we must not forget that the concept of the “state” at that time had a slightly different content than it has now<sup>4</sup>, and the power probably was also perceived in a different way. So it is quite interesting to observe the attempts undertaken at that time to describe the different communities in the categories of corporeality, which are still popular today.

The community, which was most often likened to a human body, was the church. The apostles already used this metaphor to describe a community of believers. According to Apostle Paul, “For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ“ (1.Kor. 12:12). In the Middle Ages

---

<sup>1</sup> Kantorowicz E. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*. Princeton, 1997 (first edition published 1957). P. XVII.

<sup>2</sup> For example in such films as “The Matrix” (1999), “Repo Men” (2010), “Inception” (2010).

<sup>3</sup> In the latter case see first of all: *Foucault M.* *Surveiller et punir*. Paris, 1975. *Idem.* *Histoire de la sexualité*. Vol. 1-3. Paris, 1976 – 1984; *Agamben G.* *Homo Sacer. Die souveräne Macht und das nackte Leben*. Frankfurt a. M., 2004.

<sup>4</sup> See for example: *Benz A.* *Der moderne Staat. Grundlagen der politologischen Analyse*. Oldenbourg, 2008. S. 11-12.

this metaphor was actively used and developed. Constant attempts were made to estimate the number of members of this body, to determine what parts of community they symbolized, even to establish a relationship between this body and its soul and spirit. For example, according to Nicholas of Cusa, sacraments were the spirit of the church, its soul was the priesthood, and the body itself was represented by all the Christians<sup>5</sup>.

Particularly the arguments about the nature of the head of this body were notable for their complexity. On the one hand, even apostle Paul spoke in this regard quite clearly, „And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all“ (Eph. 1:22-23). On the other hand, with the lapse of time the church has distanced itself from this invisible, mysterious head, and beside it appeared a second one, that is a material one – the Roman pontiff. The issue of its relation to the body of the church caused troubles for medieval writers. Gabriel Biel, a German theologian and liturgist of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, argued, for example, that the church had two heads, but it was not in any way a monster, because these heads were not equal, but one that was Jesus Christ was principal, and another, that was the Pope, only substitutional<sup>6</sup>.

However, typical late medieval conceptions of the church body were not formulated first of all in the course of abstract theological debates and reflections. They were far more influenced by the activities of the church councils of Constance and Basle. The so-called „reformatio in capite et membris“ – reform of the head and members – was quite regularly discussed at those meetings<sup>7</sup>. In this case, the head usually signified the entire Roman Curia, in particular, the set of the pontiff and the cardinals, who formed this or the Curia<sup>8</sup>. In this system the Pope acted properly not as the head of the church body, but only as one, albeit the most important part of this head.

In contrast to the two bodies of the English King explored by Kantarovich, which are explicitly mentioned in the sources and which are real – if not always *de facto*, than at least *de jure* – in the abovementioned, as well as in many other theological and public-theological, constructs the body (or bodies) of the Pope himself does not play an independent role. It is

---

<sup>5</sup> Krämer W. Das Menschenbild im politischen Denken des Nikolaus von Kues, in: Mitteilungen und Forschungsbeiträge der Cusanus Gesellschaft (further MFCG). 13 (1978). S. 225-233, here S. 227.

<sup>6</sup> „Et per hoc patet, quod ecclesia non est monstruosa, et biceps, seu bicapitalis: quia non habet duo capita exequo et principalia: sed unum principale, et aliud vicem eius tenens: quod nullam inducit monstruositatem“. Biel G. Sacri canonis missae lucidissimo expositio. Brixiae, 1576. P. 149.

<sup>7</sup> See for example Märkl C. Der Reformgedanke in den Reformschriften des 15. Jahrhunderts, in: Hlaváček I.; Patschovsky A. (Hg.) Reform von Kirche und Reich zur Zeit der Konzilien von Konstanz (1414–1418) und Basel (1431–1449). Konstanz-Prager Historisches Kolloquium (11.–17. Oktober 1993), Konstanz 1996. S. 91-109.

<sup>8</sup> About the cardinals as parts of the Pope's body see Paravicini Bagliani A. Der Leib des Papstes. Eine Theologie der Hinfälligkeit. München, 1997. S. 73-75.

just one member, or even part of a member of the whole body of the church<sup>9</sup>. His “corporality” is not his initially inherent quality, but only an outcome of his involvement in the general system.

However, if we move from the theory of “political theology” to liturgical and ceremonial practices, what we see would be slightly different. In this context the body is no longer a “signified”, pointed out by words, but a “signifier”, and at that one of the main “signifiers” in the semiotic system of rituals. At the time when epistolary and verbal argumentation used to play a less significant role in the process of political communication, it was the body, which became its main instrument.

Of course, such liturgical-ceremonial body has little to do with modern physiological understanding of corporality. That way the body’s integral part was clothes<sup>10</sup>. It can be clearly seen, if we pay attention to the description of curial rituals composed by papal masters of ceremonies. In these work we often come across comments like this, “[the emperor] is kissing the foot of the Pope, and then his hand”<sup>11</sup>. However, the sovereign actually kissed the Pope’s glove and sandal respectively.

Different garments were used in different situations. The most distinct division lay between the liturgical and extralitururgical ceremonies. These two kinds of rituals matched specific types of garments. The most well-known of them are mitre and tiara. The former were used by the Pope as a symbol of his spiritual power, the latter was referred to his secular authority<sup>12</sup>. In that way tiara was not used during divine services, but it was preferred to mitre, if the occasion was, for example, the reception of ambassadors.

Moreover, different details of clothing gave different properties to the Pope’s body. It is particularly evident in the example of the so-called “reverence”, the system of which came into life in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century. It was an expression of a particular virtue “observantia”, i.e. the respect of the people of a higher social status<sup>13</sup>. Reverence toward the Pope consisted in its

---

<sup>9</sup> Or even one part of the one of the two bodies of the church, i.e. of “corpus politicum ecclesiae militantis”. At the same time the head of “corpus mysticum ecclesiae triumphantis” remained Christ. See for example: *Stieber J. W.* Der Kirchenbegriff des Cusanus vor dem Hintergrund der kirchenpolitischen Entwicklungen und kirchentheoretischen Vorstellungen seiner Zeit, in: MFCG. 21 (1994). S. 87-156, here 131-133.

<sup>10</sup> Although there are also medieval miniatures, which depict a “naked Pope”, they are rather extremely rare exceptions. See *Millet H.* “Il libro delle immagini dei papi” Storia di un testo profetico medievale. Collana, 2002 (La corte dei papi, 9). S. 190.

<sup>11</sup> “[imperator] pontificis pedes osculatus est, deinde manum”. *Dykman M.* (ed.) L’Oeuvre de Patrizi Piccolomini ou le Cérémonial papal de la première Renaissance (further Caeremoniale) T. 1. Città del Vaticano, 1980 (Studi e testi, T. 293) P. 193.

<sup>12</sup> “Illud quoque notandum est quod romanus pontifex in signum imperii utitur regno, id est corona imperiali, et in signum pontificis utitur mitra”. *Durandus G.* Rationale Divinorum Officiorum, Davril A., Thibodeau T.M. (ed.) Turnhout, 1995 (CCCM, T. 140). P. 218.

<sup>13</sup> “...observantia est per quam homines aliqua dignitate antecedens quodam cultu et honore dignantur”.

most complete form of the following elements, a man approached the pontiff sitting on the throne, kneeled twice, nearing the steps of the throne he sank to his knees for the third time, then he kissed the Pope's right foot, his right knee, then he stood up and kissed his hand and mouth and at last moving backwards down the stairs he bowed deeply before the pope and returned to his place. At the same time, the completeness of reverence depended on the status of a person who performed it and on the properties of the Pope's body at the time. The more significant difference between them was, the fewer parts of the pontiff's body a person, who was showing him respect, was allowed to kiss and the lower the kisses were "localized".

If the Pope received visitors dressed for the extralitururgical ceremonies, then the emperor, kings, "the greatest of the sovereigns", their ambassadors and cardinals were allowed to kiss him on the lips, the same categories along with queens could kiss his hands, prelates, but only if they were in priest garments, were allowed to kiss his knee; all others were only permitted to kiss his feet<sup>14</sup>. When the pontiff was dressed in liturgical vestments, the cardinals kissed his right hand, the prelates kissed his right knee, all others who were subordinate ministrants of the Curia and all the laity regardless of their rank was only allowed to kiss his feet<sup>15</sup>.

Therefore, the hierarchy, which corresponded to the actual situation, was formed each time around and on the basis of the pontiff's body through the use of appropriate kisses. When the Pope appeared only as a carrier of secular and spiritual power, it looked like this, Emperor – Kings – Cardinals – Queens – prelates – others. However, when the pontiff appeared in the garments, in other words, in the body of the celebrant, all secular distinctions lost their meaning, and only the hierarchy of the church remained important.

In the latter case the pontiff is actually turned into a living icon, the image of Jesus Christ. Of course, ultimately any priest who said mass became a kind of "imago Dei" too. The celebrated Pope, however, did it with a completeness inaccessible to the rest of priests and bishops. It becomes evident if we turn to medieval methods of interpretation of the liturgy.

Perhaps the most influential of them was the allegorical method, which originated in the 8<sup>th</sup> century, but retained its authority throughout the whole Middle Ages<sup>16</sup>. In accordance with it the liturgy ought to be understood as a symbolic reproduction of the earthly life and sufferings of Christ. For example, the opening of the liturgical celebration of the Eucharist

---

*Thomas Aquinas*. Summa Theologiae. T. 2-2. Cambridge, 2006. Q. 102, Art. 1.

<sup>14</sup> Caeremoniale. P. 451-452.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> About this method see: *Suntrup R.* Die Bedeutung der liturgischen Gebärden und Bewegungen in lateinischen und deutschen Auslegungen des 9. bis 13. Jahrhunderts. München, 1978 (Münsterische Mittelalter-Schriften; Bd. 37). S. 46-68; *Jungmann J.A.* Missarum Sollemnia. Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe. Bd. 1. Freiburg i. B., 1952. S. 143-156; *Angenendt A.* Grundformen der Frömmigkeit im Mittelalter. München, 2004 (Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte; Bd. 68). S. 38.

could be interpreted as an allegory of the preaching of Jesus, while the next part of the mass – from offertory to the “Pater Noster – could be seen as a narration of his sufferings, and finally, the final part of the divine service corresponded to the resurrection and ascension of the Saviour. In this way between the course of the Mass and the life of Christ arose a synchronism of sorts, whose goal was to bring a prayer closer to God both historically and psychologically<sup>17</sup>. Theological in its nature, this method of interpretation revealed roughly the same semantic content in every liturgy regardless of the type. However, different Masses contained a different number of external, formal elements, which could be interpreted by allegorical means. The highest concentration of these elements was present in the solemn papal mass.

For the first time a detailed description of the peculiarities of this mass with the evidences of their allegorical meaning could be found in the treatise "On the Holy Sacrament of the Altar"<sup>18</sup>, written ca. 1198 by Lothario de Segni (c. 1161 – 1216), who later became Pope Innocent III. Most of the regulations described were subsequently repeated and partly supplemented in “Interpretation of Divine Services”<sup>19</sup> of William Durandus (c. 1230 – 1296), Bishop of Mende and one of the most respected liturgists of the Middle Ages. This treatise created in 1286 – 1291 remained influential and popular up to the Early Modern period. In the 14<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup> centuries it was translated into French, German, Spanish, Italian and English. In 1459 “Interpretation” was published for the first time, and before 1500 it was published at least 43 times, only the editions of the Bible were more numerous<sup>20</sup>.

However, Durandus’ very voluminous work was not dedicated exclusively to the papal Mass. On the contrary, the author discussed them very seldom and in different parts of the text. The Bishop of Mende was mainly interested in the issues related to parochial and episcopal church services, and mentioned the papal liturgy only when it differed from other types of the mass. Therefore, relatively few and scattered Durandus’ observations on the papal worship were related just to the specific elements of the papal liturgy.

When at the beginning of the mass the pontiff solemnly entered the church and directed his steps to the altar, there were six ranks of the clergy stepping before him. They represented

---

<sup>17</sup> Angenendt A. Liturgik und Historik, S. 139.

<sup>18</sup> *Innocentius III. De sacro altaris mysterio*, in: *Migne J.P.* (ed.) *Patrologia cursus completus, series latina*. T. 217. Col. 773-915.

<sup>19</sup> *Durandus G. Rationale*, as in the note 12.

<sup>20</sup> About “Rationale Divinorum Officiorum” see *Buijssen G. H.* *Durandus’ Rationale in spätmittelhochdeutscher Übersetzung*. Bd. 1-4. Assen, 1966 – 1983; *Thibodeau T.M.* Introduction, in : *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum...* Vol. 3. P. 195-278; *Brucker C.* Variations et fixité dans la réception du Rationale divinorum officiorum de Guillaume Durand: ses traductions au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle, in: *Vanneste A., Leuven A.* (ed.) *Memoire en temps advenir. Hommage à Theo Venckeleer*. Leuven, 2003 (Orbis Supplementa; Vol. 22). P. 13-33.

six “ranks” („ordines personarum“) of Jesus’ ancestors mentioned in the Old Testament, i.e. the Patriarchs, prophets, kings and princes, priests and military leaders. The Pope, who was behind them, symbolized Christ himself, and his entrance into the church represented the First Coming of the Lord to Earth<sup>21</sup>. The same symbol was behind two lamps, which were carried in front of the pope: they signified the Old Testament prophecies and laws predicted the Coming of Jesus<sup>22</sup>.

Other metaphors of the entering ceremonies also referred to the Incarnation. Two deacons, marching behind the pontiff, and holding the hem of his robe, stood for Abraham and David, whom had been promised that the coming Savior would be of their kind<sup>23</sup>. Embroidered canopy, which was carried over the pope, meant Scripture and marked His place in the procession, of Whom said the laws and prophecies, that is, again, Christ<sup>24</sup>. Finally, the three priests who met the Pope on his way from the throne to the altar and kissed him on the lips and chest stood for the three Magi who came to worship the nativity of the Lord and to bring him gifts. Kissing the Pope on the mouth, these Magi-priests showed a visible, human nature of Christ, kissing Him on the chest – His hidden, divine nature<sup>25</sup>.

The beginning of the papal Mass particularly contained many specific elements, which had an allegorical meaning, typical only for this divine service. However, such details, though in smaller numbers, were present in other parts of the papal liturgy. In this way before the catholic prayer a Cardinal-Bishop came to the pontiff and brought him an open book. The Pope read the collect from this book, thus becoming like Jesus, about whom St. Luke wrote, “And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place

---

<sup>21</sup> “Romanus pontifex cum sex ordinibus clericorum a loco ubi se induit et paravit, processionaliter progreditur ad altare, designans quod Christus exivit a Patre et venit in mundum. Hic enim processionis ordo generationis Christi seriem repraesentat, quam Matheus evangelista describit (Matth. 1), in qua sex inveniuntur ordines personarum, a quibus, secundum carnem, Christus originem traxit, et in mundum processit, videlicet patriarche, prophete, reges, principes, pastores et duces“. *Durandus G. Rationale*. P. 274.

<sup>22</sup> “Et praeferuntur duo luminaria cum incenso, quia lex et prophetae cum psalmis Christi prenuntiaverunt adventum“. *Ibid.* P. 275.

<sup>23</sup> “Duo dyaconi pontificem deducentes significant Abraham et David quibus incarnationis Christi facta est repromissio, nam illi repromissum est: *In semine tuo benedicentur omnes gentes* (Gen. 22:18,); isti vero pollicitum, *De fructu ventris tui ponam super sedem tuam* (Psal. 131: 11)“. *Ibid.* P. 274.

<sup>24</sup> “Quator autem ministri super pontificem mappulam ferunt in summitatibus quatuor baculorum colligatam. Mappula illa, quae diversis figurata est ymaginibus, sacram designat Scripturam. Super pontificem ergo portatur extensa, ut is venisse monstretur quem lex scripserat et prophete“. *Ibid.* P. 275.

<sup>25</sup> “Porro tres sacerdotes, qui pontifici venienti coram altari reverenter occurrunt, et inclinat os eius osculantur et pectus, significant illos tres magos qui venerunt Ierosolymam dicentes: *Ubi est qui natus est rex Iudeorum?* (Matth. 2 : 2, 11). Per geminum osculum, geminam in Christo confitentur naturam, divinam scilicet et humanam: divinam quasi latentem in pectore, humanam quasi patentem in ore“. *Ibid.* P. 276.

where it was written, the Spirit of the Lord *is upon me* (Lk. 4:16)<sup>26</sup>.

After reading the Apostle a subdeacon kissed the pontiff's foot, symbolizing John the Baptist, who once said, "He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose (In. 1:26-27)"<sup>27</sup>. Finally, of particular importance was the place, where the Eucharist was done – not at the altar, but in front of the throne of the Pope. Durand explained, "The Roman Pontiff gives communion not there, where he breaks [the host], for he breaks at the altar and gives communion at the throne, because Christ in Emmaus broke [the bread] in the presence of two students, and ate in Jerusalem in front of the twelve disciples"<sup>28</sup>.

At this the list of episodes of the papal liturgy, which distinguishes this divine service from all the rest, ends. In these moments the Pope is actually "playing the role" of Jesus which corresponds well with his title "Vicar of Christ". However, did the Roman pontiffs use the liturgical allegories, created in the late 12<sup>th</sup> – mid 13<sup>th</sup> century by Lothar de Segni and Durandus? And if so, when exactly?

The lack of contemporary evidence does not allow us to answer this question with sufficient certainty, but if we look at the Roman Ordines, we may notice a curious phenomenon. The description of the papal Mass, closest to the Durandus's instructions, is only found in the book of ceremonies, in the so-called "Caeremoniale" of Agostino Patrizi Piccolomini and Johannes Burckard written in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century<sup>29</sup>. It contains all the points Durandus marked, though without specifying their symbolical meaning<sup>30</sup>. Taking into account that the previous five Ordines from the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> – mid 15<sup>th</sup> century either do not note these things at all, or mention only from one to three out of the eight original episodes<sup>31</sup>, it can be considered a significant deviation from the Roman curial tradition.

---

<sup>26</sup> "Romanus vero pontifex stans collectam pronuntiat, quam libro legit aperto, et deinde sedet, quia secundum evangelista testatur: *Venit Iesus in Nasareth, ubi nutritus fuerat, et intravit, secundum consuetudinem diei sabbati in synagogam, et surrexit legere. Et traditus est ei liber Ysaiiae prophete. Quem ut revolvit invenit locum, ubi scriptum erat: „Spiritus Domini super me, propter quod unxit me (Isa. 61: 1)“*. Ibid. P. 309.

<sup>27</sup> "Quia vero illi per visa miracula cognoverunt hunc esse de quo eorum magister predixerat: *Qui post me venit, ante me factus est, cujus non sum dignus corrigiam calceamenti solvere* (Eu. 1:26-27), ideo, pronus ad pedes, calceamentum romani pontificis subdiaconus osculatur". Ibid. P. 323.

<sup>28</sup> "Romanus itaque pontifex ideo non communicat ubi frangit, quoniam ad altare frangit et ad sedem communicat, quia Christus in Emmaus, coram duobus discipulis, fregit et in Ierusalem, coram duodecim discipulis, manducauit". Ibid. P. 549.

<sup>29</sup> Caeremoniale as in the note 11.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. T. 2. P. 294-316.

<sup>31</sup> *Ordo* from the mid 15<sup>th</sup> century contains no coincidence with the "Rationale" (*Tamburini F.* (ed.) *Le Cérémonial Apostolique avant Innocent VIII*. Roma, 1966 (Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae", sectio historica; Vol. 30). S. 45-51, 82-91); the same is true in the case of ceremonial of Pierre Ameil from the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century (*Dykmans M.* (ed.) *Le Cérémonial papal de la fin du moyen âge à la Renaissance*. T. 4. Rome, 1985 (Bibliothèque de l'institut historique belge de Rome; Fasc. 27). P. 70-81). François de Conzie, papal master of ceremonies, who lived at the turn of the 14<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, mentioned only three "Magi-priests". (Ibid. T. 3. Rome, 1983. P. 315-318). The so called "long" ceremonial written about 1342 concentrates

The hypothesis that the changes in the texts of ceremonial books reflect the changes in the daily practice of the Curia is indirectly confirmed by the fact that during the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century the papal liturgy underwent other changes too. Papal sermons completely disappeared, everyday papal Mass, previously co-existed with the solemn one, went out of the use. The general number of papal liturgies dramatically decreased – at the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century the Pope celebrated 3 – 4 times a year. At the same time the introductory parts of the Mass became extraordinary solemn and long<sup>32</sup>.

Obviously, all these changes were aimed not at reducing, but, on the contrary, at increasing the value of the papal liturgy in the curial ceremonial. They transformed it from an everyday event to an exclusive one. And we can hardly attribute to random coincidences the fact that during this event the role of the body of Pope as a "living icon" of Christ was greatly emphasized.

In addition to the Mass at the disposal of the Roman pontiffs there were many other ways in which they could present themselves, their body as a symbol, an image of Jesus or God the Father, Moses, St. Peter and Paul<sup>33</sup>. Such methods included not only numerous extralitururgical ceremonies of the Roman curia, but also paintings and sculpture<sup>34</sup>.

However, in contrast to the legal methods of English lawyers of the 16<sup>th</sup> century such practice did not assume that the pope had several bodies. That is why attempts to present, on the one hand a certain political body, that personified the institute of the papacy<sup>35</sup>, and on the other hand a certain "familial" body, consisting of his nephews<sup>36</sup>, as the second and third body of the Pope seem to me a bit strained. Even in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century Christ remained the institutional guarantor of the Church and the appearance of nephews at the Curia was mostly to satisfy the pontiff's practical political needs, which could be made without the use of new symbolic structures.

---

on quite different moments and does not correlate with Durandus (Ibid. P. 148-158). Finally, in the ceremonial of Iacobus de Stefanesci from the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century there are some, but not all of the 8 episodes (Ibidem. T. 2. Rome, 1981. P. 339-347).

<sup>32</sup> Nabuco J. Introduction, in: *Tamburini F.* (ed.) *Le Cérémonial Apostolique*. P. 22\*-32\*; *Fernández P.D.* The Patrimony of St. Peter. The Papal Court at Rome c. 1450 – 1700, in: *Adamson J.* (ed.) *The Princely Courts of Europe, Ritual Politics and Culture under the Ancien Régime 1500 – 1700*. London, 2000. P. 153.

<sup>33</sup> See for example *Bölling J.* Die zwei Körper des Heiligen. St. Petrus im Rom des Reformpapsttums, in: *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 106, 2011, S. 155-192.

<sup>34</sup> The most graphic examples of such artworks albeit from the earlier time are collected here: *Ladner G.* *Die Papstbildnisse des Altertums und des Mittelalters*. Von Innocenz II. zu Benedikt XI. Città del Vaticano; Roma, 1970. (Monumenti di antichità cristiana, Ser. 2, Vol. 4).

<sup>35</sup> *Krüger Th. M.* Die zwei Körper des Papstes. Zur politischen Theologie des Renaissancepapsttums, in: *In frumento et vino optima*. Festschrift für Thomas Zotz zu seinem 60. Geburtstag. Ostfildern, 2004. S. 297-316.

<sup>36</sup> This point of view was presented at "the Royal Body conference" in London (2-4 April 2012) by Jennifer Maria DeSilva.



I think it is more appropriate to speak not of several bodies of the pontiff, but of several contexts in which it may appear. Two of these contexts – politics and theology on the one hand and liturgy and ceremonial on the other hand – have been discussed out above. The third one, which concentrates on the physical and physiological properties of the pontiff's body, can also be often found in the texts of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. First of all, it is represented by the issues of health and longevity of the pontiff. They appeared at the latest in the 11<sup>th</sup> century and remained relevant through the late Middle Ages. In addition, the issues related to the safety of the pope gained particular importance. As a clear example here we can mention the foundation of the Swiss Guard during the reign of Julius II, but already in the mid – late 15<sup>th</sup> century the ceremonial books of the Curia contained the requirements to the Pope's bodyguards<sup>37</sup>. The level of fear for the life of the pontiff manifested itself in the fact that in the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century a taster became involved in the Mass. He had to try the wine and the hosts of the Eucharist, though, as far as I know, there were not any trustworthy cases of poisoning of priests by the use of the Sacred Gifts.

A parallel study of the three aforementioned contexts during one separate period of time<sup>38</sup> is the main objective of my research project. Hopefully, in this brief overview I managed at least partly to show, how diversity, variability and flexibility of late medieval conceptions of the Pope's body developed within the framework of these contexts. This, in its turn, allows more accurate understanding both of the self-perception of the Roman pontiffs and of the image of the papacy, which they propagated. Particularly, this approach shows the necessity to adjust the widespread thesis of complete worldliness of the Popes in the decades immediately preceding the Reformation. The study of this issue on the basis of the sources, relating not to Rome but to the episcopacies of the Holy Roman Empire must be also resultative enough, but I can't provide a sufficiently developed conclusions, so far I'm only at the preparatory stage of this phase of my research.

---

<sup>37</sup> For example: "Ante pontificem conservatores, capita regionum et alii officiales ac nobiles cives urbis, pedes preibunt, et pretoriani milites cum eis, accincti ense, circiter centum, et baculum in manibus portantes ad custodiam corporis pontificis". *Caeremoniale*. T. 1. P. 80.

<sup>38</sup> In my case it is a the period from the return of the Popes from Avignon up to the Reformation (1387 – ca. 1520).